

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)

Instructor: Laura Saunders *

1 - Acknowledgment:										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means	
I have read and understand the above statement.	(1)	12	100%							
				0	25	50	75	100		
Return Rate										
12/26 (46.15%)										

2 - I am a...										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means	
Master's student	(1)	12	100%							
Doctoral student	(2)	0	0%							
Undergraduate student	(3)	0	0%							
Post-Master's certificate student	(4)	0	0%							
Non-degree/ Prematriculated student	(5)	0	0%							
				0	25	50	75	100		
Return Rate										
12/26 (46.15%)										

3 - Which Program are you enrolled in?										
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means	
MSLIS	(1)	12	100%							
BS	(2)	0	0%							
MA or MFA	(3)	0	0%							
MA CHL/MA Eng	(4)	0	0%							
MS LIS/ MA History	(5)	0	0%							
MS LIS/ MA CHL	(6)	0	0%							
MA/MFA	(7)	0	0%							
MA/MAT	(8)	0	0%							
Prefer not to answer	(9)	0	0%							
				0	25	50	75	100		
Return Rate										
12/26 (46.15%)										

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)
Instructor: Laura Saunders *

4 - This course is...

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means		
A Requirement	(1)	0	0%								
An Elective	(2)	12	100%								
				0	25	50	75	100			
Return Rate											
12/26 (46.15%)											

- Interested in subjectmatter.
- I chose this course in the hopes of learning social justice practices specifically for the LIS profession.
- The course description and the professor.
- I am interested in learning more about ways to work against oppression in the field of LIS.
- I was interested in how social justice overlaps with library science and wanted a chance to apply academic theories to libraries.
- I'm interested in critical theory and questioning the patriarchy.
- This is an important topic that needs to be addressed throughout the curriculum and wanted to both participate in a support this endeavor
- The subject is in my area of professional interest.
- I'm committed to the social justice responsibilities and possibilities inherent in library work, especially public libraries
- I am very interested in and dedicated to critical theory and critical librarianship.
- Studying and understanding the intersection of social justice and libraries is an integral part of librarianship that is not emphasized enough in other classes (unless those classes also happen to be taught by Laura Saunders).
- It is the only course that attempts to address systemic inequality in LIS, racism, classism, etc. and identify ways to navigate these issues. I don't understand why this isn't already a required course, or just the content of the course. It's the only opportunity to engage in critical discussions.

5 - Please answer the following questions about yourself as a studentThe results of this question are meant to encourage self-reflection and to provide information about your engagement with the course.

I participated in discussions

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly agree	(1)	5	41.67%								
Agree	(2)	5	41.67%								
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	2	16.67%								
Disagree	(4)	0	0%						1.75		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median								
12/26 (46.15%)	1.75	0.75	2.00								

5 - Please answer the following questions about yourself as a studentThe results of this question are meant to encourage self-reflection and to provide information about your engagement with the course.

I asked questions

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly agree	(1)	3	25%								
Agree	(2)	6	50%								
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	3	25%								
Disagree	(4)	0	0%						2.00		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median								
12/26 (46.15%)	2.00	0.74	2.00								

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)
Instructor: Laura Saunders *

5 - Please answer the following questions about yourself as a studentThe results of this question are meant to encourage self-reflection and to provide information about your engagement with the course.

I prepared for each class

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly agree	(1)	6	50%		1.50
Agree	(2)	6	50%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.50	0.52	1.50		

5 - Please answer the following questions about yourself as a studentThe results of this question are meant to encourage self-reflection and to provide information about your engagement with the course.

I attended class regularly

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly agree	(1)	10	83.33%		1.17
Agree	(2)	2	16.67%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.17	0.39	1.00		

5 - Please answer the following questions about yourself as a studentThe results of this question are meant to encourage self-reflection and to provide information about your engagement with the course.

