



Annual Program Review 2010-2011 Instructional Programs

Division:

Library Sciences

Report written by Susie Chin, Instruction Librarian/Credit Information Competency Coordinator

Authorization

After the document is complete, it must be signed by the Division Chair and Dean before being submitted to the Program Review Committee.

Signature of Division Chair

Signature of Dean

Date Submitted to Program Review Committee

Describe the relationship of your program to the college's [Mission Statement](#):

The Library Science Program at GCC, specifically, the credit Information Competency Program, is directly related to the college's mission. In support of the statement in the *Mission*, "Using personal interaction, dynamic and rigorous instruction, and innovative technologies, we foster the development of critical thinking and lifelong learning," the program not only teaches students the nuts and bolts with regard to (re)searching, the program also focuses on developing students' ability to think critically about what and how they search. A familiarity with popular internet search engines does not make a good researcher; thus, as the *Statement of Core Values* indicates, "Glendale Community College is committed to helping students to develop important skills that are critical for success in the modern workplace, such as...the effective use of technology for work and research..." Library 191 instructors instill in students the ability to critically, and with sound judgment, identify authoritative and reliable sources of information. Such skills are not necessarily intuitive, especially given the ease with which any information can be found on the internet. Instead, these skills need to be learned and practiced. With the ever-changing technological and information-laden environment in which students find themselves, it is crucial for students to be competitive and develop critical thinking skills that will assist them in their academic, professional, and life-long pursuits.

Additionally, the increasingly competitive employment market requires that students are well-equipped beyond merely using technology, but capably applying strategic, critical thinking to how technology can be used for research purposes. Being information competent is as essential a skill as reading, writing, and arithmetic in the current academic and professional climate. Furthermore, with respect to students' ability to "conduct their lives with responsibility," the Library Science Program at GCC teaches students about the ethical use of information. To summarize the goals of the Program as stated in the last *Library Science Instructional Program Review* in 2006-2007:

The credit courses cover all aspects of information competency instruction including, but not limited to, developing search strategies, doing research using both print and online library and web resources, analyzing search results, following rules for properly citing sources, and understanding intellectual property rights. This is in keeping with the statewide Academic Senate definition of information competency: "the ability to find, evaluate, use, and communicate information in all its various formats. It combines aspects of library literacy,

research methods and technological literacy. Information Competency includes consideration of the ethical and legal implications of information and requires the application of both critical thinking and communication skills.”
 <www.AcademicSenate.cc.ca.us>. (Moore, 6)

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	FTES Trend	FTEF Trend	WSCH / FTEF Trend	Full-time % Trend	Fill Rate Trend	Success Rate Trend	Awards Trend
Library 191 (Change in % 06-07 to 09-10)	+19.8%	+0.0%	+19.8%	20%	+12.3%	+3.8%	n/a

1.1. Describe how these trends affect student achievement and student learning:

The percentages above reflect an almost 20% increase in full-time equivalent students, while the percentage of full-time equivalent faculty has not increased. Even though Library 191 is no longer paired with English 101 due to the complications associated with filling the class, as documented in the last Library Science Program Review (06-07), the increased enrollment for Library 191 is not unique; since the recent budget crisis began, there are more students and fewer courses to accommodate demand. Simply, if there are fewer classes available, there will be more students in the classes that are offered. However, a contributing factor to the decrease in retention for Library 191 could be explained by the fact that we have not been able to pair the course with another course that requires students to complete a research project. As a result, students enrolled in Library 191 are not necessarily motivated to complete the class because there is no research project that serves as a point of need for their taking a library research/information competency course. There is also a misperception, especially by students who are the least motivated or driven, that because Library 191 is a library course, it is an “easy-to-pass” class that requires minimal or passive effort on their part. Students are often stymied by these assumptions because they come in with low expectations for the class and for themselves. Students confuse being able to use a computer with researching effectively, the latter being a lot more complicated and thought-provoking than the former.

