GLENDALE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Annual Program Review   2012-2013 – INSTRUCTIONAL REPORT

LIBRARY SCIENCE

Authorization

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

Author: Susie Chin   Division Chair: Jeanette Stirdivant

Date Received by Program Review: December. 20, 2012

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.

Library Science Program Review Data Update 11/16/2012		FTES	FTEF	WSCH / FTEF	Full-Time Faculty Percent	Fill Rate	Success Rate	Total Awards	SLOAC Course Count	% of Courses with SLOs Defined	% of Courses with Assessments Run	Sections
Library Science	2008-2009	10.4	0.67	495	40.0%	91.1%	51.1%	0				5
	2009-2010	9.3	0.67	444	40.0%	82.7%	56.3%	0				5
	2010-2011	9.3	0.80	369	66.7%	84.0%	51.1%	0	1	100.0%	100.0%	6
	2011-2012	9.8	0.80	389	83.3%	101.0%	41.6%	0	1	100.0%	100.0%	6
	% Change	-5.7%	+20.0%	-21.4%	+43.3%	+10.0%	-9.5%	--	--	+0.0%	+0.0%	
	Four-Year Trend	stable	increasing	decreasing	increasing	stable	stable	n/a		stable	stable	

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

The above trend analysis has been updated/corrected from the initial trend analysis that was generated for the last four-year cycle. The FTEF (full-time equivalent faculty) rate is calculated at 0.133 because LIB 191 is a 2-unit course and faculty load is 15 hours. While the change from 2010-2011 to 2011-2012 remained the same at .80, the percentage change of 20% reflects an additional full-time librarian teaching in the credit information competency program. Since 2010-2011, we now have three full timers who teach LIB 191, two of whom teach alternating semesters.

Whereas the number of students between 2008-2009 to 2011-2012 has remained about the same, the increase in the number of sections resulted in a decrease (-21.1%) of WSCH/FTEF (Weekly Student Contact Hours per Full-Time Equivalent Faculty.) The number of students enrolled over the four-year cycle remained stable while the number of sections offered increased; as a result, the rate of change in FTES is -5.7%.

The increase of 43.3% in full-time faculty teaching LIB 191 represents the correction made to the status of faculty teaching in the program. Two of the full timers had been incorrectly designated as

adjunct faculty members. While the fill rate remains "stable," in actuality, it has increased dramatically in recent years due to the decreasing number of courses offered across the campus. While this is a positive sign, the success rate has remained "stable" and has not increased. See *Section 3.2 on Weaknesses*, for a discussion about success and retention rates for LIB 191.

*The fill rate was recalculated for this report by the credit coordinator and approved by the Dean of Research and Planning. For Fall 2011, the contract education online course for the County Assessor's office was originally listed under the ticket number of 4216 with a cap enrollment of 30 and a total enrollment of 0, which seemed to suggest that the course was not able to be filled.

However, due to issues with PeopleSoft and possibly clerical error, this course was reissued a new ticket number of 4314 with a cap enrollment of 19 and a total enrollment of 19.

The above ticket and enrollment numbers are based on the AIS report, and not the census report since census reports were not available at the time of the writing of this report; however, recalculating the fill rate for 2011-2012 based on the above numbers indicate a cap enrollment of 154 and a total enrollment of 155, which means that the fill rate for 2011-2012 would be 101%. Based on these numbers (replacing ticket #4216 for #4314), the fill rate had increased by 10%, which is more reflective of the actual enrollment rate.

1.2   Please explain any other relevant quantitative/qualitative information that affects the evaluation of your program?

Each semester, students take 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. However, as is the case in previous years, the number of students who complete the class is not high, and the number of those who take both assessments is even lower. It continues to be the case that students enrolled in the class often lack the basic skills to successfully complete the course.

