

Detailed Assessment Report
Fall 2012 Instructional Multimedia Center (PR)
As of: 6/19/2013 08:14 AM PST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked *One-Time, Recurring, No Request.*)
Program Review - Annual Update Responses
Discipline/Program/Area Name

Instructional Media Center
Academic Year

2012-2013

Name of person leading this review.

Shirlene Thatch

Names of all participants in this review.

Shirlene Thatch and Cheryl Burleson

Please review the five year headcount and FTES enrollment data provided on [Program Review website](#). Comment on trends and how they affect your program.

Since the peak of AVC's enrollment in 2008-2009 there has been a 26.1% decrease in annual enrollment. This decrease in enrollment is directly related to severe budget cuts and workload reductions across the state and is not indicative of a lack of community need for education. Though enrollment and resources have diminished, the workload of has increased while the staffing has decreases. The increases include: podcasting, course video taping, video conferencing and higher traffic to onsite services (i.e. computer lab, training rooms, media rooms).

Using the student achievement data provided on the [Program Review website](#), please comment on any similarities or differences in success, retention, and persistence between race, gender, and location/method of delivery groups. Please comment on all three (success, persistence, and retention). Identify which trends and achievement gaps will be addressed in the current academic year.

N/A

Analyze changes in student achievement and achievement gaps over the past five years. Cite examples of using data during that time as the basis for resource allocation (e.g. human, facilities/physical, technology, financial, professional development) or making other changes that resulted in improvements in student achievement.

N/A

Provide examples from your program where assessment findings of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), and/or Operational Outcomes (OOs) were discussed and used to make budget decisions in the past year. This should include brief descriptions of assessment findings, when the discussions occurred, who participated, and what, if any, budget items/resources resulted.

Discussion have occurred at departmental, departmental with dean and division meetings on a monthly basis. Minutes of departmental meetings will be uploaded into WEAVEonline. Though decisions have been made to upgrade equipment as identified in outcomes assessment, however due to the lack of budgetary resources these requests have not been funded.

Analyze changes in SLO, PLO and/or OO assessment findings over the past five years. Cite examples of using data during that time as the basis for resource allocation (e.g. human, facilities/physical, technology, financial, professional development) or making other changes that resulted in the improvement of SLO, PLO and/or OO findings this past year.

At this point there is no comparative data to show as findings have only been entered in for 2012.

Review the program goals and objectives related to improving outcome results and/or student achievement identified in the most recent comprehensive self study and subsequent annual update(s). List program goals and objectives for this academic year, adding new ones if needed.

Goal: Establish greater access from ITS for IMC/multimedia computer/laptop administration (similar to the Learning Center). Create a one-stop process and eliminate the confusion for the end-user. On-going Goal: Ensure maximum utilization of Mac computers in the IMC by using both Windows 7 and Lion operating systems. Updated Goal still on-going Goal: Purchase equipment to provide additional smart-carts to accommodate growing technology usage across campus. On-going Goal: Update IMC Policy and Procedure Manual. On-going in planning Goal: Increase usage of IMC services at the Palmdale Center On-going in planning Goal: Complete conversion of multimedia collection to Horizon On-going in planning NEW GOALS: Purchase equipment to provide additional back-up equipment to accommodate growing technology usage across campus. Update video conferencing equipment and software in the BE building
List significant new and continuing resource needs in rank order of importance. Identify the document (e.g. Educational Master Plan, action plan, state mandate, accreditation mandate) and/or data which corroborate each need.

Human Capital Restore IMC Technician from 10 months to 12 months Restore Clerical II from 10 months to 12 months Restore Clerical III from 11 months to 12 months Restore Graphic Artist from 11 months to 12 months Reclassifications Clerical II to Multimedia Assistant Clerical III to Multimedia Specialist New Hires IMC Technician Evening Clerical Asst. II Training budget for IMC staff Facilities Additional space for student viewing, equipment storage, podcasting, and multimedia station for faculty. Equipment Technology is an ever-changing field, and as such, it is difficult to name specific needs four years in advance. There may be technology needs that have yet to be created and/or explored. Upgrade office computers