I treated my classmates with respect

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly agree	(1)	9	75%		1.25
Agree	(2)	3	25%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.25	0.45	1.00		

5 - Please answer the following questions about yourself as a studentThe results of this question are meant to encourage self-reflection and to provide information about your engagement with the course.

I treated the instructor with respect

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly agree	(1)	9	75%		1.25
Agree	(2)	3	25%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.25	0.45	1.00		

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)
Instructor: Laura Saunders *

5 - Please answer the following questions about yourself as a studentThe results of this question are meant to encourage self-reflection and to provide information about your engagement with the course.

I was open to learning from other points of view

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly agree	(1)	8	66.67%						1.33		
Agree	(2)	4	33.33%								
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%								
Disagree	(4)	0	0%								
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median								
12/26 (46.15%)	1.33	0.49	1.00								

5 - Please answer the following questions about yourself as a studentThe results of this question are meant to encourage self-reflection and to provide information about your engagement with the course.

I was prepared and participated in labs

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly agree	(1)	5	41.67%						1.92		
Agree	(2)	3	25%								
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	4	33.33%								
Disagree	(4)	0	0%								
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median								
12/26 (46.15%)	1.92	0.90	2.00								

6 - Please elaborate on your ratings for the previous questions

Return Rate	Mean
6/26 (23.08%)	

- I don't really feel like "strongly agree" really makes sense as a response to these questions -- I came to class prepared, participated, was challenged, tried to do my part to maintain a respectful environment. I'm not sure how "strongly agree" makes a better case for these things...
- I could have said more in discussions, but I was a bit uncomfortable speaking up at times because of the amount of time spent discussing how to call people out.
- More meta-discussions about how we were discussing course material could have helped enrich the class. Occasionally I was worried about offending classmates or coming from a dominant point of view and felt that issue didn't get quite enough examination.
- The nature of this class is one in which speaking about my own experience as a white, cisgender individual seemed far less important than passing the megaphone to those classmates with experiences that are not normative (those who want it, at least). Additionally, I don't find this large a group conducive to discussion. It feels more like each comment needs to be a fully formed opinion on something, whereas the small group discussion were much easier to participate and contribute to.
- I am by nature a "class participant," so preparing and taking part in class discussions was not difficult for me.
- The class was too large to participate as fully as I would have liked in all conversations, but I did find it useful to listen to all the discussions.

7 - On average, how many hours per week did you spend on course-related work?

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means		
0-3	(1)	1	8.33%								
4-6	(2)	10	83.33%								
7-9	(3)	1	8.33%								
10-12	(4)	0	0%								
13+	(5)	0	0%								
				0	25	50	75	100			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median								
12/26 (46.15%)											

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)

Instructor: Laura Saunders *

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content

The course was organized well

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly agree	(1)	3	25%		1.92
Agree	(2)	7	58.33%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	2	16.67%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.92	0.67	2.00		

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content

Course content matched the syllabus

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly agree	(1)	7	58.33%		1.42
Agree	(2)	5	41.67%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.42	0.51	1.00		

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content

Course outcomes/goals were clearly communicated

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly agree	(1)	7	58.33%		1.50
Agree	(2)	4	33.33%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	1	8.33%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.50	0.67	1.00		

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content

Course goals/outcomes were achieved

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly agree	(1)	3	25%		1.92
Agree	(2)	7	58.33%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	2	16.67%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.92	0.67	2.00		

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)

Instructor: Laura Saunders *

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content									
Materials were appropriately up-to-date									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means	
Strongly agree	(1)	10	83.33%						
Agree	(2)	2	16.67%						
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%						
Disagree	(4)	0	0%						
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%						
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median						
12/26 (46.15%)	1.17	0.39	1.00						

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content									
Readings contributed to my understanding of course content									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means	
Strongly agree	(1)	10	83.33%						
Agree	(2)	2	16.67%						
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%						
Disagree	(4)	0	0%						
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%						
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median						
12/26 (46.15%)	1.17	0.39	1.00						