The data shows the degree of improvement on average for all sections per semester on all questions (first column) and also how students improved overall (last two columns). For Fall 2011-Spring 2012, the rate of improvement from the pre- to post-assessment was 74% and 68% (respectively) on all questions. In Fall 2011, 84% of students and 91% of students in Spring 2012 showed improvement in the post-assessment. Finally, 27% of students in the Fall and 47% of students in the Spring showed significant improvement. Below is a matrix that captures the comparative results of Library 191 sections for Fall 2011-Spring 2012 described above:

	All Questions n=44	Student Improvement	Significant Student Improvement
Fall 2011			
3 sections (Average)*	**74%**	**84%**	**27%**
Spring 2012			
2 sections (Average)	**68%**	**91%**	**47%**

***While 4 classes were offered in Fall 2011, we have reliable data only for 3 of the courses. The online course's assessment data was not properly captured, and due to the change in the Learning Management System (LMS), we were no longer able to recapture and reassess the data because the former LMS is no longer available to us. This was an unfortunate casualty since the data would have captured assessment of how students were doing in our first and only online offering. However, see Section 2.7 for a qualitative assessment based on feedback from the online section instructor.*

2.0.   Student Learning and Curriculum

Course Level

Year	SLOAC Course Count		% of Courses Assessed
2010-2011	1	100.0%	100.0%
2011-2012	1	100.0%	100.0%
% Change		+0.0%	+0.0%
Four-Year Trend		stable	stable

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

List each program within the division	Active Courses with Identified SLOs		Active Courses Assessed		Course Sections Assessed	
	N / N	%	N / N	%	N / N	%
Library Science	1	100%	1	100%	6/6	100%

2.1   Please comment on the percentages above.

The percentages above show that we have identified SLOs for LIB 191 and have assessed each section of the course.

2.2   Using the results from your division/departments recent assessment reports, please summarize any pedagogical or curricular changes that have been made as a result of your course assessments.

In past semesters, we collected pre-assessment data to determine which questions/topics to focus on for each section taught. Focus topics were determined by establishing a threshold percentage in order to come up with the top three or four focus topics. However, in the last few semesters, instructors have moved away from this method of determining areas of focus. A lot of energy, resources, and time had been spent to come up with the minutiae and the micro-level assessment data we had been generating. The pre- and post-assessments weren't telling us anything different from what could already be determined based on instructors' practice, experience, and formative assessment tools.

In fact, the instructors discovered that students required more repetitive practice and guided instruction in the areas of (a) citation style, (b) search strategies and search techniques, and (c) evaluation skills. In the process of revising the Course Outline this semester, we have updated the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and Course Exit Standards to better reflect the above three objectives.

As such, the pre-and post-assessments will continue to provide feedback on a macro-level of overall improvement as opposed to parsing out specific questions to focus on. The credit coordinator and the adjunct librarian/database specialist have begun to redesign the LIB 191 assessment database to simply align specific questions with specific SLOs and exit standards, so that the reports generated will show us the percentage of improvement per SLO/exit standard. The additional objective of this redesign will be to simplify the functionality of the database for reporting purposes.

The assessment test questions need to be updated, which has not been done in a few years. The objective is also to design questions that can more directly map to the course's SLOs and exit standards.

To bolster the assessment data, the credit coordinator will create a basic form that asks each librarian teaching each semester to provide qualitative, summative feedback/assessment regarding the semester in question. These questions will be based on program review questions as well as a listing of specific designated assignments with identified learning outcomes. These outcomes will be mapped to specific Course Outline exit standards and Program Learning Outcomes, which in the case of LIB 191, are the same as the Student Learning Outcomes. This form will hopefully also relieve each instructor from the challenge of recollecting what happened the previous year.

2.3   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—Introduction to Information Competency

Degree, Certificate, Program Level

List each degree and certificate, or other program* within the division	AA/AS Degree PLO Identified		AA/AS Degree Assessment Cycles Completed		Certificate PLO Identified		Certificate Assessment Cycles Completed	
	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
Library Science	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a	

2.4   Library Science currently offers one credit information competency course. This course does not meet any AA/AS degree or certificate program. It is however a transferable course for elective units.

