

QC Alumni

EXIT INTERVIEW

GSLIS Experience

Name (Optional)

Email (Optional)

Graduation Year
and Semester

(1) What was your best/most useful experience in GSLIS?

(2) What was the most problematic part of your experience at the GSLIS?

(3) If you could change only one thing at the GSLIS, what would it be?

SUBMIT

Summary of Graduate Exit Interviews, Spring 2013 (3 from Spring 2014)

(29 responses)

To a remarkable extent, the comments from the most recent two years' graduating students paralleled the results from the April 2014 Alumni survey.

Best aspects of the program were technology courses, those with a practical emphasis, and faculty with practice experience working in LIS.

Courses that featured a mix of theory and practice were especially valued, as were internship experiences and observations (in LMS courses), and the Special Collections fellowship program. Students would value more trips to other area institutions and/or more guest speakers to bring the "real world" into the classroom. One respondent mentioned working more closely with QC libraries to provide hands-on experience.

There were many positive comments on faculty in general, but others were mentioned as being unresponsive or disorganized.

Criticisms related to communications issues, scheduling issues, cutting back of course sections due to budget constraints, and a lack of attention to the needs of students who work full-time. Students have issues with the current practice of filing a paper form to allow those with more credits to pre-register and perhaps this approach can be reworked. One student specifically mentioned how Queens College in general does not attend to the needs of evening students with regard to Financial Aid, the Bursar's Office, the Registrar, parking stickers and college IDs.

As with the alumni survey, respondents would appreciate more career guidance, more technology courses, more current technology courses (e.g. social media, cloud computing), more guidance in advising, more evening courses. Some however, would like more day and afternoon classes. Several people felt that there was far too much information in 709 to cover in a single semester, while another opined that s/he had feared it too much and it was actually not too bad. Others strongly valued 709.

Other specific comments can be addressed by relevant committees and the Chair/Vice Chair.

THE EXIT INTERVIEWS OF
SEPTEMBER, 2009; FEBRUARY, 2010; and JUNE 2010

During the AY 2009/2010 the GSLIS had, according to the College, 161 graduates. Twenty eight students completed their course of study at the end of the 2009 Summer Session, 56 at the conclusion of the Fall 2009 semester and 77 at the end of the Spring 2010 semester. Each April, as part of its concluding activities for the academic year, the GSLIS surveys those who either have graduated in either the preceding September or February or have applied for a June degree. This year 29 (18%) of these graduates responded. This is a stronger return than has been the case for the past few years. In AY 2008/2009 23 (14.2%) returned the questionnaire. 20 (11.3%) of the 176 graduates during the AY 2007/2008 participated while in AY 2006/2007 19 (11%) of the 172 graduates returned the survey.

As has been the case in the past responses to the three questions will be examined in the order in which they were presented on the survey instrument.

Part One: What was your best/most useful experience at the GSLIS?

This question drew 55 comments from these 29 respondents. Upon examination of the comments it was discerned that they fell into the following categories: (1) the GSLIS as a whole; (2) the curriculum in general and then specific courses; (3) full time faculty; (4) adjunct faculty; and (5) responses that were not appropriately placed under one of these headings.

The GSLIS, as a whole, is well regarded by these graduates. One stated “the entire experience was useful...” and provided “a quality education in two years.” Another indicated that “the program was really useful in my life” and an additional graduate reported that it was “excellent in archival studies.”

A major part of these positive reflections lies in the perceptions of the curriculum as a whole and the faculty responsible for its execution. One respondent commented on the “number of interesting courses” while applauding “the idea that there [are] four required courses.” Echoing that sentiment was the statement that there were “plenty (courses) to choose from and all very informative & educational.” A recurring theme on the curriculum generally was the opportunity for “hands on experience” which “were based on things I actually had to do in my job.” Buttressing this were additional statements that “assignments in a majority of the courses were most useful.” Another seemed to capture the essence when he/she summed it up this way. “I loved a majority of my courses.”

“The faculty and staff are the biggest assets the program has” and the “opportunity to learn from their collective knowledge and experience was the best” reflected one respondent. Another noted “how much the faculty cares about (students)-not just how we are doing in class.” Duly noted was the availability of professors during advisement. “Most professors,” added a third, “were patient, inviting and approachable.”