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content									
Assignments contributed to my understanding of course content									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means	
Strongly agree	(1)	5	41.67%						
Agree	(2)	5	41.67%						
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	2	16.67%						
Disagree	(4)	0	0%						
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%						
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median						
12/26 (46.15%)	1.75	0.75	2.00						

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content									
Assignments challenged me to think critically									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means	
Strongly agree	(1)	6	50%						
Agree	(2)	6	50%						
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%						
Disagree	(4)	0	0%						
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%						
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median						
12/26 (46.15%)	1.50	0.52	1.50						

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)

Instructor: Laura Saunders *

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content									
Course discussions contributed to my understanding of course content									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means	
Strongly agree	(1)	5	41.67%						
Agree	(2)	6	50%						
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	1	8.33%						
Disagree	(4)	0	0%						
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%						
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median						
12/26 (46.15%)	1.67	0.65	2.00						

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content									
Lab sessions contributed to my understanding of the material									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means	
Strongly agree	(1)	1	8.33%						
Agree	(2)	3	25%						
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	8	66.67%						
Disagree	(4)	0	0%						
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%						
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median						
12/26 (46.15%)	2.58	0.67	3.00						

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content									
The course was rigorous (was intellectually challenging and/or encouraged me to think deeply about content)									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means	
Strongly agree	(1)	8	66.67%						
Agree	(2)	4	33.33%						
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%						
Disagree	(4)	0	0%						
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%						
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median						
12/26 (46.15%)	1.33	0.49	1.00						

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content									
The course was rigorous (was intellectually challenging and/or encouraged me to think deeply about content)									
Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses				Means	
Strongly agree	(1)	8	66.67%						
Agree	(2)	4	33.33%						
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%						
Disagree	(4)	0	0%						
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%						
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median						
12/26 (46.15%)	1.33	0.49	1.00						

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)

Instructor: Laura Saunders *

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content

The pace of the course was appropriate

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly agree	(1)	3	25%		2.08
Agree	(2)	5	41.67%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	4	33.33%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	2.08	0.79	2.00		

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content

Course content approached subject matter from multiple/diverse perspectives

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly agree	(1)	8	66.67%		1.33
Agree	(2)	4	33.33%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.33	0.49	1.00		

8 - Please answer the following questions about the courseThe results of this section are used to improve the syllabus and course content

Course content addressed issues of diversity as related to the content

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly agree	(1)	12	100%		1.00
Agree	(2)	0	0%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.00	0.00	1.00		

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)
Instructor: Laura Saunders *