2.5   Using the results from your division/departments recent assessment reports, please summarize any changes that have been made as a result of your program level assessments. Your summary should include a summation of the results of all degrees, certificates, and other programs which were recently assessed.

      Program level outcomes (PLOs) have recently been identified for the coming assessment year. The PLOs are the same as the SLOs for the upcoming assessment cycle.

2.6   Please list all degree/certificate programs within the division that were reviewed in the last academic year.

      Library 191 is not part of a degree or certificate program.

2.7   What recent activities, dialogues, discussions, etc. have occurred to promote student learning or improved program/division processes in the last year?

Mark an "X" in front of all that apply.

X	Curricular development/revisions of courses[1]
X	Curricular development/revision of programs[2]
X	Increased improved SLO/PLOs in a number of courses and programs[3]

X	Other dialog focused on improvements in student learning[4]
X	Documented improvements in student earning[5]
	Increased/improved SLO/PLOs in a number of courses and programs
	New degree or certificate development
	Best Practices Workshops
X	Conference Attendance geared towards maintaining or improving student success[6]
	Division Retreat in 2011-2012
X	Division or department attendance at Staff Development activity geared towards maintaining or improving student learning[7]
	Division Meeting Minutes
	Reorganization

Please comment on the activities, dialogues, and discussions above.

[1] The revision for the Course Outline for LIB 191 has recently been approved by the Curriculum and Instruction Committee, which will be in effect for Spring 2013. The revision included changes for the following reasons: (a) made the current Course Outline compliant to formatting rules established by C & I (such as providing specific examples of assignments, etc.), (b) removed jargon for clearer, more transparent language, (c) replaced the course exit standards with the adopted language/components of the official GCC Information Core Competencies adopted in Spring 2007, which also better reflects the professional standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), (d) scaled back what can actually be accomplished in a 2-unit information competency course and updating the course content to better reflect the change in the nature of resources and how these sources are accessed; (e) revised Methods of Instruction and Out of Class Assignments so that there is more flexibility in the learning needs and preferences of students and instructors;(f) documented a variety of textbook options (both print and electronic) and other freely available resources to support curriculum; and (g) revised SLOs so that they are more easily mapped to exit standards for assessment purposes.

In addition, one instructor will be using Google Forms to efficiently collect student work for the purpose of more timely formative assessment of specific concepts. The use of Google forms will also allow the instructor to collect additional statistical data on formative as opposed to summative assessment data. This same instructor will also (a) assess students' use of visual learning tools by incorporating such out-of-class lessons with in-class activities and assignments, and (b) continue to use assignments such as the iSearch exercise to better foster students' sense of personal investment and motivation in engaging with LIB 191 coursework.

[2] The plan to revamp the credit information competency instruction program was established in last year's program review. The 2011-2012 trend analysis and in-house assessments as well as qualitative assessments have confirmed the need to revamp the credit instruction program as planned a year ago—with whatever modifications are necessary as things change/evolve. The catch-all, one course offering of LIB 191 to meet all credit information competency instructional needs of students is not serving the current student population. See section 3.3 for plan and modifications.

[3] As discussed in section 2.2, the SLOs have been revised from 3 to 4. Two of the former SLOs were redundant, and one of the SLOs needed to be split into two. The revised SLOs are more transparent and can be more easily mapped to the exit standards in the database. In addition, the course exit standards were replaced with the adopted language/components of the official GCC Information Core Competencies adopted in Spring 2007, which also better reflect the professional standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL).

[4] Discussions among instruction librarians have included a recognition that "more and more students who register for this class are less and less prepared for the academic work required…What I plan to do is to teach to the most basic and essential learning outcomes." This instructor plans to incorporate the use of ipads for group exercises to reinforce basic concepts. In addition, this instructor plans to have students complete more chapter exercises, and postings to discussion boards for each reading assignment. Another instructor found that to better engage students in more active chapter readings, concept mapping replaced chapter quizzes.

