About WILIS 2

WILIS 2 is a research project designed to create and implement a shared approach to alumni tracking that all library and information science (LIS) programs can potentially use to evaluate the effectiveness of their master’s degree programs. This summary report allows you to compare the results of your WILIS 2 alumni survey with the results of all 39 participating LIS programs. Each program was invited to provide a random sample of 250 alumni who graduated within the last five years. Note that your results may be affected by the sample you chose (e.g. years of graduation). All sites have already received a copy of their complete dataset, frequency tables, text responses, and a list of alumni who provided updated contact information.
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1.0 WILIS 2 OVERVIEW

1.1 ABSTRACT

WILIS 2 is a research project designed to create and implement a shared approach to alumni tracking that all information and library science master’s programs can potentially use to evaluate the effectiveness of their degree programs. The project builds on WILIS 1, an in-depth, comprehensive study of career patterns of graduates of library and information science (LIS) graduates from five North Carolina programs from 1964 to 2007. WILIS 2 used a community-based participatory research (CBPR) approach in which representatives of eight pilot programs worked together with the research team to refine the recent graduates’ portion of the WILIS 1 online survey so that it would be suitable for all LIS programs. The group also identified the key survey results to be included in the Program Report. This summary report allows participating programs to compare their results with those of other programs. All sites also received a copy of their complete dataset, frequency tables, text responses, and a list of alumni who provided updated contact information.

1.2 WILIS 2 METHODOLOGY AND RESPONSE RATES

The WILIS 2 survey gathered data on:

- Demographics
- Employment
- LIS Master’s Program Experience and Evaluation
- Knowledge and Skills Provided by the LIS Program

Programs were asked to select a random sample of 250 of their master’s degree graduates from the previous five years; however, several programs included a few graduates from earlier years. Fewer than four percent of these respondents graduated prior to 2003. Programs with multiple degrees were able to select the degree programs included in their sample. The graduates received an email invitation and three email reminders. A few programs mailed paper invitations to encourage better response rates. A survey was counted as complete if the respondent had answered at least through Section SP (Student/Program Characteristics). The achieved response rate for all three phases of the survey was 40.5 percent (n=3507). Response rates for individual programs ranged from 15.5 percent to 80.4 percent. For purposes of this report, we use the full dataset of the 39 LIS programs graduating between 2000 and 2009 (n=3507). The response rate for University of Illinois was 80.4 percent (n=193).
1.3 Participating Programs

Pilot programs are marked with an asterisk (*).

Appalachian State University
Dalhousie University
Dominican University
Drexel University
East Carolina University
Long Island University
Louisiana State University
McDaniel College
North Carolina Central University
Old Dominion University
San Jose State University
Simmons College*
Trevecca Nazarene University
University at Albany, SUNY
University at Buffalo, SUNY
University of Alabama*
University of Alberta
University of Arizona*
University of British Columbia
University of California -Los Angeles

University of Central Missouri*
University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign*
University of Kentucky
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina-Greensboro
University of North Texas
University of Pittsburgh
University of Puerto Rico
University of Rhode Island*
University of South Carolina
University of South Florida
University of Tennessee
University of Texas-Austin
University of Toronto*
University of Washington*
University of Western Ontario
University of Wisconsin-Madison
Wayne State University
William Paterson University
Table 1. Summary of Program Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WILIS 2 Programs (n=39)</th>
<th>All Identified LIS Master’s Programs(^1) (n=106)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accreditation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA(^2)</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23% NCATE 3% Other</td>
<td>39% NCATE 10% Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographical Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Size(^3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Institution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>US News Top Ranked(^2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) LIS programs in North America were obtained from the following five sources: American Library Association’s *Alphabetical List of Institutions with ALA-Accredited Programs*; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education’s (NCATE) *List of Recognized Programs per Accredited Institutions for School Library Media Specialist (ALA/AASL)*; Peterson’s Guide Note: A comprehensive search was done for library and information science programs, at the graduate and undergraduate level. I-schools Caucus; Council on Library/Media Technician’s list of *U.S. Library Technician Programs*

\(^2\) The list of LIS programs with ALA accreditation was retrieved on March 3, 2009; the US News list of top 25 schools in Library and Information Studies was obtained on February 23, 2009.