There were some courses and professors singled out for specific praise. As a group the technology courses were complimented for their “discussion of up and coming trends and social networks.” Within this group, Web building, the design and construction of databases and GSLIS 751 were specifically identified. All classes with Dr. Cool, in the view of one respondent, “were wonderful” since she “treated us as graduate students.” The two best courses, another respondent suggested, were “by far Dr. Smith’s Children’s Literature and Dr. Alexander’s Manuscript to eBooks.” These courses, added this graduate, “were rigorous with graduate level readings, discussions and assignments.” Two felt that Dr. Li’s course on information literacy was their paramount educational experience. Other courses singled out were “YA Services” and Internship. The significance of the adjunct faculty in the success of the GSLIS also comes through here. Jennifer Sainato’s “Preservation and Conservation of Cultural Materials” (GSLIS 733) was “valuable, interesting with lots of work.” (three respondents) Storytelling and Early Literacy (GSLIS 790.3) with B. Gordh was also praised by one respondent. “The most useful experience I had at the GSLIS was taking a class by Professor James Farrell” added another.

Additional faculty praised by these respondents specifically are Professors Blake, Ng and Perry. Reinforcing the significant role of the adjunct faculty in the GSLIS resurfaces here as well. One noted their experiences with “great teachers like Jack Martin, Carey Stumm (seconded by a colleague) and Laroi Lawton.” “Professor DeCandido,” added another, “was especially inspiring.”

There were other factors reinforcing the positives noted above. One theme was the sense of community at the GSLIS. One respondent was most impressed by forming relationships with students and faculty, a second commented on the “fellowship of other students” and found it “encouraging to be among my peers.” A third felt “an active student government has been a key in building student community.” A fourth was impressed by the constant availability of the computer lab. Finally one simply said Karen R.

There were some quirky things as well. One stated “making a table/chart has helped me with my papers, presentations and my overall research papers.” Another respondent appreciated “help in finding a job” while a second said “GLISANN helped me get a job.” More intriguing was the statement “getting a master’s degree.”

Overall these comments would suggest that the GSLIS has approached Athens in terms of library/information studies. Far from it-but these responses do provide a rough indication of some things that it is doing “right” as well as its ability to meet its stated goals and objectives-to some degree. In that sense the responses to question one are helpful. Always more interesting, however, are the responses to the next question on this elementary survey instrument.

Part Two: What was the most problematic part of your experience at the GSLIS?

This question elicited 41 comments from these 29 respondents. Finding fewer complaints than there were praises (55) is itself interesting. However, these may be of greater interest in terms of the perceived deficiencies in the GSLIS' ability to achieve its stated goals and objectives. The structure in this segment will mirror that employed above-the School as a whole, the curriculum generally and specifically, the faculty as an entity, and, finally, other issues that do not fit conveniently under one of those headings.

Generally the comments concerning the School as a whole were modest in scope. Two felt the process of getting to the GSLIS itself was the biggest obstacle. While the GSLIS itself is aware of the gauntlet many students face to gain their education, this is one factor beyond its control. More problematic was the perception of a "lack of consistency of the class schedule" which resulted in missing a certificate mandated course. The GSLIS has (since 2005) had a long term course rotation schedule. The second edition of this covering the period of the Summer Session 2010 through the Spring 2016 semesters is now available to all on the School's Web site. Since 2007 all students for their second semester meet with their selected faculty advisor and complete a tentative program plan to ensure that the requirements for all certificate programs can be met during a student's residency. This was introduced to minimize this type of situation. Having only one such comment is indicative of the progress of the GSLIS in meeting student expectations.

Related to this are the observations that "some classes fill up quickly even with pre-registration" and "registering when a popular class was offered was difficult." That there were the only comments on registration-a staple of reports past-indicates that the current system of advisement, limited pre-registration and online registration for all but first semester students has vastly improved this element of the GSLIS. The imponderable here is the initiation of a new student registration system using CUNYFIRST and how it will impact GSLIS students.

There is one rising concern that is of more importance in the current era. One respondent indicated that he/she "was not prepared to enter the job market" while a second recommended "more job seeking workshops." This is a most legitimate concern in AY 2009/2010 as graduates are experiencing more competition for fewer professional positions in the metropolitan New York region. The GSLIS itself does not currently have the resources (a placement officer for example) to launch a complete service for its students. However, it has introduced a jobs LISTSERV for all to access and some faculty have been most active in passing on position announcements and relevant workshops as they encounter them in their professional activities. Faculty have been known to recommend individuals for positions as well as counsel students informally. All of this goes beyond the expectation of writing letters of recommendation upon request. But there are finite limits here. Greater utilization of College resources as part of the solution might be considered.