Replace outdated videoconference equipment with new HD equipment and purchase annual software upgrades. Portable podcast units Smart carts Laptops (for circulation and to fully equip BE 132 for interactive faculty instruction and employee training) Central Control Station in the IMC to monitor, remotely control, and address minor problems of LCDs. High quality VHS to DVD converter DVD Blue ray players HD video cameras CD/DVD burner Office copy machine Multimedia station for faculty production/creation of multimedia Tabletop videoconference system iTunes on PC computers across campus and especially in the IMC computer lab. iTunes U for the use of podcasts. Approval of cross platform technology on Mac computers across campus. Budget Repair budget that will allow for backup equipment/part purchases as well as an adequate amount for repairs campus-wide (\$20,000). Multimedia budget to update multimedia for circulation and to purchase multimedia for the Palmdale Center (\$10,000). Software budget to meet need of maintaining updated computers for student use in lobby, keep circulated laptops upgraded, and maintain upgraded software on IMC employee computers, video conversion/editing ability, podcast computer, editing computer, etc. to ensure interactivity between all computers (\$10,000). Annual Shutterstock subscription (\$2,200.00). Supplies (\$17,000.00)

Detailed Assessment Report
Fall 2012 Learning Resources Center (PR)
As of: 6/19/2013 08:14 AM PST
(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked *One-Time, Recurring, No Request.*)
Program Review - Annual Update Responses
Discipline/Program/Area Name

Learning Assistance Center/Instructional Resources and Extended Services Division/Learning
Center
Academic Year

2012

Name of person leading this review.

Professor Diane Flores-Kagan Professor Magdalena Caproiu, Ph.D
Names of all participants in this review.

Faculty: Diane Flores-Kagan Faculty: Dr. Magdalena Caproiu Faculty: Kristie Jorris Staff:
Michele Lathrop Staff: Raquel Trejo Staff: Kether Foisel Staff: Tasakyna Raper
Please review the five year headcount and FTES enrollment data provided on [Program Review website](#). Comment on trends and how they affect your program.

Unduplicated headcount totals partially follow the trend of District totals for the given years, rising and falling similarly until the 2010-2011 academic year in which District numbers fell,

whereas more students were served in the Learning Center than in previous years. This could be attributed to combined efforts of Learning Center faculty and staff to promote tutoring and learning assistance, students placing more value on services, and faculty referrals of students needing help. For 2011-2012, District and Learning Center headcounts align again, perhaps because of the overall drop in student enrollment and fewer campus-wide course offerings. IR (Learning Center) FTEs follow the same pattern as District FTEs, higher to lower. Learning Center Services, tutoring and learning assistance, are offered as LAC non-credit courses and are combined with LAC credit courses in the annual FTEs data; the same pattern, higher to lower, is noted.

Using the student achievement data provided on the [Program Review website](#), please comment on any similarities or differences in success, retention, and persistence between race, gender, and location/method of delivery groups. Please comment on all three (success, persistence, and retention). Identify which trends and achievement gaps will be addressed in the current academic year.

Success: District men and women succeed at 68% and 70% respectively whereas LAC men succeed at 56% while LAC woman succeed at 62%. African American LAC students showed the lowest success rate at 48% while Asian LAC students were the most successful at 72% followed by White students at 69%. Hispanic and American Indian LAC students succeeded at 62% and 63% respectively. Numbers of LAC Pacific Island students are very low, 50%. Retention: The Learning Center's data for retention by gender shows an unexplained dip in retention of females and males beginning in 2009-2010. Since that time, the rate has risen, but has not yet reached the 2007-2008 rates (94% females and 97% males). Retention rates by race have dropped over time by 6% in both the White and Hispanic categories, but by double that (12%) for African Americans, from 88% in 2007-2008 to 76% in 2011-2012. Persistence: A prior persistence study by the Dept. of Institutional Research showed that "attending one or more Learning Center courses during the term increases the probability that a student will return in the spring." Another such study will be requested by Learning Center faculty in Spring 2013. Trends: A high level of promotion of Learning Center services resulted in higher student attendance in 2010-2011 (see #5 above), but dipped the next year when promotional attempts leveled. Since then, a Learning Center Advisory Committee has been formed with one of its goals to assist Learning Center faculty and staff in the development of a systematic method for publicizing its services, particularly tutoring, workshops, and individual learning improvement plans. The expectation is that more students from all populations will seek services, resulting in an increase of success and retention rates by race. Achievement gaps can also be addressed with help from the committee which is comprised of mostly faculty with the charge of advising Learning Center faculty and staff about the needs of students in their various disciplines.

Analyze changes in student achievement and achievement gaps over the past five years. Cite examples of using data during that time as the basis for resource allocation (e.g. human, facilities/physical, technology, financial, professional development) or making other changes that resulted in improvements in student achievement.

