GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Annual Program Review   2011-2012 – INSTRUCTIONAL

Division - Program

STUDENT SERVICES - LIBRARY SCIENCE

Authorization

After the document is complete, it must be reviewed and submitted to the Program Review Committee by the Division Chair.

Author: Susie Chin
Division Chair: Jeanette Stirdivant
Date Received by Program Review: November 10, 2011

Overview of the Program

All degrees and certificates are considered programs. In addition, divisions may further delineate and define programs based on their assessment needs (developmental sequences, career track, etc).

Statement of Purpose – briefly describe in 1-3 sentences.

The objectives of Library 191: Introduction to Information Competency:

- Teach students information competency skills so that they may better navigate the increasing complexities of an information society (GCC Core Competency #3)
- Instill students with the critical thinking skills necessary to find, evaluate, use, and communicate information to meet professional, academic, and personal information needs (California Community College Academic Senate definition of information competency)

Please list the **most significant achievement** accomplished since your last program review.

With support from Career Technical Education, an adjunct librarian developed an online version of Library 191 which is being piloted in Fall 2011 as part of the Los Angeles County Assessor's Office program.

List the current major strengths of your program:

1. The program addresses two of GCC's Core Competencies:
    - Information Competency
    - Critical Thinking

2. Library 191 is beneficial for students in conducting college-level research and it is especially useful for those transferring to a four-year university. Institutional research and planning has shown through assessment measures that Library 191 helps students to be able to apply information competency skills academically, professionally, and personally. It has also been documented that students who have taken Library 191 tend to do better in their English 101 classes and overall throughout their GCC tenure. Library 191 is not the only way, but it is one of the most direct ways, to meet the college's core competencies for Information Competency and Critical Thinking.

List the current weaknesses of your program:

Credit information competency is currently a one-class "program" that does not meet any certification or degree requirements, nor does it meet any of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) or the California State University General Education (CSU-GE) Certification Pattern (breadth) requirements to transfer to a four-year institution. Because of this, and because many students do not recognize the benefits of critical thinking and information competency skills, a limited number of students see the value of taking this course.

1.0. Trend Analysis

For each program within the division, use the data provided to indicate trends (e.g., steady, increasing, decreasing, etc.) for each of the following measures.

Program	Academic Years	FTES Trend	FTEF Trend	WSCH / FTEF Trend	Full-Time % Trend	Fill Rate Trend	Success Rate Trend	Awards Trend
LIBRARY SCIENCE	2007-2008	13	0.6	708	44.4%	80.6%	50.0%	0
	2008-2009	10	0.3	983	80.0%	91.1%	51.1%	0
	2009-2010	9	0.3	881	40.0%	82.7%	56.3%	0
	2010-2011	9	1.1	277	25.0%	84.0%	51.1%	0
	% Change	-31.1%	+76.5%	-60.9%	-43.8%	+4.2%	+2.2%	--
	4-Yr. Trend	decreasing	increasing	decreasing	decreasing	stable	stable	n/a*

1.1. Describe how these trends have affected student achievement and student learning:

The Dean of Research and Development provided additional insight into the above data; the table reflects total enrollments at census for all sections by semester. (See also Appendices: FTES/Enrollments and Full-Time Faculty Percentage.) The enrollments were converted into FTES, and indicate a change between 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 that was impacted by block scheduling which resulted in a smaller number of FTES per enrollment. As a result, enrollments appear to have decreased from 2009-2010 to 2010-2011. However, the FTES/Enrollments Appendix shows that total enrollments (raw numbers) have increased from 119 during the 2009-2010 academic year to 135 during the 2010-2011 academic year.

The raw numbers are more reflective of the actual increase in enrollment. In the past few semesters, classes have been filling, most likely due to fewer class offerings across all disciplines because of the budget situation, resulting in more Library 191 sections filling. This has made a proactive marketing effort (mostly to English 101 and ESL 151 students) unnecessary. The result has been fewer English 101 and ESL 151 students taking Library 191 concurrently and more underprepared students enrolling in Library 191.

Finally, from Fall 2010- Spring 2011, the percentage of fulltime faculty who teach in the program was 67%; in order to increase this percentage, it is necessary to hire an additional fulltime librarian.

*Awards Trend does not apply to Library 191

1.2. Is there other relevant quantitative/qualitative information that affects the evaluation of your program?

Yes. Each semester, students are given a pre- and post-assessment exam to determine their level of knowledge of information competency. The data shows that the information competency skills of students who complete Library 191 do improve. However, the data reflects only those students who were able to complete the course and who took both pre- and post-assessments. The number

of students who complete the class is not high, and the number of those who take both assessments is even lower. As discussed in section 1.1, students enrolled in the class often lack the basic skills to successfully complete the program. Please see section 3.2 on plans to increase retention, persistence, and success of students who enroll in the credit information competency program.