The instructor for the online section of LIB 191 in Fall 2011 found that students (specifically, contract education students who were returning adult learners earning an AA degree) needed (a) more face-to-face contact, so a hybrid course is recommended (b) more staff support for technical trouble-shooting (c) sufficient support for technical trouble-shooting for students from the college, (d) more commitment of collaboration between the English faculty member and the Instruction Librarian regarding aligning curriculum, and (e) more modeling for students.

[5] See *Section 1.2* on pre- and post-assessment data.

[6] Instructors attended a variety of conferences and workshops relevant to improving student success, including the following: *CARL (California Academic and Research Libraries) Conference: Creativity and Sustainability Fostering User-Centered Innovation in Difficult Times, the Library Orientation Exchange's (LOEX) Conference, Creative Landscapes: Information Literacy for All Terrains,* and *SCIL's (Southern California Instruction Librarians) SCIL Works 2012: Back to Basics: The Ubiquitous One-shot*

[7] In preparation for the credit program redesign, the credit coordinator attended the staff development workshop, *Creating a Requisite or Advisory Preparation Matri*x.

3.0 Reflection and Action Plans

3.1   Based on your data and analysis presented above, as well as on issues or items that you were unable to discuss above, comment on the Strengths and Weaknesses of the Program

Strengths
List the current strengths of your program

1. The program addresses two of GCC's Institutional Learning Outcomes (formerly Core Competencies): 3) Information Competency, and 4) 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.

3.2   Weaknesses
List the current weaknesses of your program

1.   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.

2.   Retention and success rate: The retention and success rate of students in LIB 191 has not improved but has remained stable. In the four-year cycle, the average for those students who pass the class hovers around 50-40%. Although our fill rate has improved, factors contributing to success rate include students enrolling in classes who are under-prepared because they are desperate to enroll in any 2-unit class in order to meet minimum credit load requirements for financial aid purposes, etc. Currently, the recommended prep for LIB 191 is "Eligibility for ENGL 101." Since this is only a recommendation, students enrolled in ENGL 102 or 104 to ESL levels 1 or 2 have attempted to take the class.

     About 30% of our students end up dropping out of the course for a variety of reasons, including: (a) lack of commitment or motivation for an elective course that students assumed would be an easy course and (b) a lack of basic reading and writing skills.

     The redesign of the program, which was developed from the previous year's *Library Science Program Review 2011-2012* (*Section 3.3*), attempts to address some of the weaknesses of the program.

3.3   Using the weaknesses, trends and assessment outcomes as a basis for your comments, please <u>briefly</u> describe any future plans and/or modifications for program/division improvements. Any plans for reorganization should also be included, along with a resource request if applicable.

Plans or Modifications	Anticipated Changes/ Improvements	Link to EMP, Plans, SLOs, PLOs, ILOs
Reconstitute Library 101 as a 3-unit course, including a pre- or co-requisite of ENGL 101 that fulfills the CSU-GE breadth requirements.	• Meeting the breadth requirement would likely improve retention and success for the course, and possibly stabilize the fill rate for the course. • This course would focus more on the higher levels of learning as established in Bloom's Taxonomy such as integration, analysis, and evaluation.	ILO #3 (Information Competency)
Revised Course Outline for LIB 191 (previously noted in 2011-2012 Program Review as the 2-unit Library 120)	• Emphasis on repetition and more guided instruction on applying basic concepts and more hands-on approach to research skills • Improve student levels of retention and persistence.	LIB 191 SLOs and PLOs as well as ILO #3 (Information Competency)