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

Yes, the program has been administering pre- and post-assessments to Library 191 students. Beginning in 2005, these assessment tests were used to help instructors focus on those areas of the curriculum in which each class of students as a whole needed more instruction and practice. Until 2008, tests were manually tallied for the total number of questions per topic answered incorrectly. In 2008, Edward Karpp, Dean of the Research and Planning Department, assisted us in electronically collecting assessment results and determining the percentages of correct and incorrect responses. This assistance greatly improved the assessment process for the credit information competency coordinator, because it relieved her from the time-consuming and laborious task of having to manually “crunch the numbers.” Beginning in 2009, one of our adjunct information competency instructors used the *Respondus* software to put the assessment test online so that it may be administered through the college’s course management software. Another adjunct librarian, in conjunction with the above mentioned adjunct instructor and the credit

information competency coordinator collaborated on an in-house relational database that allowed us to easily import the raw data, collect archived and current assessment questions, organize and manage the results, and most importantly, to analyze the data as they relate to the Course Outline's Exit Standards and Student Learning Outcomes. As a result, automating the administration and analysis of the data has made it possible for the coordinator to more efficiently draw conclusions from the data. Having said this, more needs to be done to ensure transparency among the assessment tool and the results and variables being compared. (See Section 2.0 for more detail regarding this discussion.)

A threshold was established to determine in which areas a particular class needed more focus. On average, the threshold was established at 50% to 65%, meaning that if 50-65% of the students missed a particular question, it became a topic that was targeted for that class. Adjustments were made each semester since each course is unique and individual; at times, a majority of the class did poorly on topics across the board and on other occasions, the topics that needed to be emphasized were fewer. In the event students, as a class, did poorly on the pre-assessment, it was the discretion of the individual instructor to focus on those items that the instructor felt she could reasonably manage within the semester. In summary, it is important to note that, with the exception of 2-3 sections of Library 191, since the assessment results have been collected and analyzed, students in their post-tests consistently did better on those questions/topics/areas that were focused on in class, the questions/topics/areas in which students performed most poorly on the pre-test.

Having said this, in most cases, students tended to do poorly on some reliably consistent topics; they can be categorized generally into the following: (1) search techniques such as keyword vs. subject heading searching, (2) choosing appropriate sources, and (3) recognition, understanding, and application of citation style. Over the years, administering and analyzing the assessment results indicated that these three areas emerged more frequently than others as those areas in which students lack the most experience and instruction. As a result, the Student Learning Outcomes for Library 191 thus far have been established as the following: (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, and (3) Evaluate sources through the process of compiling bibliographic annotations.

See Appendix: LIB 191 Pre- and Post- Assessment Data from Fall 2005 - Spring 2010

2.0. Student Learning and Curriculum

For each program within the division, provide the following information.

Program	% of Courses with Identified SLOs	% of Courses with Ongoing SLO Assessment	% of Courses Reviewed for Outline Changes	% of Courses Whose Prerequisites Were Validated in 2009-2010	% of Courses Whose Textbooks Were Reviewed in 2009-2010	Degree/Certificate SLO* If your division has defined other program SLOs, please indicate below
LIB 191	100%	100%	100% (as of October 2008)	0	100% (a new textbook is currently being reviewed)	n/a

* A program (for purposes of Degree/Certificate SLOs) is a cohesive set of courses that lead to degrees and certificates. Divisions may further delineate and define programs based on their assessment needs.

2.1. Would you like to comment on your percentages outlined above?

As indicated in the data above, the information competency credit program has met its requirements with regard to identifiable SLOs, ongoing assessment, revision of the course outline, and review of the course textbook.

In the last two years of the assessment process, we have determined that the course outline will need to be revised in order to better and more transparently align course exit standards and SLOs with the assessment tool. We have been using the same textbook the last few years, and we are planning to use a new textbook that better parallels the way the curriculum of the credit information competency program is organized. As a result we are preparing for the next round of revisions to the course outline and assessment tool and the selection of a new course text.