A 2012 study of students enrolled in basic skills courses (English, ESL, Math, Reading) was conducted to determine the impact Learning Center tutoring has on success. Metacognitive

measures (SLOs for LAC 900, Supervised Tutoring) and student enrollment data were used for the study. For English, ESL, and Reading, results show a higher rate of success for students who received tutoring for eight week courses and traditional courses (16 weeks). For Math, a higher rate of success was achieved in two out of three courses. In addition, SMARTHINKING data studies have consistently shown that student success is higher for students in basic skills and transfer English courses, with a recent Spring 2012 study confirming that "success in English is, in fact, dependent upon participation in SMARTHINKING." Currently, grant funding for Learning Center tutors (English, ESL, Math, Reading) and the online SMARTHINKING service continues to be requested each year. Considering the impact of these services on student success, institutionalization with district funding should be a priority. Usage data for the Academic Skills Center shows a drop in student headcount and total hours since Spring 2010, accounting, perhaps, for the assignment of the full-time learning specialist to the Palmdale campus two days a week and the reliance on adjuncts to fill the gap with fewer hours assigned to them. Also, a part-time desk assistant was formerly assigned to the Early Alert program to schedule initial and follow-up appointments with learning specialists, improving the number of students who reported for their appointments. This part-time position should be reinstated as a contributing factor to student achievement. With every Program Review since 2008, Learning Center faculty and staff have asked for a new database because the accurate reporting of data is vital to operations. Currently, Office of Information Technology Services personnel decline to assist with LC database malfunctions because of aging issues, placing Learning Center data at risk; therefore, using reliable data to inform changes that result in improvements in student achievement is problematic.

Provide examples from your program where assessment findings of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), and/or Operational Outcomes (OOs) were discussed and used to make budget decisions in the past year. This should include brief descriptions of assessment findings, when the discussions occurred, who participated, and what, if any, budget items/resources resulted.

Student success for LAC courses is measured by SLOs. Services not related to courses (computer use, instructional resource use) fall under the purview of OOs. Learning Center faculty, full-time and adjunct, held two retreats in Spring 2012 to discuss, among other topics, SLOs for LAC courses. Assessment tools for LAC 901, Supervised Learning Assistance, were reviewed to ensure that a uniform method is utilized by faculty to test students' knowledge/ability of what they learned and what they could demonstrate in workshops and individual sessions. As a result, a much smoother reporting of LAC 901 SLOs in WEAVE occurred in Spring 2012. A follow-up retreat was held in July 2012 as a review for Fall 2012 reporting of LAC 901 SLOs. Also, full-time faculty attended breakout sessions at Welcome Back Day, fall and spring, to discuss LAC course SLOs. Although LAC course SLOs assessment results primarily met targets, the need for web-based services became apparent when licenses expired for Learning Center computer software, and incompatibility issues with Windows 7 occurred. These web-based resources were procured in 2011-2012: Learning Express, Webspiration Classroom, SMARTHINKING. In addition, the license for Turnitin was renewed by the VP of Academic Affairs, and faculty who attended a Flex session were informed of ways for students to use the service more educationally and less punitively. Also, the Writing Center and Math Center shored up their AVC websites to include more instructional handouts, links,

and interactive exercises. To replace worn VHS tapes, DVDs were purchased for tutor training and study skills topics. PLOs are not applicable to the Learning Center because the Chancellor's Office acknowledges learning assistance, but does not recognize it as a program; however, OOs were created during Fall 2012. Budget decisions will be made in relation to OOs later in Spring 2013.

Analyze changes in SLO, PLO and/or OO assessment findings over the past five years. Cite examples of using data during that time as the basis for resource allocation (e.g. human, facilities/physical, technology, financial, professional development) or making other changes that resulted in the improvement of SLO, PLO and/or OO findings this past year.