\(^3\) Faculty size was obtained from the WILIS 1 survey of deans, directors, and chairs data and program websites. The faculty included part time and full time members. The faculty size ranged from 5 to 113 for the population of LIS programs. Small was considered to be 5 - 20 faculty members, medium 21 – 47 faculty members, and large 52 - 113 faculty members.
1.4 DEMOGRAPHICS

FIGURE 1: AGE - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS

FIGURE 2: GENDER - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS
**Figure 3: Race/Ethnicity*, Part 1 - 36 Programs**

![Race/Ethnicity (D3) bar chart]

*Check all that apply; multiple responses may add to more than 100%; three programs elected not to participate in this question.

**Figure 4: Race/Ethnicity*, Part 2 - 36 Programs**

![Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino? (D2) bar chart]

*Check all that apply; multiple responses may add to more than 100%; three programs elected not to participate in this question. The US Census reports Spanish/Hispanic/Latino as an ethnicity.
**Figure 5: Minority Status* - Urbana-Champaign Compared to 36 Programs**

![Bar chart showing minority status comparison between Urbana-Champaign and all programs.](image)

- Champaign-Urbana: N=190
- All Programs: N=3152

*Check all that apply; multiple responses may add to more than 100%; three programs elected not to participate in this question; minority status determined by race and Spanish/Hispanic/Latino/ethnicity.

**Figure 6: Graduation Year - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

![Bar chart showing graduation year comparison between Urbana-Champaign and all programs.](image)

- Champaign-Urbana: N=190
- All Programs: N=3507
2.0 **URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SUMMARY AND COMPARISON**

2.1 **EMPLOYMENT OVERVIEW**

**FIGURE 7: USE OF LIS KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS IN CURRENT JOB - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS**

**Use of LIS knowledge and skills in current job**

- **In a library or information center using LIS skills/knowledge**
  - Champaign-Urbana: 78%
  - All Programs: 78%

- **In a non-library or non-information center setting using LIS skills/knowledge**
  - Champaign-Urbana: 12%
  - All Programs: 10%

- **In a non-library or non-information center setting NOT using LIS skills/knowledge**
  - Champaign-Urbana: 4%
  - All Programs: 5%

- **Other, please specify**
  - Champaign-Urbana: 3%
  - All Programs: 4%

- **In a library or information center NOT using LIS skills/knowledge**
  - Champaign-Urbana: 3%
  - All Programs: 2%

- **Self-employed not using LIS skills/knowledge**
  - Champaign-Urbana: 0%
  - All Programs: 0%

- **Self-employed using LIS skills/knowledge**
  - Champaign-Urbana: 0%
  - All Programs: 0%

*Champaign-Urbana N=180  
All Programs N=3109*
Figure 8: Current Job Setting - Urbana-Champaign Compared To All Programs

Current job setting (E19)

- Public library: 19% (Champaign-Urbana), 17% (All Programs)
- Academic library: 24% (Champaign-Urbana), 24% (All Programs)
- School library media center: 4% (Champaign-Urbana), 5% (All Programs)
- Other, please specify: 7% (Champaign-Urbana), 2% (All Programs)
- Institution of higher learning: 3% (Champaign-Urbana), 5% (All Programs)
- Non-profit organization: 3% (Champaign-Urbana), 3% (All Programs)
- Government agency: 2% (Champaign-Urbana), 2% (All Programs)
- Archives: 2% (Champaign-Urbana), 2% (All Programs)
- Law library: 5% (Champaign-Urbana), 2% (All Programs)
- Health library: 2% (Champaign-Urbana), 2% (All Programs)
- Primary or secondary education: 1% (Champaign-Urbana), 2% (All Programs)
- Government library: 2% (Champaign-Urbana), 2% (All Programs)
- Other company: 2% (Champaign-Urbana), 2% (All Programs)
- Other special library: 2% (Champaign-Urbana), 2% (All Programs)
- Corporate library: 1% (Champaign-Urbana), 1% (All Programs)
- Technology company: 1% (Champaign-Urbana), 1% (All Programs)
- Museum: 1% (Champaign-Urbana), 1% (All Programs)
- Library vendor: 1% (Champaign-Urbana), 1% (All Programs)
- Self-employed: 1% (Champaign-Urbana), 1% (All Programs)
- Library cooperative: 1% (Champaign-Urbana), 0% (All Programs)
- Information industry: 0% (Champaign-Urbana), 0% (All Programs)
- Computer industry: 0% (Champaign-Urbana), 2% (All Programs)