In the last two semesters, we have continued to give much consideration to whether to change the "Eligibility for ENGL 101" from a recommended preparation to a pre-requisite. Since students who do not meet the current recommendation are not prohibited from enrolling in the class, students struggling with at least one of the following basic skills: writing, comprehension, reading, and/or speaking, are greatly hindered from passing the course. Consequently, students who have not completed, or are taking Library 191 in conjunction with, English 101 often struggle with the academic demands/rigor of the class. However, we recognize that there are students who do not meet the recommendation who are diligent, motivated, and have enough stamina to put in the time and effort to get as much out of the class as possible. For this reason, we are reluctant to exclude students by imposing pre-requisites.

Additionally, we have solicited advice from counselors about how best to manage this dilemma of under-qualified students enrolling in a class for which they do not yet have the skills necessary to succeed. A good discussion ensued that led to some strategies in dealing with these concerns for the program, including but not limited to the following suggestions: (1) intervening earlier in the semester with those students who exhibit a struggle in the above basic skills by reminding them that the minimum academic requirements to succeed in Library 191 are those skills acquired through English 101 or its equivalent and (2) rewriting the class' course schedule description to emphasize that the intention of the course is to support those students who have an actual research paper to complete that requires outside research, namely in English 101 or another course that requires a research project.

Retention and success are lowest for those students taking the class who don't meet the minimum recommended eligibility, are not taking a class that requires a research assignment, are only taking the course because they are in need of two units (and the only available option is Library 191), or those who minimally pass English 101 (based on reading, writing, and speaking skills in the class as observed by the Library 191 instructor).

2.2. How has assessment of course-level student learning outcomes led to improvement in student learning?

A combination of factors has led to a concerted effort on the part of the program to move toward a class that relies less on students' ability to acquire information/knowledge about information competency in favor of a curriculum that asks students to understand major concepts and to be able to directly translate those concepts into application. To this end, we have increasingly created assignments, exercises, and other activities that rely on students' ability to apply the knowledge or abstract understanding of concepts by using these concepts to guide them in completing practical, problem-based assignments in doing research and evaluating information in general.

Ultimately, the goal is to discourage passive learning and to encourage active learning by recognizing the various learning styles of students. Exercises and exams are more interactive and require students to think critically, to reflect, and to evaluate in order to solve problems posed in these activities. For example, instead of asking students to explain the advanced search technique of using Boolean operators, a question in an exam or an exercise asks students not only to understand the concept but to explain why such a search technique is effective and the specific

results expected for a particular problem. Students must be able to apply concepts, analyze, and reflect on the problem and then to articulate this in writing.

To echo comments made in Section 2.1, students who do not have writing skills that meet the recommended prep of "Eligibility for ENGL 101" will struggle with articulating how they apply complex and abstract concepts in a practical context. To encourage students to develop their writing and thinking skills, we have encouraged students to take the writing workshops offered through the Learning Center. In addition, it has been the goal of at least one full-time instruction librarian to work with English 101 faculty whose students are enrolled in Library 191 and English 101 concurrently. It should be said that this "triage" approach does not replace the pairing experience previously offered, but it does approximate it as much as possible given the availability and willingness on the part of both faculty to work collaboratively.

2.3. How has assessment of program-level student learning outcomes led to certificate/degree program improvements?

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

2.4. Does the student assessment data indicate overall program needs that may require support from the institution? Define these observed needs and support your answer using your assessment data.

Without a doubt, 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 its assessment that Library 191 helps students to be able to apply information competency skills academically, professionally, and personally. It is also 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, which are:

- 1) Information Competency
 - a) Research Strategies
 - b) Information Location/Retrieval
 - c) Evaluation of Information
 - d) Ethical & Legal Use of Information

Definition: Learners recognize the need for information and define a research topic; select, access, and use appropriate sources to obtain relevant data; evaluate sources for reliability and accuracy; and use information in an ethical and legal manner.

- 2) Critical Thinking
 - a) Evaluation
 - b) Analysis and/or Synthesis
 - c) Interpretation and/or Inference
 - d) Problem Solving
 - e) Construct and/or Deconstruct Arguments

Definition: Learners evaluate the credibility and significance of information, effectively interpret, analyze, synthesize explain, and infer concepts and ideas; solve problems and make decisions; and construct and deconstruct arguments.