The curriculum as a whole came in for some criticism-as might be expected. While many applauded the incorporation of practical assignments above, one respondent felt that there was “not enough practical applications” especially in the technology classes and, further, advocated classes that “mandated grant writing, the construction of a database and the implementation of standards such as EAD”. The GSLIS has had a course, GSLIS 746, The Design and Construction of Bibliographic Databases, and the newly introduced courses, GSLIS 730, Archival Appraisal, Arrangement and Access, and GSLIS 752, Digital Preservation should go a long ways to mitigating this second expressed concern. In addition, GSLIS 756, Managing New Technologies, requires the writing and editing of a technology related grant proposal. A number of other courses include at least some elements of grant writing. There was, in the eyes of one graduate, “not enough time spent in teaching about new technology and how to use them.” It should be pointed out that as of the Fall 2010 semester the GSLIS catalog indicates that there are 10 elective courses (GSLIS 741, GSLIS 745, GSLIS 747, GSLIS 751, GSLIS 753, GSLIS 754, GSLIS 755, GSLIS 756, and GSLIS 757) beyond the introductory course (either GSLIS 700 or GSLIS 706). This represents 16.6% of the entire curriculum.

The archival certificate program received some comments as well. There the concern was “not enough archival courses available” and “not enough ‘hands on’ work especially in archives. The GSLIS does have six courses related to archives (GSLIS 730, GSLIS 731, GSLIS 732, GSLIS 733, GSLIS 752 and, as of Spring 2010, a designated section of GSLIS 795. An additional opportunity has been provided through the establishment of the Queens College Special Collections Fellowship program in conjunction with the Rosenthal Library Department of Special Collections and Archive. This program has permitted a number of highly motivated students to do a hands-on project beginning in Fall 2009. These projects range from processing papers in the College’s Civil Rights archive and other collections to a variety of other archival work. Additional recommended courses for the Archives Certificate include GSLIS 729, 731, 736, 753 and 757.

Another segment of the curriculum singled out for comment was the School Library Media Specialist program (Program Code: 604) which one respondent characterized as “problematic.” This individual added that “courses were outdated, too much love of reading and not enough data driven, technology based instruction.” In addition, this respondent continued, this program was focused on elementary schools. One of the primary reasons the GSLIS recruited Dr. L. Cooper was its recognition that its LMS program needed an overhaul. In the three short years that she has been at the GSLIS Dr. L. Cooper has made major progress in revising and modernizing this program. GSLIS 761, Media Centers: Organization and Management, has been transformed and is more truly an introductory course for students interested in this professional specialization and students in the GSLIS can enroll in it very early in their course of study. GSLIS 763, Non-Book Materials: Sources and Services, was so thoroughly made over that it has been replaced by GSLIS 764, Instructional Technology for Information Literacy. Dr. L. Cooper’s efforts have recently resulted in the approval of an additional NYSED certified LMS program which will allow students who do not have prior teacher certification to pursue

this specialty. In short, the LMS program of 2009/2010 no longer resembles the program of 2007.

Some specific courses came in for their share of notoriety. Two respondents directed their ire at GSLIS 703 although a closer reading of these comments indicated the problem was not the course but their adjunct instructor (who has since not been invited back). The other course drawing fire from two respondents was GSLIS 700, The Technology of Information. One labeled it simply "outdated" while the second argued for its elimination since "all students have these skills" and suggested it "be replaced with a better class." Certainly the faculty are well aware-due to student feedback, various surveys and personal experience-that GSLIS 700 is in need of an overhaul. However it is not accurate to state that "all students have these skills." Many older, returning students are not familiar with current technologies. Others may be international students or recent immigrants who did not grow up with technology. Suggestions regarding courses that update student skills would need to be seriously considered by the Curriculum Committee. Other options, such as workshops, non-credit courses etc. raise serious concerns about who could be tasked with developing and teaching such sessions. Our current staffing levels are not sufficient to take on such additional, non-credit learning options,