- Champaign-Urbana: N=180
- All Programs: N=3109

Percent
**Figure 9: Quality of Preparation for First Job - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

How well did your program prepare you for your first job? (E17)

![Bar chart showing comparison between Champaign-Urbana and All Programs for how well program prepared students for first job.]

**Figure 10: Primary Level of Employment - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

What is your primary level of employment? (E21)

![Bar chart showing comparison between Champaign-Urbana and All Programs for primary level of employment.]
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**Figure 11: Supervisory Role* - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

I supervise or manage other people (E22)

*Check all that apply; multiple responses may add to more than 100%.

**Figure 12: Satisfaction with LIS - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

Overall I am satisfied with LIS as a career. (E35_A)
**FIGURE 13: INTENTION TO STAY IN LIS* FIELD - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS**

Do you think you will still be working in LIS 3 years from now? (E36)

![Bar chart showing percentage of respondents who think they will still be working in LIS 3 years from now, comparing Champaign-Urbana (88%) and All Programs (91%).](chart)

*Champaign-Urbana N=178
All Programs N=3004

*LIS refers to the broad career field of library and information science.*
**FIGURE 14: PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES* - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS**

The chart below illustrates the distribution of professional activities since graduation (LA1) for students from Champaign-Urbana and all programs combined. The chart compares the frequency of activities such as attending a professional conference, presenting a paper or poster session at a conference, holding office in a professional association, participating in online discussion lists, and attending professional meetings in the fields of library and information science.

*Check all that apply; multiple responses may add to more than 100%.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Champaign-Urbana</th>
<th>All Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Held membership in a professional association</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a professional conference</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated regularly in an online professional discussion list</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped to organize or volunteered at a professional meeting/conference</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented a paper or poster session at a professional conference</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Held office in a professional association</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had one or more papers accepted for publication as co-author</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had one or more papers accepted for publication as sole author</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Check all that apply; multiple responses may add to more than 100%.*
FIGURE 15: EMPLOYMENT STATUS - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS

Employment status (All pilot) (E9)

- Employed: 95% in Champaign-Urbana, 93% in All Programs
- Not working for pay but seeking work: 3% in Champaign-Urbana, 5% in All Programs
- Not working for pay and NOT seeking work: 2% in Champaign-Urbana, 3% in All Programs

N=190 for Champaign-Urbana, N=3388 for All Programs

FIGURE 16: LENGTH OF JOB SEARCH FROM FIRST APPLICATION - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS

Length of job search from first application (E11A)

- 0-3 months: 69% in Champaign-Urbana, 54% in All Programs
- 4-6 months: 29% in Champaign-Urbana, 20% in All Programs
- 7-12 months: 12% in Champaign-Urbana, 8% in All Programs
- Asked but not answered: 1% in Champaign-Urbana, 0% in All Programs

N=160 for Champaign-Urbana, N=2599 for All Programs
Figure 17: Length of Job Search from Graduation - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs

Length of job search from graduation (E11B)

- Champaign-Urbana: N=161
- All Programs: N=2597

- Asked but not answered: 2% (Champaign-Urbana) vs. 1% (All Programs)
- Had LIS job at date of graduation: 36% (Champaign-Urbana) vs. 0% (All Programs)
- Up to 3 months: 73% (Champaign-Urbana) vs. 38% (All Programs)
- 4-6 months: 1% (Champaign-Urbana) vs. 4% (All Programs)
- 7-12 months: 1% (Champaign-Urbana) vs. 7% (All Programs)
- More than 12 months: 0% (Champaign-Urbana) vs. 6% (All Programs)

Figure 18: Types of Positions Sought by Respondents Currently Seeking Work* - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs

Not currently working but seeking work: positions sought (NCW6)

- Professional position in a library or information center: 100% (Champaign-Urbana) vs. 94% (All Programs)
- Professional position outside a library or information center setting: 83% (Champaign-Urbana) vs. 72% (All Programs)
- Other types of jobs: 83% (Champaign-Urbana) vs. 68% (All Programs)

*Check all that apply; multiple responses may add to more than 100%.
2.2 LIS MASTER’S PROGRAM EXPERIENCE AND EVALUATION

FIGURE 19: OVERALL EXPERIENCE RATING - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS

How would you rate the overall experience that you had with your program? (SP11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Champaign-Urbana</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Programs</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=193</td>
<td>N=3507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In what ways are you still connected to your program? (SP12)

- Keep in touch with other students: Champaign-Urbana 67%, All Programs 50%
- Email listserv: Champaign-Urbana 40%, All Programs 39%
- Meet at professional association...: Champaign-Urbana 29%, All Programs 29%
- Keep in touch with faculty: Champaign-Urbana 29%, All Programs 28%
- Visit program's website: Champaign-Urbana 46%, All Programs 56%
- Newsletter (email): Champaign-Urbana 22%, All Programs 25%
- Your LIS program's alumni association: Champaign-Urbana 12%, All Programs 19%
- Newsletter (print): Champaign-Urbana 12%, All Programs 20%
- Your university's alumni association: Champaign-Urbana 12%, All Programs 12%
- Visit campus: Champaign-Urbana 6%, All Programs 11%
- I am not connected to my program: Champaign-Urbana 5%, All Programs 11%
- Other: Champaign-Urbana 8%, All Programs 9%
- Making donations: Champaign-Urbana 8%, All Programs 16%
- Reunions or alumni events: Champaign-Urbana 6%, All Programs 8%

*Check all that apply; multiple responses may add to more than 100%.
Figure 21: Areas of Concentration* in Program - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs

Concentrations (SP1B)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>Champaign-Urbana N=53</th>
<th>All Programs N=1104</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School library/media certification</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic libraries</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives and records management</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s services</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public libraries</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth literature and services</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young adult/teen services</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital libraries</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special libraries</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information organization</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special collections</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information retrieval</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web management and design</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health sciences</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information architecture</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection development</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration and management</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation management</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical services</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult services</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human-computer interaction</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural perspectives</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museums</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The following concentrations were selected by fewer than 3 percent of respondents in either group (Urbana-Champaign or All Programs): Aging, Bioinformatics, International studies, Community informatics, Data curation, Music, Oral history, Information industry, Business/corporate libraries, Science/technical libraries, Art history/Fine arts, Network information systems, and Knowledge management.
FIGURE 22: CAPSTONE EXPERIENCE - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS

Capstone experiences (SP8)

- Practicum, field experience, internship, work experience in a library or information setting
  - Champaign-Urbana: 88%
  - All Programs: 46%

- Independent study or research project
  - Champaign-Urbana: 0%
  - All Programs: 14%

- Portfolio, e-portfolio, capstone portfolio or e-portfolio
  - Champaign-Urbana: 14%
  - All Programs: 35%

- Comprehensive exam
  - Champaign-Urbana: 5%
  - All Programs: 31%

- Master’s paper or thesis
  - Champaign-Urbana: 6%
  - All Programs: 16%

- Another capstone experience
  - Champaign-Urbana: 4%
  - All Programs: 9%

Data: N=112 for Champaign-Urbana, N=3471 for All Programs.
How many of your courses were predominantly delivered online? (SP2)

FIGURE 23: COURSE DELIVERY MODES - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS

Comparison of effectiveness of online and face-to-face course delivery (SP3, SP5)

FIGURE 24: COMPARISON OF EFFECTIVENESS OF ONLINE AND FACE-TO-FACE COURSE DELIVERY - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS
Comparison of convenience of online and face-to-face course delivery (SP4, SP6)

- Champaign-Urbana Online N=172
- All Programs - Online N=2259
- Champaign-Urbana Face to Face N=122
- All Programs - Face to Face N=3198
**Figure 26: Continuing Education – Delivery Mode Preferences* - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

*Check all that apply; multiple responses may add to more than 100%.*
2.3 Knowledge and Skills
These knowledge and skill questions include ALA Competencies.