9 - Please elaborate on your ratings for the previous questions

Return Rate	8/26 (30.77%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I felt that the discussions did not match the level of critical thinking in the readings. The readings were really fantastic and thoughtfully selected for this course. I learned so much just by working my way through the syllabus. So I do think the course was rigorous and that the readings were great. I might change the course description a bit if it is offered again, though. We weren't assigned any "primary sources" of theory (Habermas, Freire, Chatman, Giroux) to read or analyze; rather these are theorists who influenced the writers whose articles we were reading. I did read some Freire outside of class, but haven't read Chatman or Giroux, and it's been ages since I've studied Habermas. It might have been nice to have read a longer work that brought together some of the articles during the class. Maybe a longer work by one of those primary theorists could have helped ground the rest of the syllabus a little bit. The in-class activities and discussions really ranged in my experience. The large-group class discussions were often a bit tough to get through. Although some of them helped me think about the material more carefully or in a new way, many of them seemed really stunted and strange. I'm not sure if it was the large number of students in the classroom, or the difficulty of analyzing the subject matter, but I was surprised at how awkward the class discussions could be. On the other end of things, the small group discussions, activities, and the guest speakers were all fantastic. The guest speakers were all super and helped me connect the readings and classwork to the LIS field in a practical and energizing way. I also found that the large group discussions tended to go a bit better and be more focused after a guest speaker had presented. The assignments were spaced nicely for student-sanity -- I liked that there were several papers due at the beginning of the semester, petering out later in the semester near finals / group-project time. I think that the small group discussion leader activity was a great assignment, and I almost wish that we had more of those assigned. Or some mechanism to do short write ups or reflection assignments on the readings in order to process the material a bit more thoroughly before coming to class. The service learning project is a great idea in theory, but I think my group ran out of steam working on it. It's was a long time frame with very little accountability built in during the process beyond the proposal paper -- I think having due dates along the way may have helped? Not sure. But I did appreciate the time at the end of class to discuss and check in. Some of the project types seemed innately more structured than others, which is OK, but I think it may result in some uneven final projects. Survey feedback: The lab question should possibly have a N/A radio button added, since this course was seminar-style and there were no labs. Also the "The course was rigorous" question is repeated. This course provided valuable perspectives that are sometimes missing from other courses. Discussions did sometimes get a bit off track, but in the end we did discuss many important subjects. If this course is offered again (which I hope it is) I might suggest a bit of reallocation of time spent to make sure the topics that were only given one day really get that full day. For example, the class discussion on the day we were discussing disability ended up being more about a topic we'd been discussing in past weeks and we didn't get to talk about disability much. I loved so many of the readings for this class. They were really inspiring--this is one of the only classes for which I've been truly excited to do the reading each week. I found the final project to be the most frustrating final project I've encountered thus far at Simmons. I did not work well with my group, and despite a fairly interesting topic, I dreaded working on this project and was not at all interested or engaged. I agree with other classmates that our discussion of "whiteness" could have been more productive towards the beginning of the semester. I really enjoyed all of the guest speakers. Because of the difficult nature of the topics we explored, and the fact that this semester was the first iteration of this course, I'm not sure how reasonable it would be to expect the course outcomes to be met. This was definitely a broad course, so we could not go too deeply into any one topic, but this left things feeling a little shallow. This is difficult because the subject of the course is one for which we do not yet have a lot of practical answers. Because of this, additionally, the assignments were a little broad, and I would have liked to have them be more focused. The pace of the course was varied, and difficult to follow at times. Because this was a special topic, so many things were on the table to be discussed, and it was very clear that it was hard to choose between, and then pace, the various topics. - Re: organization, I wish the concept of whiteness was introduced earlier in the semester because it would have influenced other readings and discussions, but I'm not sure if it would have been possible. Also, because so much was packed into a semester, I don't think we were able to really delve into topics. Again, all the more reason to make the "content" of this course required, if not the course itself. - Lab sessions? - Some discussions were interesting and encouraged me to think deeply about content, but I kept hoping our discussions would have delved even further, which was disappointing, but not the end of the world. I always left class wanting to investigate further. - Re: pace, I felt like we didn't have enough time. It went by so quickly. 	

10 - Please answer the following questions about the instructorThe results of this section are used for improving teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

Communicated information clearly

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(1)	8	66.67%						1.33 			
Agree	(2)	4	33.33%									
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%									
Disagree	(4)	0	0%									
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median									
12/26 (46.15%)	1.33	0.49	1.00									

10 - Please answer the following questions about the instructorThe results of this section are used for improving teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

Provided timely feedback on assignments

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly Agree	(1)	10	83.33%						1.17 			
Agree	(2)	2	16.67%									
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%									
Disagree	(4)	0	0%									
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median									
12/26 (46.15%)	1.17	0.39	1.00									

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)
Instructor: Laura Saunders *

10 - Please answer the following questions about the instructorThe results of this section are used for improving teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

Provided feedback that I could use

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(1)	8	66.67%		1.42
Agree	(2)	3	25%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	1	8.33%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Stronly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.42	0.67	1.00		

10 - Please answer the following questions about the instructorThe results of this section are used for improving teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

Responded to e-mails or phone calls in a timely manner

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(1)	10	83.33%		1.25
Agree	(2)	1	8.33%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	1	8.33%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Stronly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.25	0.62	1.00		