Currently it is possible for a student to test out of GSLIS 700 and take GSLIS 751 in its place. However, this creates additional problems in that GSLIS 751 is offered only in the Spring semester and is limited in size because of its intense content. In recognition of this problem the GSLIS recently introduced GSLIS 706, Advanced Technological Concepts, for students with some of the requisite skills but not sufficient for registration in GSLIS 751. Unfortunately GSLIS 706 has attracted only a minimal number of registrants. Generally it has not been able to actually be offered as frequently as we hoped because of a minimum fifteen student enrollment rule, recently adopted by the Queens College administration (an increase from the previous minimum of ten). The hiring of a new Lecturer charged with the oversight of GSLIS 700 will eventually lead to a substantive review-in conjunction with other relevant faculty and committees- of departmental needs and options. The School's new Lecturer, it must be noted, is still in his first semester and it is unrealistic to expect that this will take place within the current academic year. This has been a continuing problem for the GSLIS and will be a challenge for the Technology and Curriculum Committees to resolve ASAP.

Only one graduate expressed some disappointment in the faculty. "With the exception of Professor Ng, the adjuncts were unfailingly better than the tenured faculty by every measure: teaching skills, organization, classroom management, and, most of all content." While the adjuncts are highly regarded, it is important to recall that this is only one comment. The College and the GSLIS continuously monitor through peer evaluations and student evaluations the classroom performance of its full time and adjunct faculty. The results of the student evaluations are available to all via the College's Office of Institutional Research. As a department the GSLIS faculty receive

some of the strongest scores of the 32 academic departments of the College. These ratings also play a major role in the re-appointment of non-tenured faculty, tenure itself and all subsequent promotions. Adjunct faculty are similarly assessed and, when found wanting, are simply not invited back. These are the mechanisms in place to minimize characterizations like this one concerning the faculty.

Another respondent added that “older faculty need to be replaced by new people to make it an exciting program.” Be that as it may, the GSLIS is, in fact, in transition. Over the last four years the GSLIS has successfully recruited three new faculty members (Professors Alexander, L. Cooper, and Li). In AY 2010/2011 the GSLIS added a full time lecturer (W. Valero) to buttress its ability to offer technology based courses. Two members of the 13 member faculty retired as of September, 2010 (Professors Blake and Smith) and the School has been given permission to recruit for one replacement. Permission to recruit a second replacement has not yet been approved in light of the uncertain budget situation of New York State . This represents over 1/3 of the faculty who represent the third generation of the GSLIS already. The impact of New York State’s Early Retirement Incentive program is largely unknown at this writing—at least one other faculty member has indicated her intention to retire- but there is one certainty—the new generation of the faculty of the GSLIS will soon be in place.

There were some other comments directed at the faculty. One indicated she/he had taken a class “never getting a bad grade and then not getting the grade you thought you deserved.” The GSLIS, as the Graduate Curriculum now requires, systematically includes in the course syllabus the basis for the evaluation of students and the relative weights given each of the assignments. As a School that is about all it can do. “Professors with unrealistic expectations” seemed to be directed at one adjunct who has not been retained. One respondent characterized the adjuncts as “not engaging” while another stated “some of the adjunct faculty were less than ideal.” As indicated above, adjuncts are subject to the same system of evaluation as full time faculty and in those cases where they are found wanting they are not retained. These comments present an interesting contrast to those above from the student who praised our adjuncts.

Some of these negative concerns are beyond the powers of the GSLIS. There were criticisms of the Queens College web site (1), email & esims (our College registration system) (1), and Blackboard (1). The wonder here is that were not more. One graduate had an issue with “reading all the emails.” Finally, in contrast to that reported above, one felt there was “a total lack of community. Too many students are there to get a raise on their job; too many faculty are already retired mentally or are interested only in their own projects, not the students.” While there might have been a grain of truth regarding this characterization of the students in the distant past, it has not been the case in recent years. The infusion of a far larger cadre of full time students than had been the norm, and the thriving of the student organizations (qcLISSA, ALA, SAA, SLA) have really transformed student life at the GSLIS. As for faculty, in all of these reports

(this is the fifth) the preponderance of the comments about the faculty have been the obverse of this sentiment.

One very interesting element in this report for AY 2009/2010 was that there were no complaints (or even comments) regarding GSLIS 709, Research in Library and Information Studies. These had been an enduring feature of these reports to this point. Their absence indicates that the revision of that course has been most effective.

Part Three: If you could change one thing at the GSLIS, what would it be?