Most targets have consistently been met in SLOs assessment of LAC courses in the past four years. LAC 901, a bit less so, now has a more uniform reporting system which last term contributed to improved results because faculty met numerous times and agreed on methods for assessment. LAC 900 tutoring data measures metacognitive behaviors related to student self-regulation and study habits for which SLOs for independence, motivation, acquisition, retention, performance, and study skills were statistically significant in Spring 2012 as opposed to Fall 2011 in which one or two were not statistically significant. Despite these good results, budget reductions have reduced Supplemental Instruction offerings and individual tutoring (General Tutoring, Math, Reading), and students can no longer make tutoring appointments (Math, Reading, Writing). Staffing for desk assistants has been cut entirely, depriving students of receiving immediate assistance at times when tutorial specialists are unavailable, making the collection of usage data difficult, and interrupting the tutoring occurring in the vicinity. PLOs are currently not applicable because major services (tutoring and learning assistance) are offered as courses for which SLOs are measured; however, PLOs may be developed at a later date, according to the Office of Institutional Research. OOs were developed in Fall 2012 and have not yet been assessed.

Review the program goals and objectives related to improving outcome results and/or student achievement identified in the most recent comprehensive self study and subsequent annual update(s). List program goals and objectives for this academic year, adding new ones if needed.

Goals for 2012-2013 have not changed from 2011-2012 goals because each of them encompasses the Learning Center (LC) mission statement in terms of support and services for classroom instruction. For instance, goals related to the improvement and increase in LAC course offerings (Goal #4) as well as SLOs assessment (Goal #5) require continuing oversight by faculty. The objectives for goals can change each year, however. For example, one is to offer LAC 100 as a hybrid course in Spring 2013 in response to requests by Learning Center tutors to accommodate academic and work schedules. In addition, an added objective under Goal #2 is to replace the full-time academic skills learning specialist position with a new position that addresses the need to fill the gap not only for Academic Skills but also Reading, the latter of which to accommodate student learning needs for workshops and individual learning improvement plans with the intent of improving outcomes and student achievement. Other objectives require the assistance of members of the Learning Center Advisory Committee, comprised of faculty and staff across disciplines and departments, in the promotion of the Learning Center at both locations, Lancaster and Palmdale (Goal #1). This objective, formerly

involving LC faculty and staff, was not met in 2011-2012, reflecting the need for campus representatives (members of the committee) to invest in a promotional plan meant to attract their students and thereby to support their students' learning needs. Most objectives related to staffing (Goal #2) were not met because of budget cuts, so they continue to 2012-2013 should funding conditions improve. The Learning Center is understaffed by a large measure with the reduction of hours for the ESL Learning Specialist, the loss of desk assistants for Reading, Writing, Math, and General Tutoring/SI, the burden of duties for the vacant/unfilled positions of Computer Technician and Clerical III being assumed by tutorial specialists, and 12 month assignments of tutorial specialists being reduced to 11 months. Three objectives related to technology (Goal #9) require funding, the justification for which point to innovative programs and services that have proven or could improve outcomes and/or student achievement.

List significant new and continuing resource needs in rank order of importance. Identify the document (e.g. Educational Master Plan, action plan, state mandate, accreditation mandate) and/or data which corroborate each need.

1. Stable budget (district funding) for tutoring and tutor training. Tutoring outcome studies (see Repository) clearly link tutoring to student achievement.
2. A new Learning Center database to accurately collect data for SLOs and OOs. This data is directly connected to outcomes and/or student achievement.
3. Replacement of computers that are currently five years or older and failing. Student computer usage which is higher than in previous years warrants this need (see Repository, "CMC Usage").
4. Extension of the full-time Writing Center Learning Specialist position from 10 to 12 months in order to provide the same level of services to students year round. Tutoring, SMARTHINKING, and persistence reports of student achievement reflect the continuing need for tutor training, SMARTHINKING oversight, and LAC 901 instruction (workshops and individual learning improvement plans).
5. Full-time Academic Skills/Reading Learning Specialist to fill the gaps in both areas. The Early Alert program needs to be maintained, and the faculty member needs to be involved in interdisciplinary activities, such as Reading Directed Learning Activities (DLAs), to assess students' learning needs.
6. Funding to continue to hire adjunct faculty in the areas of academic skills, ESL, and writing. Restore hours that were cut for the ESL Learning Specialist. ESL skills are basic skills, so support services (workshops and individual learning improvement plans) should be available to this population of students more than four hours per week.
7. Tutorial Specialist for Palmdale Center. Tutoring requires oversight in order to assure that outcome studies continue to clearly link tutoring to student achievement.
8. Funding for student desk assistants (Early Alert, General Tutoring/SI, Math, Reading, Writing). Students will receive assistance when needed, and usage data can be collected all of the time instead of some of the time.
9. Instructional technology such as software and Web-based services, Web tools such as Web cams and wireless access, and resources (DVDs, book, etc.), all as aids to student achievement. Hybrid course offerings, such as LAC 100 (Spring 2013), require technologically-based tools. Adobe Acrobat Professional software needs to be available at the Palmdale office of the Writing Center Learning Specialist in order for her to perform the same duties she performs at her Lancaster office such as posting Web-based materials on the Learning Center Website and MyAVC.