We currently do not have enough librarians to teach Library 191 and thus expand the program. Given the different area responsibilities of the full-time librarians, it is difficult for them to take on the responsibility of teaching Library 191 without putting other responsibilities on hold. There are two full-time instruction librarians who currently teach in the credit program. Given the budget cuts of recent years, which have impacted the adjunct librarian accounts, we have not had an opportunity to recruit adjunct librarians who are interested in teaching Library 191. In addition, there has been only one year in the last six during which all five full-time librarians have been working (due to personal leaves or leaves to take on other assignments). Even if we were able to recruit adjunct credit library science instructors, these librarians often burn out quickly due to the time-consuming preparation that is required for each class session in order to ensure that students receive the most up-to-date instruction in a constantly changing field. Finally, a curriculum in library science that emphasizes not only acquisition of concepts but an application of these concepts in the most practical manner requires more time and effort in both preparation and in grading.

3.0. Evaluation of Previous Goals

This section is an evaluation of program goals and activities from previous years.

3.1. List actions identified in your last program review or any other related plan(s).

The following actions identified in the *Library Science Instructional Program Review (2006-2007)* by Deborah Moore, Instruction Librarian, are being addressed in this document:

- a) "Begin to develop hybrid and online components for Library 191." (Moore, 72)
- b) "Begin to revise Library 101 to fit into the Interdisciplinary Studies program so that we can infuse information competency instruction into more disciplines on campus. Library 101 will also offer an alternative to Library 191." (Moore, 72)
- c) "Begin exploring the possibility and feasibility of remodeling a classroom on the 2nd floor of the Library Building that could be an instruction room shared by Library Science and other disciplines (such as English and Social Science). (Moore, 73) "This room would need to be computer-equipped and hold at least 40 students so we can provide instruction to classes with larger seat loads." (Moore, 73)

3.2. What measurable outcomes were achieved due to the actions completed?

- a) A hybrid was piloted in the Spring of 2010; the hybrid is being offered again in Fall 2010 and will be offered in Spring 2011 in order to complete the cycle. We will be delivering an online version of Library 191 for launch in Fall 2011, with support from Contract Education.
- b) Due to the limited resources and time that the credit information competency coordinator has to devote to the overhaul of certain aspects of the program, we have not moved forward on any plans to reconstitute Library 101 or integrate it into the Interdisciplinary Studies program. Instead, we have informally discussed making Library 191 a 3-unit class given the amount of work the class currently requires on the part of the students and the instructors. As part of the focus on Library 191, since 2004, we have revised the course outline for Library 191 several times, most recently in October 2009.
- c) There continues to be a need to expand the credit information competency program in terms of availability of classroom/lab space. Discussions took place at the time of planning for the proposed Lab/College Services Building about making classroom/lab space

available for library instruction purposes.

3.3. Evaluate the success of the completed actions. Did the completed actions lead to improved student learning or improved program/division processes?

- a) In many ways, the hybrid offering is still an experiment. Like most anecdotal evidence, the pilot was bumpy, and there have been significant improvements for the hybrid offering in Fall 2010. In completing the cycle, by offering it a third time in Spring 2011, we will have more information and experience in determining whether this mode of delivery is optimal in terms of student learning, success, and retention. At this point, we are not convinced that a hybrid offering is the best platform for our students. Our students continue to struggle with online course management software. In a hybrid class, independence, focus, self-direction and motivation, and the ability to problem-solve are important characteristics for students to succeed. As a result, students have expressed, and we have witnessed, that the hybrid offering is, indeed, *a more, not less*, challenging offering because it requires important skills that many of our students do not readily possess at this point in their academic development. It seems that for students who do not already possess these characteristics, maturity is a driving factor in developing these traits.