The data shows the degree of improvement on average for all sections per semester on questions (first three columns) and also how students improved overall (last two columns). For Fall 2010-Spring 2011, the rate of improvement from the pre- to post-assessment was 82% and 86% (respectively) on all questions. The rate increases to 90% in areas in which the instructor focused her instruction (based on pre-assessment scores). In non-focus areas the rate of improvement was 79% (Fall 2010) and 85% (Spring 2011).

In Fall 2010, 89% of students and 100% of students in Spring 2011 showed improvement in the post-assessment. Finally, 43% of students in the Fall and 51% of students in the Spring showed significant improvement.

Below is a matrix that captures the comparative results of Library 191 sections for Fall 2010-Spring 2011 described above:

Comparison of Library 191 Post-assessment Improvement from Fall 2010-Spring 2011*

	All Questions n=42	Focus Questions	Other Questions	Student Improvement	Significant Student Improvement
Fall 2010					
3 sections (Average)	**82%**	**90%**	**79%**	**89%**	**43%**
Spring 2011					
3 sections (Average)	**86%**	**90%**	**85%**	**100%**	**51%**

*For more detailed information about how focus questions were determined, please refer to section 1.2 of the *Annual Program Review, Fall Report, Instructional Programs, 2010-2011 for Library Science/Credit Information Competency Program* and to the *Appendix: Library 191 Pre- and Post- Assessment Data from Fall 2005-Spring 2010*.

2.0. Student Learning and Curriculum

Provide the following information on each department and program within the division.

List each department within the Division as well as each degree, certificate, or other program within the department.	Active Courses with Identified SLOs		Active Courses Assessed		Course Sections Assessed		If this area has program outcomes have they been assessed? Yes or No
LIBRARY SCIENCE	1/1	100%	1/1	100%	6/6	100%	---

2.1. Please comment on the percentages above.

The percentages show that we have identified SLOs for Library 191 and assessed both the course and each section.

2.2. a) Please provide a *link** to all program <u>assessment timelines</u> here. This link could be to your division /department website, eLumen, etc.
  b) Briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses/programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of developing assessment timelines and course/program alignment matrixes.
  c) Based on the program assessment timelines you have developed and the evidence you have gathered, please comment briefly on how far along your division/program is in the assessment process.

a) http://www.glendale.edu/library/instruction/documents/LIB191SLOAssessmentTimelineFall2011.doc
b) Please see section 3.2 for plans and modifications at the course/program level.
c) The assessment cycle for Fall 2010-Spring 2011 is complete.

2.3 a) Please provide a *link* to any program and/or relevant course <u>assessment reports</u>. Does the evidence from assessment reports show that students are achieving the desired learning outcomes?
  b) Please briefly summarize any pedagogical or curricular elements of courses and/or programs that have been changed or will be changed as a result of the assessments conducted.

a) There are no program level outcomes for Library Science. For assessment reports for Fall 2010-Spring 2011, please see section 1.2.
b) Please see section 3.2 for plans and modifications at the course/program level.

2.4 Please list all courses which have been reviewed in the last academic year.
   Note: Curriculum Review is required by the Chancellors Office every 6 years.

Library 191

2.5 Please list all degree/certificate programs within the division that were reviewed in the last academic year.
Library 191 is not currently part of a degree/certificate program.

2.6 For each program that was reviewed, please list any changes that were made.

n/a

3.0. Reflection and Action Plans

3.1 What recent activities, dialogues, discussions, etc. have occurred to promote student learning or improved program/division processes?

1. In Spring 2011, one of the credit program instructors implemented the use of LibGuides, a user- and designer-friendly web-based tool that delivers course curriculum to students; the use of this tool improved the content accessibility and enhanced communication between instructors and students. During Fall 2011, 3 out of 4 instructors are now using this tool.

2. In Summer 2012, the Library Science program's hybrid and online formats as well as the face-to-face offerings will be evaluated for student persistence and retention by the Office of Research and Development; the last evaluation was conducted in 2007. At this time, it is still too soon to determine the efficacy of the hybrid and online offerings without further analysis.

3. At a recent "Credit Information Competency" planning meeting, library faculty discussed the direction and vision of the credit program. As a result, the department plans to restructure the program to meet the needs of the current student population, over 65% of which are basic skills students. The current Library 191 course provides a level of instruction too advanced for basic skills students, a concern that has been observed by the credit instructors for the past few semesters. A proposal to the Title V STEM Gateway grant will be submitted to support the restructuring of the credit instruction program to better meet the needs of GCC's increasing population of basic skills students. See section 3.2 below for details.

3.2   Using the weaknesses, trends and assessment outcomes listed on the previous pages as a basis for your comments, please briefly describe your plans and/or modifications for program/division improvements

In addition to the data and the discussion included in section 1.2, instructors of Library 191 found that approximately 75% of students who passed the class with a "C" or better in 2010-2011 met the following student learning outcomes:

1. Develop search strategies in order to identify and locate appropriate sources of information.
2. Determine the quality of an information source based on evaluation criteria.
3. Evaluate sources through the process of compiling bibliographic annotations.