Figure 27: Basic Knowledge - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs

The program provided me with basic knowledge of the field. (SP9_A)

Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Not an issue for me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Champaign-Urbana N=193
- All Programs N=3505
**Figure 28: Information Seeking - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

The program provided me with information seeking skills or knowledge. (SP9_B)

- **Champaign-Urbana**
  - N=193

- **All Programs**
  - N=3504

**Figure 29: Research and Evaluation - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

The program provided me with research and evaluation skills or knowledge. (SP9_C)

- **Champaign-Urbana**
  - N=193

- **All Programs**
  - N=3503
**FIGURE 30: ORGANIZATION OF INFORMATION - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS**

The program provided me with organization of information skills or knowledge. (SP9_D)

**FIGURE 31: PUBLIC SERVICE - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS**

The program provided me with public service skills or knowledge. (SP9_E)
**Figure 32: Instruction - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

The program provided me with instructional skills or knowledge. (SP9_F)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, and not an issue for them in the Urbana-Champaign program and all programs combined.]

- Champaign-Urbana: N=193
- All Programs: N=3503

**Figure 33: Collaboration - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

The program provided me with collaboration skills or knowledge. (SP9_G)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree, and not an issue for them in the Urbana-Champaign program and all programs combined.]

- Champaign-Urbana: N=193
- All Programs: N=3504
FIGURE 34: INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS

The program provided me with information technology skills or knowledge. (SP9_H)

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses for information technology skills or knowledge.](chart)

- **Champaign-Urbana**: N=193
- **All Programs**: N=3507

FIGURE 35: MANAGEMENT - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS

The program provided me with management skills or knowledge. (SP9_I)

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses for management skills or knowledge.](chart)

- **Champaign-Urbana**: N=193
- **All Programs**: N=3507
**FIGURE 36: LEADERSHIP - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS**

The program provided me with leadership skills or knowledge. (SP9_J)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents' agreement with the statement regarding leadership skills or knowledge, comparing Champaign-Urbana to all programs.](chart1)

- **Champaign-Urbana**
  - N=193
  - 3% Strongly disagree, 25% Disagree, 42% Agree, 20% Strongly agree, 2% Not an issue for me

- **All Programs**
  - N=3506
  - 3% Strongly disagree, 26% Disagree, 49% Agree, 20% Strongly agree, 10% Not an issue for me

**FIGURE 37: BUDGET/FINANCE - URBANA-CHAMPAIGN COMPARED TO ALL PROGRAMS**

The program provided me with budget and finance skills or knowledge. (SP9_K)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents' agreement with the statement regarding budget and finance skills or knowledge, comparing Champaign-Urbana to all programs.](chart2)

- **Champaign-Urbana**
  - N=193
  - 5% Strongly disagree, 22% Disagree, 42% Agree, 18% Strongly agree, 3% Not an issue for me

- **All Programs**
  - N=3505
  - 3% Strongly disagree, 25% Disagree, 49% Agree, 24% Strongly agree, 3% Not an issue for me
**Figure 38: Problem Solving - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

The program provided me with problem solving skills or knowledge. (SP9_L)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of responses to the question related to problem solving skills or knowledge.](chart.png)

- **Champaign-Urbana**
  - N=193

- **All Programs**
  - N=3505

---

**Figure 39: Advocacy - Urbana-Champaign Compared to All Programs**

The program provided me with advocacy skills or knowledge. (SP9_M)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of responses to the question related to advocacy skills or knowledge.](chart.png)

- **Champaign-Urbana**
  - N=193

- **All Programs**
  - N=3505
**Figure 40: Realistic Understanding of Work in Information Field - Urbana-Champaign Compared To All Programs**

The program provided me with a realistic understanding of what it is like to work in the information field. (SP9_N)

**Figure 41: Skills To Apply On The Job - Urbana-Champaign Compared To All Programs**

The program provided me with skills I can apply on the job. (SP9_O)