10 - Please answer the following questions about the instructorThe results of this section are used for improving teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

Was prepared for each class

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(1)	9	75%		1.25
Agree	(2)	3	25%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Stronly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.25	0.45	1.00		

10 - Please answer the following questions about the instructorThe results of this section are used for improving teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

Structured content so that ideas built upon each other (scaffolded information)

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(1)	5	41.67%		1.67
Agree	(2)	6	50%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	1	8.33%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Stronly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.67	0.65	2.00		

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)

Instructor: Laura Saunders *

10 - Please answer the following questions about the instructorThe results of this section are used for improving teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

Managed classroom dynamics in a productive way

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(1)	2	16.67%		1.83
Agree	(2)	10	83.33%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.83	0.39	2.00		

10 - Please answer the following questions about the instructorThe results of this section are used for improving teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

Was consistent in enforcing course standards or policies

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(1)	7	58.33%		1.50
Agree	(2)	4	33.33%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	1	8.33%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.50	0.67	1.00		

10 - Please answer the following questions about the instructorThe results of this section are used for improving teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

Encouraged me to think critically

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(1)	11	91.67%		1.08
Agree	(2)	1	8.33%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.08	0.29	1.00		

10 - Please answer the following questions about the instructorThe results of this section are used for improving teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

Treated me with respect

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses	Means
Strongly Agree	(1)	12	100%		1.00
Agree	(2)	0	0%		
Neither agree nor disagree	(3)	0	0%		
Disagree	(4)	0	0%		
Strongly disagree	(5)	0	0%		
				0 25 50 75 100	Instructor
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median		
12/26 (46.15%)	1.00	0.00	1.00		

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)

Instructor: Laura Saunders *

11 - Please elaborate on your ratings for the previous questions

Return Rate 6/26 (23.08%)

- Professor Saunders did a great job introducing this new class. It was a crazy range of complex subject matter to dive into, and I think we all learned along the way about how to structure the classroom environment. I hope it's offered again in the future, if only because the content was so good! And important! The first go-around for any course, let alone one with a wide range of challenging subjects, is necessarily going to be a work-in-progress. That was my expectation coming into the class, and I really appreciated the opportunity to participate in helping shape it with my peers and professor over the course of the semester. I think this class really has the potential to be a great part of SLIS and could lead the way for other LIS programs to follow suit.
- As mentioned before, discussions did tend to get a bit off track at times. A bit more structure in class discussions might have helped with this issue, but overall the class was good.
- The content and topics in some cases were provocative and generated uncomfortable conversations among the students. I think Laura did the best she could to moderate these exchanges, considering this was the first time she taught it. That being said, I admire her for being the first in my academic and professional career to raise it.
- Dr. Saunders was very knowledgeable and clearly has a passion for this subject. I was a little confused about some of the feedback on assignments because I had points taken off without explanations of where things were done wrong or could use improvement.
- For this particular series of topics, classroom dynamics were difficult to structure. Laura did a great job recognizing personal shortcomings and encouraging all of us to self examine.
- Considering the content of the course, it would be challenging to manage classroom dynamics in a productive way. Laura did the best she could.

12 - SLIS is committed to creating an environment that is respectful of all. Above you were asked the extent to which the instructor in this course treated you with respect and employed strategies to ensure a respectful and inclusive environment for the class-- meaning one in which people of all races, genders, sexual orientations, abilities, political affiliations, etc. feel welcome to contribute their voices and in which all community members are encouraged to treat one another with respect. Please answer the following questions regarding the classroom climate. The results of this section will be used to improve teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

The instructor employed strategies to create an inclusive environment

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly agree	(1)	11	91.67%						1.08 		
Agree	(2)	1	8.33%								
Neither agree or disagree	(3)	0	0%								
Strongly disagree	(4)	0	0%								
Disagree	(5)	0	0%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median								
12/26 (46.15%)	1.08	0.29	1.00								