For example, many students still cannot adequately manage submitting assignments online via Blackboard and most struggle with deadlines. In almost two semesters of teaching the hybrid offering, we have come to the conclusion that in general, students rely too much on the face-to-face sessions and do not come prepared (by reading and completing the online tutorials, readings, and assignments). Thus, they come to class not having done the prep work in order to complete assignments for the face-to-face sessions. Less content can get covered and portions of the curriculum must be repeated because students come to class unprepared when they should have completed work online before attending the face-to-face session. Of course, those who exhibit a higher level of student skills are able to keep up. Others languish because they become lost and *have an extremely* difficult time keeping pace after missing just one face-to-face session, especially if they have not been on top of things from the very beginning. Truly, there is absolutely no room for slacking off in a hybrid class while having the expectation of keeping up.

- b) Comment in 3.2b is explanatory.
- c) No progress has been made in securing a 40-seat classroom/lab, but the need still exists in order for the information competency program to expand.

3.4. What modifications do you plan to make to your program/division in the future to improve student learning and/or program/division processes?

- a) We will complete the assessment cycle for the hybrid course to determine its viability and future hybrid offerings. We will consider whether a fully online offering might mitigate the problems with students' over-dependence on the face-to-face sessions of the hybrid offering. A completely online course might compel students to develop those traits that lead to success since no face-to-face alternative would be available to them in an online course, with the exception of possibly meeting the first day of class. As a result, self-selection of those with the skills to succeed in an online environment might increase both the success and retention rate.
- b) There are no plans to pursue the reconstitution of Library 101 if modifications to Library 191 will lead to improved learning. Library 101 is considered a more advanced-level credit information competency course, since it also requires students to submit a research paper; Library 101 was last offered in Spring 2000 and it was marketed specifically to students and instructors of English 101 at that time.
- c) A 40-seat classroom/lab continues to be necessary for the expansion of the library instruction program. The credit and non-credit information competency programs cannot expand without the space to accommodate additional courses, workshops, and orientations. At least 3 sections of Library 191 have filled during most semesters in recent years. Ideally, since information competency often requires students to use resources available only in the library, it is optimal to have access to an instructional lab that is close to the library so that students may easily access materials required to complete assignments. Since no 40-seat classroom/labs exist on campus currently, this resource request would require remodeling of existing space on the 2nd floor of the Library Building or allocation of space in the proposed Lab/College Services building.

4.0. Action Plans

Based on trends and student learning outcomes, describe your program plan for the next academic year. Include necessary resources.

Action	Related EMP Goals and SLOs	How action will improve student learning	Resource Needs
Revise Library 191 Course Outline	EMP Strategic Goal 1.3; Course SLOs	The course will be structured in a way that promotes optimal student learning.	None
Revise Library 191 Assessment Tool	Course-level SLO	Revising the assessment tool will provide feedback for making course revisions in a timely manner, especially in addressing specific areas of student need.	Funding for an adjunct librarian to assist in reconfiguring the credit program's assessment database in order to meet the program's assessment needs.
Continue to make Library 191 more problem-based	Course-level SLO	Students will be able to better retain concepts and apply them appropriately.	None

Evaluate Hybrid Delivery	EMP Strategic Goal 1.3	After completing the cycle of offering a hybrid option from Spring 2010 – Spring 2011, the hybrid offering will be evaluated for student retention and persistence. Consideration will be given to whether the course in this platform is a help or a hindrance to students' acquisition of information competency skills.	None
Consider/Implement Online Delivery	EMP Strategic Goal 1.3	Students who have “real world” responsibilities and who already have intrinsic motivation, study skills, independence, maturity and the desire to learn prefer the flexibility of the online environment. These types of students will likely thrive and succeed in a class that is delivered online.	Funding and technical support for online implementation of Library 191.
Request 40-seat classroom/lab for credit and non-credit information competency instruction	EMP Strategic Goals 1.2, 1.3, 3.3	Having access to a 40-seat classroom/lab will allow for expansion of the information competency program. More students will be able to participate in the workshop program and we will be able to offer more sections of Library 191. In addition, we will be able to accommodate orientations for classes that have seat loads greater than 27 students (our current classroom/lab capacity).	Funding to remodel space on the 2 nd floor of the Library Building to create this classroom/lab. Funding for furniture and computers for the lab. This will also require additional funding for adjunct librarians to teach in both the credit and non-credit information competency programs.