These findings are based on assessment tools such as exercises, quizzes/exams, and annotated bibliographies. As a result of both the quantitative and qualitative information, the following proposed actions will address identified concerns in order to meet student learning outcomes for the credit information competency program.

Plans or Modifications	Anticipated Improvements
• Re-constitute Library 191 as a 3-unit Library 101 • Add "Pre- or co-requisite: English 101" • Seek approval for Library 101 to fulfill the IGETC and CSU-GE breadth requirements	• The pre-/co-requisite would increase the likelihood that students enrolled in Library 101 would have the skills, focus, and ability to succeed in the course. • These changes would allow for a more comprehensive curriculum and greater depth of coverage.
• Create a 2-unit Library 120 as the introductory level of information competency • Emphasize the application of basic concepts and a hands-on approach to research skills	• Improve student levels of retention and persistence while meeting GCC Core Competency (#3 Information Competency). • Address the basic needs of the majority of the current student population, over 65% of which are basic skills students.

Plans or Modifications	Anticipated Improvements
• Introduce a 1-unit Library 191 • Introduce a 1-unit Library 192 • Library 191 and Library 192 are two separate 1-unit courses that cover the same content as Library 120	• Improve student levels of retention and persistence while meeting GCC Core Competency (#3 Information Competency). • This is a viable option for students who will benefit from an incremental approach to acquiring basic information competency skills.
• As we restructure and improve the program to meet the needs of the existing student population, additional lab space and resources for more instructors will be needed • Request funding for additional adjunct librarians to teach in the credit information competency program. Note: the resource request for funding for additional adjunct librarians is attached to this document • Request funding for additional lab/classroom space for the library science program. Note: the resource request for additional lab/classroom space is included in the Library Services program review document	• Implementing these changes will allow the Library to increase its course offerings and by doing so, ensure that more students, both basic skills students and those wishing to fulfill the IGETC and CSU-GE Breadth requirements will meet GCC Core Competency #3. • The funding of additional adjunct librarians and lab/classroom space will also allow more students to be able to meet Core Competency #3.

2011 PROGRAM REVIEW

Section 4
Resource Request – Personnel

LIBRARY SCIENCE *Increase Adjunct Librarian Hours*	**I:LS-1**

Type of Request: ___ Facilities/Maintenance   ___ Classroom Upgrades   ___ New space
___ Instructional Equip.   ___ Non-Instructional Equip   ___ Conference/Travel   ___ Training
___ Computer/Hdware   ___ Software/Licenses   ___ Supplies   _X_ Other

Mandatory: Is this request for one-time funding? ___   OR   Does this request require ongoing funding?_X_

If this is a repeat request, please list the Resource ID code or year requested: _____2010_____

Mark if the following apply to this request: ___ Health & Safety Issue   ___ Legal Mandate
                                                    ___ Accreditation Requirement   ___ Contractual Requirement

4.1. Clearly describe the resource request.

This request for additional adjunct instructional librarian hours will support expansion of the credit library science program. The proposed restructuring of the library science program (as described in section 3.2) will meet the needs of a greater number of basic skills students. In order to offer enough sections of information competency to meet the needs of all students, additional sections will need to be taught by adjunct librarians. Amount requested **$8,800 augmentation** to the library's adjunct librarian account for 2012-2013 (Fall/Spring)

Breakdown of cost: 2 hours/2 units x 2 sections x 17.5 weeks x 2 semesters x $63 per hour

4.2. Justification and Rationale: What planning goal, core competency or course/program SLO does this request address? Use data from your report to support your request.

This resource request addresses EMP Strategic Goals 1.2: "*Access.* Increase student access by developing strategies and systems to improve student articulation, assessment, and basic skills preparedness" and 1.3: "*Persistence and Success.* Increase student persistence and success in completion of their educational goals." Assessment of the current program demonstrates that student performance is positively impacted by information competency instruction (see Overview 1. and 2.).

This resource request also addresses these Core Competencies: (1) Communication, specifically in writing and using documentation; (3) Information Competency: Research Strategies, Information Location/Retrieval, Evaluation of Information, and Ethical and Legal Use of Information; and (4) Critical Thinking: Evaluation, Analysis and/or Synthesis, Interpretation and/or Inference, Problem Solving, and Construct and/or Deconstruct Arguments (see section 1.2 for details on pre- and post-assessment exam findings).

4.3. What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?

Filling this resource request will allow more students to acquire the Core Competencies listed above. The acquisition of the skills related to the core competencies will be evaluated through the assessment of pre- and post-tests and SLOs for each course.

APPROVALS

AGENCY	DECISION						
The Program Review Committee has reviewed the data, outcomes and plans in the report and finds this request to be: **Referred to Rick Perez**	Well supported						
	Adequately supported						
	Not supported						
	Reason:	Sect.1: Data		Sect.2: SLOs		Sect.3: Plans		Other:
Standing Committee Review of Resource Request **Committee: Academic Affairs**					Prioritization Score		