12 - SLIS is committed to creating an environment that is respectful of all. Above you were asked the extent to which the instructor in this course treated you with respect and employed strategies to ensure a respectful and inclusive environment for the class-- meaning one in which people of all races, genders, sexual orientations, abilities, political affiliations, etc. feel welcome to contribute their voices and in which all community members are encouraged to treat one another with respect. Please answer the following questions regarding the classroom climate. The results of this section will be used to improve teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

The instructor fostered a climate of respect

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means		
Strongly agree	(1)	11	91.67%						1.08 		
Agree	(2)	1	8.33%								
Neither agree or disagree	(3)	0	0%								
Strongly disagree	(4)	0	0%								
Disagree	(5)	0	0%								
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor		
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median								
12/26 (46.15%)	1.08	0.29	1.00								

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)

Instructor: Laura Saunders *

12 - SLIS is committed to creating an environment that is respectful of all. Above you were asked the extent to which the instructor in this course treated you with respect and employed strategies to ensure a respectful and inclusive environment for the class-- meaning one in which people of all races, genders, sexual orientations, abilities, political affiliations, etc. feel welcome to contribute their voices and in which all community members are encouraged to treat one another with respect. Please answer the following questions regarding the classroom climate. The results of this section will be used to improve teaching and for annual and tenure/promotion reviews.

I felt I could approach the instructor with questions or concerns

Response Option	Weight	Frequency	Percent	Percent Responses					Means			
Strongly agree	(1)	10	83.33%						<p>1.17</p>			
Agree	(2)	2	16.67%									
Neither agree or disagree	(3)	0	0%									
Strongly disagree	(4)	0	0%									
Disagree	(5)	0	0%									
				0	25	50	75	100	Instructor			
Return Rate	Mean	STD	Median									
12/26 (46.15%)	1.17	0.39	1.00									

13 - Please elaborate on your ratings for the previous questions

Return Rate	4/26 (15.38%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professor Saunders made every attempt to accept feedback and create an inclusive environment. Opening up a feedback board on the Moodle page, accepting mid-semester feedback forms, and having open office hours before class were all good channels of communication that were kept open between student and professor. I think that there could have been a bit more on us, the students, being responsible for an inclusive / safe environment. See answer to 14 for more. • The instructor was very respectful of everyone in the class. The classroom environment was sometimes a bit uncomfortable, but that was to be expected when discussing difficult topics. • Dr. Saunders encouraged us to lay ground rules and build our own inclusive, supportive, and instructive environment at the beginning of class. She was also very approachable. • Considering some of the topics discussed in the course, any instructor for this course would need to step up their inclusion game, so I feel like it was obvious that Laura was very mindful of creating an inclusive environment and fostering a climate of respect. Also, Laura is very approachable and easy to contact outside of the classroom. 	

14 - Please use this space to comment on your personal experiences with regard to respect and inclusiveness in this course.

Return Rate	4/26 (15.38%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I felt that some students used this course to create a personal identity of moving past their privilege, instead of working towards improving everyone's experience in LIS, and learning how to think critically about solutions to systemic injustices. • I felt included and respected for the most part. I think it might have been a useful exercise at the beginning to have the class put together an agreement or some kind of collaborative code of conduct that we could revisit throughout the semester. Something written instead of a discussion. • I'd say my answers to the last question apply here as well. • As I've mentioned before, Laura was always mindful of creating an environment of respect and inclusiveness. One of our discussions about the concept of whiteness evolved into a discussion for the white students in the class, which isn't necessarily a bad thing, but because there were students of color in the room, it was a bit odd. However, I found the discussion to be very productive for the white people in the room. This is the only class in which such a discussion could have occurred at SLIS and be welcomed, instead of dismissed or moved away from immediately. Bravo to Laura for having the guts to jump in and try! 	

15 - What was the most valuable thing you learned in this course?