Appendix: LIB 191 Pre- and Post- Assessment Data from Fall 2005 - Spring 2010

	Average Total Questions	Average Focus Questions	Average Other Questions	Average Student Improvement	Average Significant Student Improvement
Fall 2005					
4 sections	68%	75%	66%	84%	37%
Spring 2006					
2 sections	72%	73%	72%	93%	65%
Fall 2006					
2 sections	63%	72%	62%	82%	28%
Winter 2007*					
1 section	58%	100%	55%	85%	15%
Spring 2007					
3 sections	62%	84%	54%	91%	15%
Summer 2007*					
1 section	43%	43%	43%	80%	20%
Fall 2007					
4 sections	59%	75%	56%	90%	13%
Spring 2008					
5 sections	62%	78%	57%	78%	10%
Summer 2008					
1 section	67%	93%	57%	92%	31%
Fall 2008					
2 sections	79%	82%	74%	92%	56%
Winter 2009					
1 section	61%	86%	51%	86%	29%
Spring 2009					
3 sections	67%	92%	57%	85%	43%
Summer 2009					
1 section	65%	73%	61%	95%	15%
Fall 2009					
2 sections	84%	96%	76%	94%	47%
Spring 2010					
3 sections	80%	79%	81%	94%	43%
Average Total for All Sections**	67%	81%	62%	88%	28%

Total Questions: Percentage of all questions with fewer students answering incorrectly on the post-class assessment

Focus Questions: Based on students' responses on the pre-class evaluation, several focus areas were identified, e.g., effective database searching or understanding citations, etc. This is the percentage of the questions pertaining to the focus areas that have fewer students answering incorrectly on the post-class assessment.

Other Questions: Percentage on non-focused questions with fewer students answering incorrectly

Student Improvement: Percentage of students who improved overall from pre-class assessment to post-class assessment

Significant Student Improvement: Percentage of students who improved significantly, that is, they missed half

* Only 1 section was offered during short sessions in Winter and Summer, thus percentages for short sessions do not reflect an average.

** Includes the average of all regular and short sections based on raw percentages.

2010 PROGRAM REVIEW

Division:

Library Science

I: LS-1

Section 5.0. Resource Request - Personnel

All resource requests should be tied to at least one of the following:

- The [Educational Master Plan](#) or other related plan goal.
- The [Core Competencies](#) (Institutional SLOs)
- A program SLO or course SLO

5.1. What planning goal (EMP or other plan), core competency, or course/program SLO does this resource request address?

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," 1.3: *Persistence and Success*. Increase student persistence and success in completion of their educational goals," and 3.3: "Strengthen the interface between Student Services and Instructional Services for both credit and noncredit students and both transfer and CTE credit students." This resource request also addresses the following 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; (4) Critical Thinking: Evaluation, Analysis and/or Synthesis, Interpretation and/or Inference, Problem Solving, and Construct and/or Deconstruct Arguments.

5.2. What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request? (This could be an improvement in the SLO or another measurable outcome.)

Filling the request for additional adjunct librarians to teach in the credit information competency program will allow more students to acquire the Core Competencies listed in Section 5.1 so that more students could have the critical skills to succeed after they have completed their education at GCC and move forward on academically or professionally. The GCC Core Competencies are the minimum skills and characteristics that will enable students to succeed no matter their life pursuits in general. While most students know how to get online for leisure and social purposes, very few are equipped to use technology to its maximum advantage. Fostering the Core Competencies by exposing students to the possibilities of strategic research in the new century allows them to be competitive and to improve their quality of life.

5.3. Describe the resource request in detail.

At this time, we are requesting additional adjunct instructional librarian hours in order to support expansion of the credit library science program. A full-time librarian was requested through the SSHAC as part of the Library Services program review process. The expectation is that the new librarian would teach Library 191 as part of their assignment. Full-time librarians are responsible for coordination of specific areas of library service, which requires most of their attention and limits their availability to teach in the credit program. For these reasons, this resource request focuses on expanding the information competency instruction program through adding adjunct librarians to the program.