These 29 respondents had 34 comments/suggestions for the GSLIS to consider: stretching the parameters as GSLIS students tend to do. In considering these proffered ideas the structure adopted in the first two sections will be followed here. First to be examined are items concerning the School as a whole. These will be followed by sections on the curriculum, the faculty and things that do not lend themselves to any of the previous headings. By far the ideas concerning the curriculum (15) outnumber those addressing concerns for the school as a whole (10) and faculty (4). The remainder (5) concern things that are not appropriately placed in any of the preceding sections.

Reflecting the difficulty of getting to Queens College indicated above, two graduates suggested "more classes in NYC." The obverse of that was the contention that the GSLIS should "focus on QC...classes in Manhattan should be in addition not in place of offerings at the College." This is a fine line to walk. GSLIS 733, The Conservation and Preservation of Cultural Materials, and GSLIS 752, Digital Preservation presently can only be taught in Manhattan since the College itself lacks the pre-requisite preservation labs each course needs. Each semester there are two core courses offered at the Murphy Institute. There are multiple sections of these courses available at the College each semester and in the Summer Session. All the other electives taught at the Murphy Institute, primarily in the Children's and Young Adult Services and Archives Certificate programs, are also offered at the College in a subsequent semester. The sentiment is a legitimate one but, pending the acquisition of additional physical and faculty resources, the GSLIS will continue to attempt to meet the needs of a majority of its students following the current practice of offering courses at both sites in alternating semesters.

The theme concerning the role of the practical/"hands on" portion of the program generated the proposal (from two graduates) that the GSLIS use more outside speakers and field trips. Related to this was the counsel that the "GSLIS get more involved in outside activities" and "increase the visibility of the GSLIS in local news-it is an excellent and affordable program." Outside speakers are not a novelty in a wide range of classes while field trips are rarer and less often organized. The part time/ working students who are still the majority of the GSLIS student body make the organization of such ventures a daunting, but not impossible, task. Student organizations, however, have had greater success in organizing field trips.

Aligned with the assertions that the GSLIS did not adequately prepare students for job seeking was the admonition to provide “more preparation for job seeking.” As indicated above, the GSLIS recognizes this but has constraints on what is possible in this regard. It should also be noted that in the last two years very few potential employers have attended the annual “Career Day.”

More cryptic were references to the registration process, an element of concern indicated earlier, and “listening to student complaints.” The GSLIS does have a grievance system in place. Students who feel that this is necessary can meet with the Graduate Advisor for Continuing Students and/or the Chair/Director at any time. Any meeting of that type works to resolving the problems at hand.

The GSLIS has, especially in recent years, drawn a large number of students from Nassau/Suffolk Counties where Civil Service regulations are a significant aspect of permanent employment in public libraries. One respondent felt that the GSLIS should offer “more guidance on which courses help meet those requirements.” At one time the GSLIS did examine its curriculum and matched courses with Civil Service requirements. Given the great changes in the School’s curriculum in the past five years, this is something that should be re-examined to assist these students in their program planning.

But it was the curriculum that received most of the attention of these 29 respondents. In most cases the key word is more. Three proposed even more technology courses while another restated the idea that “those without basic skills get remedial instruction while the rest take a course like 751 as the technology core course.” Related to this was the recommendation that faculty “add more technological channels to teaching; Blackboard was OK but only C. Perry used a wider range of options.” There is some evidence that this may be in process. The proportion of classes now requiring a computer classroom where the transformation becomes possible has increased geometrically in recent years. Further, the addition of the Lecturer position with a focus on teaching technology courses should also help to address these observations.

The newly revised and enhanced archival certificate program (2009) also drew a fair number of comments. Two graduates simply requested more archives courses, another would have greater flexibility in meeting the internship requirements for that certificate program. One additional plea was for “more classes on museums.” The GSLIS recognizes the merits of these ideas but responding adequately to them requires both additional faculty resources (difficult to recruit even in better times) and infrastructure improvements (not likely in the short term future). There is already a fair amount of flexibility in the internship requirements in that many students in other specialized areas attain the 150 hour stipulation over a period exceeding the semester in which he/she is enrolled in that course. The ability to augment course offerings in this specialization is

dictated by the degree to which the symbiotic elements of faculty and infrastructure change.