Return Rate	7/26 (26.92%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reading articles from the current conversations in the field and getting to hear from the guest speakers who are really digging into this work as a part of (or outside of) their LIS jobs were the most valuable parts of the course for me. Another important component was having the opportunity to really delve into my own unconscious biases and prejudices and to try to unpack them, and also to consider how they might affect me and the way I work within the LIS profession in the future. It also made me want to get out there and start dismantling the patriarchy and systemic racism! A little bit at a time. • I learned that there are many different ways to incorporate radical perspectives into your own practice in the LIS field, and that it is important to find like minded people to support the work you want to do in your institution. • The readings for this class were great though I would have liked to delve more deeply into theories and read about certain ideas from their original authors. I especially enjoyed all of the guest speakers. Hearing about their work and experience was very valuable. • I really appreciated Chris Strauber's talk about accessibility. I also loved the article about feminist HCI theory. I feel we had a safe space in which to practice having difficult discussions and question the foundations of our profession. I'm so happy to have been introduced to In the Library with the Lead Pipe. • My privilege as a white cis-hetero-woman left me vulnerable to much discomfort in discussions and readings. I did my best to "shut up and listen" to the experiences of those different from me. I'm not sure I always succeeded, but I hope I've learned from the moments when I failed at recognizing other viewpoints and perspectives. • It was very valuable to look more at critical theory and see how it can be used in practice. • The most valuable thing I learned in this course is just having the opportunity to engage in these critical discussions about LIS. The theories and unique discourse will certainly inform my practice once I'm in the field. I know that I'm ahead of the game because of the content of this course. It's unfortunate that most SLIS students will graduate without not engaging in these critical discussions. I think what Laura was trying to do is imperative for the work that we do as information professionals. I was fortunate to have taken this course with this particular professor. 	

Simmons College
SLIS spring 2016 face-to-face

Course: Spring2016LIS-505J-01: Spring 2016 Radical Librarianship (LIS-505J-01)

Instructor: Laura Saunders *

16 - What are two or three things that this instructor does well?

Return Rate	9/26 (34.62%)
--------------------	---------------

- The instructor picked amazing resources that will continue to guide my thinking. She invited incredibly amazing guest-speakers who both expanded my theoretical and practical understanding and agency as a LIS professional. The professor encouraged me to work a lot harder on my critical thinking and its expression than I had done before, and I am grateful for that.
- 1. Is enthusiastic about the material and discussions happening in the field. 2. Worked tirelessly to bring in amazing guest speakers in-person and virtually. 3. Was receptive to feedback and tried to push conversations forward. 4. Was really good about breaking up the long class sessions into smaller parts -- into activities, lectures, guest lectures, and small group activities.
- 1. She is good at incorporating many different perspectives into her teaching. 2. She is good at listening to students. 3. She has a great network of professional contacts that allowed her to invite really good guest speakers to the class.
- This instructor does a great job of bringing up to date readings and issues to the class. She was always present and prepared for class. I appreciate that she is constantly trying to improve the course and her teaching through periodic evaluations.
- Laura makes students feel welcome and is always friendly. She facilitates discussions organically and addresses important issues in librarianship that not everyone is talking or thinking about.
- She leads discussions well, creates a terrific syllabus, and offers enthusiastic support for our projects. She's also very easy to reach for communication outside of class.
- Dr. Saunders was very good at bringing in professionals to speak, making critical theory approachable, and encouraging the class to think critically.
- Laura is great at tying together personal experiences with the course curriculum. Her anecdotes provide a clearer understanding of course content. Her understanding of difficult topics, and willingness to explore together rather than dictate viewpoints really set her above other professors in nearly every program I've encountered in my academic career.
- Again, Laura is mindful...of inclusiveness and also of sharing power. She was proactive in trying to encourage students who were less vocal to contribute more, and was fairly successful, particularly because her method didn't shine a spotlight on anyone. Students still retained their power. Also, as she facilitated discussion about theories, she also encouraged us to identify ways to bring theory into action. Lastly, Laura provides extensive feedback, including thought-provoking questions, on assignments in a timely manner, which allows you to reflect further, learn from, and build on for your personal development. This is directly linked to Laura being mindful.