	• Address the basic needs of the majority of the current student population, over 65% of whom are basic skills students.	
Pilot 1-unit offerings that include embedding a librarian for: • ESL 141/151 fast-track option • ENGL 190/ENGL 120 fast-track option	• This was formerly the plan to offer two separate 1-unit courses that would be equivalent to the 2-unit option • Since Title V is offering to fund pilots for a 1-unit offerings taught with a cohort of ESL 141/151 and ENGL 190/ENGL120, this is an opportunity for instruction librarians to try out the 1-unit options in a more controlled environment that will be assessed for their efficacy to students' ability to gain information competency skills in a more contextualized environment.	EMP 1.2.4b and 1.2.4c: Improve Basic Skills Preparedness
• 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 CSU-GE Breadth requirements will meet ILO #3. • The funding of additional adjunct librarians and lab/classroom space will also allow more students to be able to meet ILO #3.	EMP 3.5.2: Innovative Learning for 21st Century Students and Faculty

Format Rev. 9.21.12

2012 PROGRAM REVIEW

Section 4
Resource Request

LIBRARY SCIENCE	
Instructional Lab Upgrade/ ipad cart	**I: LS-1**

Mark Type of Request:

	Facilities/Maintenance	X	Computer Hardware for Student Use
	Classroom Upgrade	X	Computer hardware for Faculty Use
	Instructional equipment	X	Software/Licenses/Maintenance/Agreements
	Non-Instructional Equipment		Conference/Travel
	Supplies	X	Other

4.1 Currently, the library's instructional lab, which is used for credit and non-credit information competency instruction, seats 27 students. The seating arrangement is designed in a manner that is conducive to a more traditional lecture and presentation style of teaching and learning. Three rows of nine desktop computers are lined up and facing the front of the classroom. This configuration is not the most conducive to a more collaborative, (inter)active learning environment in order to foster learning in a discipline that can only be mastered through hands-on practice and group work.

It is widely accepted and has been documented that the current generation of students greatly benefit from a more flexible environment in which students are allowed to collaborate. However, because the room is not adequately sized to allow for more modular, flexible seating arrangements in which students may work together in small group projects, we are requesting that computer hardware, namely ipads including a charging hub, cases, screen protectors, wireless router, AppleTV and applicable cables, and a server for students and faculty be funded in order to mitigate the current impediment to collaborative learning resulting from the limitations of the physical arrangement of space in the lab. In addition, since ipads are run on apps, a lump sum for the software at the institutional rate is included.

A kinesthetic learning style can be better incorporated with other learning styles by utilizing hardware tools with which students are familiar; this familiarity results from their facility with and affinity to mobile communication devices. In addition, since ipads are run on apps,

Amount requested:

Item and Description	Cost	Amount Requested	Total Cost
BNDL IPAD2 BLK WI-FI 16GB 10 PK	$3,790.00	3	$11,370
Bretford PowersyncCart for iPad	$2,599.95	1	$2,599.95
Wireless Router and Storage (G-Connect Wireless Storage for iPad with Internet Access 2TB 7200 RPM	$229.95	1	$229.95
AppleTV	$99.99	1	$99.99
HDMI to VGA Adapter	$59.95	1	$59.95
eWaste Fee / Recycling			$180.00
Apple Apps (Pages, Numbers, Keynote)	$20	30	$600
Total			$15,139.84

9

4.2   Funding

X	Requires One Time Funding—*for hardware and software*
	Requires Ongoing Funding
X	Repeat Request—*adjunct faculty request*
	Year(s) Requested

4.3   Please check if any off the following special criteria apply to this request:

	Health & Safety Issue
	Accreditation Requirement
	Contractual Requirement
	Legal Mandate

Please explain how/why this request meets any of the above criteria.

4.4   Justification and Rationale: What EMP Goal, plan, SLO, PLO, or ILO does this request address? Please use information 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." (Namely, "Increase availability of Basic Skills courses," and "Explore the incorporation of basic skills into course curriculum") and 1.3: "*Persistence and Success.* Increase student persistence and success in completion of their educational goals." (Namely, "Implement systems to facility easier transition into credit programs, including noncredit to credit transition," "Develop goals for student persistence," and "Address the high attrition rate for first year students.") Assessment of the current program demonstrates that student performance is positively impacted by information competency instruction.