Other broad areas of the curriculum generated thoughts. One respondent suggested the development of “a certificate program in library management”... “more courses in it.” Still another advocated “more classes dealing with public libraries.” The GSLIS has twice tried to launch a library management program and failed to attract sufficient enrollment to the proposed introductory course on both occasions. Those seeking positions in public libraries would seem to be reasonably well served. First those attracted to Children’s and Young Adult Services have a well defined certificate program. Those interested in adult services have GSLIS 779 and an array of advanced reference courses. Technology oriented students have the courses identified above and GSLIS 770, Public Libraries: Organization and Management. Those interested in technical services in public libraries have that course (GSLIS 770) and a number of courses beyond GSLIS 703 to select from. It would seem that the GSLIS is well positioned to prepare students for public librarianship without making major changes in the curriculum. That does not mean that existing courses do not have to be continuously reviewed and updated.

The fourth theme concerning the curriculum raised by one respondent was the need for changes in the LMS program. This is revisiting the comments made in section two. As pointed out earlier, this program, under the direction of Dr. L. Cooper, has already taken a number of major steps in that direction and continues to make progress in LMS program development.

There were some specific suggestions for new courses. Two proposed a course on grant writing. Grant writing is an integral aspect of GSLIS 756, Managing New Technologies and is also required in other elective courses. Another student felt that the GSLIS should add a course on scholarly communication and copyright. GSLIS 709 was not totally absent. One respondent offered two amendments to this course: (1) that it be offered at the beginning of the program to eliminate the stress at the end of one’s course of study (illogical for a culminating experience that is to demonstrate a grasp of, presumably, a new field-not possible given the State’s requirements); and (2) that it be offered as a two semester, six credit course (an old idea that pre-dates the “new” GSLIS 709 which seems to be working).

A now familiar refrain was the idea that courses should feature “more hands on i.e. more involvement with CUNY, NYPL, QPL and BPL librarians” (two respondents). Finally was the recommendation that certificates be processed when the student completed his/her program rather than only in the Spring semester as part of the School’s June graduation ceremony. The former discounts the frequency and wide range of speakers who are guests in classes, participants in student/school sponsored events and the internship connections. The latter, the annual processing of certificates, may have more

to do with the College's *modus vivendi* than that of the GSLIS-but is something to be considered.

The GSLIS, one graduate felt, "needs new blood." Professors Alexander, Ng, Perry, Sainato and Stumm are characterized as "wonderful, energetic, enthusiastic and involved in the profession." The GSLIS, continues this respondent, "needs more like them." An additional graduate said that the GSLIS should "pay more attention to course evaluations." Both of these comments have been alluded to earlier. A third comment in this vein was that "too many adjuncts did not have experience or care much for the students" and that the GSLIS should "get more qualified full time faculty." As indicated above, all faculty, including adjuncts, are evaluated by their peers and students. Those adjuncts found wanting are not renewed. However the need to invoke this, especially in light of the large number of adjuncts the GSLIS has utilized to offer its full program, has been relatively rare.

There were some unique proposals put forth in this edition of the exit interviews. A very worthy one was the concept of "graduate/teaching/research assistantships to help students afford it (their education) better." While the GSLIS would support this, the awarding of assistantships of this type is the sole province of CUNY, which currently limits them to doctoral students.

Equally sweeping-and much easier to attain it would seem-is expanding "options for continued use of library resources for alumni." This is a novel idea and one worth investigating.

Two other items put on the table are far more specific. One simply states that GLISANN is awful but offers no specifics as the basis for this comment. It is hard to examine something without some sense as to the context of that observation. The second was the need "to emphasize the importance of checking the web site to understand what is going on at the GSLIS." While this is discussed in the group interviews prior to admission, perhaps it needs to be reinforced in other forums later. Further, the best way to stay current with department happenings is to closely monitor the GSLIS listserv.

Conclusion

Overall the graduates of AY 2009/2010 have painted a positive portrait of the School. The program, the curriculum and the faculty as entities are highly regarded. The criticisms elicited are focused and limited. Many of them are already being addressed, to some degree, by the GSLIS. The changes these graduates would make are relatively modest in terms of the School as a whole and its faculty. More significant are the ideas on the curriculum which-in essence-seem to say More! More! This may be challenging in light of the current budget situation but every effort will be made to respond to student input. There is a good foundation here for the next generation of the caretakers of the

GSLIS to work with as the School evolves to meet the changing needs of library/information service professionals in the maturing information age that is the 21st century.