17 - What are two or three areas in which this instructor could improve this course?

Return Rate	7/26 (26.92%)
--------------------	---------------

- 1. The larger group discussions could have been reduced in number... I feel like they weren't often the best medium for this particular class. It's important to come together as a group once in a while but I often dreaded this part of each class. 2. Although open to feedback, it seems like there may have also been some defensiveness. Understandable, but the defensiveness maybe got in the way of reception. 3. Adding a group-created timeline for the service learning projects.
- 1. She could take a more active role in making sure discussions stay on topic. 2. She should check her links on the Moodle site to make sure they work. Also, she might consider dividing the Moodle site up by week, as a huge block of readings for the whole semester sometimes made it difficult to find the reading for that week in a timely fashion.
- This course has a lot of content that generates difficult discussions and I would have preferred if the instructor facilitated them more strongly instead of stepping back to see how conversation played out. At times, I felt like staying focused on discussing each article in turn would have provided more conversation structure. It would have also been nice if the instructor asked certain students who spoke up often to take a step back to allow more quiet students to speak. In the future it might be helpful including some sort of intense anti-racism training at the beginning of the class to get everyone on the same page.
- I felt the powerpoints were not very helpful or engaging in this class. More discussion could have been a more interesting use of time. Our discussion about whiteness felt a little unfinished and unresolved. After the class in which students felt excluded from the conversation that may have become about how white people can talk about oppression, we kind of just moved on and didn't further address that moment of discomfort. If it is uncomfortable to discuss race and privilege in the class about race and privilege, where is it going to be comfortable, and how will we learn the most inclusive, respectful way to address this thorny issue? I would not want to perpetuate and further any classmates' discomfort, but I would have liked to interrogate our discussions further.
- I don't know whether the time we spent on Overcoming Whiteness in LIS was an effective exercise, but I admire the attempt to try it. That was one of the more uncomfortable classes of the course.
- The course would be better with better facilitation of discussions and more focused assignments.
- As previously mentioned, I would have loved it if we began our discussion on the concept of whiteness earlier on in the semester, since it is applicable to all course topics (and the LIS professions). Also, it would have been helpful to determine together the classroom rules and expectations for how we would navigate more contentious discussions throughout the semester. We talked about it during our first class, but we never actually set the guidelines. This would have encouraged trust/community building, which I believe would have helped to facilitate productive discussions.

18 - Other comments (including about your responses to the previously asked questions:

Return Rate	5/26 (19.23%)
--------------------	---------------

- I had hoped for a deeper level of discourse around the articles we read and the profession in general. I acknowledge that it is difficult to bring so many perspectives to a table, but the constant anecdotal comments from various students did not contribute anything to the learning experience. I believe that this course is absolutely vital to our practice, but needs to be offered continuously, or actually be embedded in every course we take (the new 401?).
- This class was challenging and important. It really should be offered again.
- I hope this class is offered again in the future. This content is rarely covered in my other classes and I believe the topics are incredibly important to being a successful LIS professional.
- I really enjoyed this course and think it is a really integral topic to the LIS field. It should definitely become a regular course if not a required course. Smaller class sizes would certainly improve this course experience, and could be possible if it were offered more often. I was surprised at how much I disliked the final project for otherwise loving this course. Perhaps more specific guidelines could help improve that experience, as well as more opportunities for real-world experience.
- The content of this course should be required for all SLIS students; it's all foundational and important for us to consider as students but also as emerging professionals. I am confident the content would also help with navigating microaggressions, which for some reason SLIS has yet to tackle, in any way. I am very happy that I was able to take this course, and thank goodness Laura Saunders had the guts to create it. You can't go wrong with Laura.