This resource request also addresses these Institutional Learning Outcomes: (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

4.5   What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?

Filling this resource request will allow more students to acquire the Institutional Learning Outcomes listed above. The acquisition of the skills related to the Program Learning Outcomes will be evaluated through the assessment of pre- and post-tests and class assignments for SLOs for each course section utilizing the resources requested above.

10

APPROVAL

AGENCY	DECISION	
The Program Review Committee has reviewed the information in this request and finds it to be:	COMPLIANT	**X**
	NON COMPLIANT OR INCOMPLETE	
	a) Request not adequately described or incomplete	
	b) Request not linked to assessments or assessments not completed	
	c) Request not linked to EMP, plan or SLO,PLO or ILO	
	d) Report Incomplete	
PRC Comments		

Form Revised 9.19.12

Reports determined to be "Non-Compliant" will be returned to the division member responsible. Reports must be resubmitted with needed changes to the Program Review Office. Requests will not move forward in the budget process if the report or request is Non-Compliant.

2012 PROGRAM REVIEW

Section 4
Resource Request

LIBRARY SCIENCE	
Additional Adjunct Hours	**I: LS-2**

Mark Type of Request:

	Facilities/Maintenance		Computer Hardware for Student Use
	Classroom Upgrade		Computer hardware or Faculty Use
	Instructional equipment		Software/Licenses/Maintenance/Agreements
	Non-Instructional Equipment		Conference/Travel
	Supplies	**X**	Other

4.1   Clearly describe the resource request.

Additional hours for adjunct librarians
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 3.3) will meet the needs of a greater number of basic skills students and provide more options to students of varying academic abilities. In order to offer enough sections of information competency to meet the needs of students, additional sections will need to be taught by adjunct librarians.

Amount requested $9,100 augmentation to the library's adjunct librarian account for 2013-2014 (Fall/Spring)Breakdown of cost: 2 hours/2 units x 2 sections x 17.5 weeks x 2 semesters x $65 per hour

4.2   Funding

	Requires One Time Funding
	Requires Ongoing Funding
X	Repeat Request—*Adjunct Faculty Request*
	Year(s) Requested

4.3   Please check if any off the following special criteria apply to this request:

	Health & Safety Issue
	Accreditation Requirement
	Contractual Requirement
	Legal Mandate

4.4   Justification and Rationale: What EMP Goal, plan, SLO, PLO, or ILO does this request address? Please use information 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." (Namely, "Increase availability of Basic Skills courses," and "Explore the incorporation of basic skills into course curriculum") and 1.3: "Persistence and Success. Increase student persistence and success in completion of their educational goals." (Namely, "Implement systems to facility easier transition into credit programs, including noncredit to credit transition," "Develop goals for student persistence," and "Address the high attrition rate for first year students.") Assessment of the current program demonstrates that student performance is positively impacted by information competency instruction. This resource request also addresses these Institutional Learning Outcomes: (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

4.5   What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?

Filling this resource request will allow more students to acquire the Institutional Learning Outcomes listed above. The acquisition of the skills related to the Program Learning Outcomes will be evaluated through the assessment of pre- and post-tests and class assignments for SLOs for each course section utilizing the resources requested above.

APPROVAL

AGENCY	DECISION	
The Program Review Committee has reviewed the information in this request and finds it to be:	COMPLIANT	**X**
	NON COMPLIANT OR INCOMPLETE	
	a) Request not adequately described or incomplete	
	b) Request not linked to assessments or assessments not completed	
	c) Request not linked to EMP, plan or SLO,PLO or ILO	
	d) Report Incomplete	
PRC Comments		

Form Revised 9.19.12
Reports determined to be "Non-Compliant" will be returned to the division member responsible. Reports must be resubmitted with needed changes to the Program Review Office. Requests will not move forward in the budget process if the report or request is Non-Compliant.