5.4. What resources are needed to fill this request? Potential funding sources might include Senate PFE funding, categorical funding sources, Perkins funding, basic skills funding, etc.

Note: All personnel requests will require the additional "IHAC Addendum" to be completed.

Type of Resource	Amount Requested	Description	Justification	Potential Funding Sources
Personnel	Budget of \$60 per hour for adjunct librarians to teach Library 191 – approx. \$2,000 per semester	<p>1. A full-time tenure-track librarian was requested through SSHAC as part of the Library Serv. Program Review</p> <p>2. Adjunct Instructional Librarians</p>	<p>1. Information Competency delivered as a credit class cannot be expanded without an additional full-time librarian, who will be required to teach Library 191 as part of their assignment (requested SSHAC).</p> <p>2. Additional adjunct instructional librarians are also needed in order to expand the credit information competency program.</p>	District funding; currently the instructional program budget pays for adjunct librarians to teach Library 191.

2010 PROGRAM REVIEW

Division:

Library Sciences I: LS-2
Remodel Classroom/Computers

Section 5.0. Resource Request - Facilities

All resource requests should be tied to at least one of the following:

- The [Educational Master Plan](#) or other related plan goal.
- The [Core Competencies](#) (Institutional SLOs)
- A program SLO
- A course SLO

5.1. What planning goal (EMP or other plan), core competency, or course/program SLO does this resource request address?

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," 1.3: *Persistence and Success*. Increase student persistence and success in completion of their educational goals," and 3.3: "Strengthen the interface between Student Services and Instructional Services for both credit and noncredit students and both transfer and CTE credit students."

This resource request will also address the following Core Competencies by allowing additional information competency instruction to occur: (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; (4) Critical Thinking: Evaluation, Analysis and/or Synthesis, Interpretation and/or Inference, Problem Solving, and Construct and/or Deconstruct Arguments.

5.2. What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request? (This could be an improvement in the SLO or another measurable outcome.)

By providing a 40-seat classroom/lab for information competency instruction, more students would be able to participate in information competency instruction and thereby acquire the Core Competencies listed in Section 5.1 so that more students could have the critical skills to succeed after they have completed their education at GCC and move forward on academically or professionally. The GCC Core Competencies are the minimum skills and characteristics that will enable students to succeed no matter their life pursuits in general.

5.3. Describe the resource request in detail.

In addition to the 40-seat classroom/lab being requested here, replacement/new computers for the existing library classroom/lab (LB313) are being requested through the Library Services Program Review process. Currently, the library has one lab with 27 student computer stations and one instructor station. Larger classes needing library orientations cannot be accommodated or must be split in order for these orientations to take place. The calendar for scheduling instruction in the library's existing lab has reached its capacity. Library 191, the library workshop program, and orientation sessions must compete with each other for scheduling of the room. The credit and non-credit information competency program cannot expand without the space to accommodate additional courses/workshops. As stated previously, at least 3 sections of Library 191 have filled during most semesters in recent years. Ideally, since information competency often requires students to use resources available only in the library, it is optimal to have access to an

instructional lab that is close to the library so that students may easily access materials required to complete assignments. Since no 40-seat classroom/labs exist on campus currently, this resource request would require remodeling of existing space or allocation of space in the new Lab/College Services building.

5.4. What resources are needed to fill this request? Potential funding sources might include Senate PFE funding, categorical funding sources, Perkins funding, basic skills funding, etc.

Type of Resource	Amount Requested	Description	Justification	Potential Funding Sources
Facilities/ Equipment	Unknown/ \$45,000 for 41 new computers	1. Remodeled or new space and furniture for 40- seat classroom/ lab space 2. New computers	1. There is a need for additional information competency offerings beyond the capacity of the library's existing classroom/lab. 2. New computers and furniture will be required for the new or remodeled space	District funding and Instructional Equipment funding