Detailed Assessment Report

Fall 2012 Library Studies (PR)

As of: 6/19/2013 08:14 AM PST

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked *One-Time, Recurring, No Request.*)

Program Review - Annual Update Responses
Discipline/Program/Area Name

Library Science
Academic Year

2012

Name of person leading this review.

Scott Lee

Names of all participants in this review.

Van Rider

Please review the five year headcount and FTES enrollment data provided on [Program Review website](#). Comment on trends and how they affect your program.

Although district headcount and FTES declined between 07-08 and 11-12, LIB course student headcount increased 11% and FTES increased 8%. The likely causes for this divergence from the district trends are: 1) With an overall reduction in available courses there was greater demand for any courses that existed. 2) LIB 101 is required by SOAR students, and as the number of SOAR students increased, the number of students in LIB 101 also increased.

Using the student achievement data provided on the [Program Review website](#), please comment on any similarities or differences in success, retention, and persistence between race, gender, and location/method of delivery groups. Please comment on all three (success, persistence, and retention). Identify which trends and achievement gaps will be addressed in the current academic year.

Retention: When comparing rates of retention of students in Library (LIB) courses to students at AVC in general, the differences between the two groups is small. The data provided looks at Mode, Race, Gender and Ethnicity. By Mode there is a 1% difference in favor of LIB Student Population, overall, with a 6% advantage in Traditional classes and a 3% disadvantage in Online classes. By Race, there is a 1% difference in favor of AVC General Population. By Gender, there is a 3% difference in favor of AVC General Population. By Ethnicity there is a 1% favor for Latino students in AVC General Population and a 5% favor for Non-Latino students in LIB Student Population. Given how close these number are, there is no need for significant changes or remedies to be implemented. LIB faculty, however, will have discussions in the 2012-2013 academic year about these numbers to identify if we feel they indicate a need for any changes or additional study. Persistence: According to data, the LIB Student Population has averaged a 12% higher rate of persistence than the AVC General Student Population over a period of times back to the 2006-2007 academic year. Given the higher performance of LIB Students, there is no need

to implement changes or remedies, but this will be part of the faculty discussions this year. Success: When comparing rates of success of students in Library (LIB) courses to students at AVC in general, the differences between the two groups is fairly small with one double-digit difference. The data provided looks at Mode, Race, Gender and Ethnicity. By Mode there is a 3% difference in favor of LIB Student Population, overall, with a 12% advantage in Traditional classes and a 6% disadvantage in Online classes. By Race, there is a 1% difference in favor of AVC General Population. By Gender, there is a 5% difference in favor of AVC General Population. By Ethnicity there is a 4% favor for Latino students in AVC General Population and a 9% favor for Non-Latino students in LIB Student Population. Given how close these numbers are, there is no need for significant changes or remedies to be implemented. LIB faculty, however, will have discussions in the 2012-2013 academic year about these numbers to identify if we feel they indicate a need for any changes or additional study.

Analyze changes in student achievement and achievement gaps over the past five years. Cite examples of using data during that time as the basis for resource allocation (e.g. human, facilities/physical, technology, financial, professional development) or making other changes that resulted in improvements in student achievement.

Student achievement data is best represented in the data presented in Part 6 of this form.

Currently there is a need for new computers in the Library classroom (L118) to support LIB courses. The current computers are no longer powerful enough to reliably access the Library's new database system, EBSCO Discovery Service. This has reached a crisis point this semester but there is no achievement data to add to this discussion. There is a plan to move LIB courses to other classrooms on campus next semester until new computers can be placed in L118. It cannot be said at this point how this will or will not affect student achievement.

Provide examples from your program where assessment findings of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs), Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), and/or Operational Outcomes (OOs) were discussed and used to make budget decisions in the past year. This should include brief descriptions of assessment findings, when the discussions occurred, who participated, and what, if any, budget items/resources resulted.

The Library has not used SLO's or PLO's to make budget decisions. Budget decision that affect student learning for Library courses are generally made outside of our control, such as choosing to eliminate summer courses or choosing to not purchase new computers for L118.

Analyze changes in SLO, PLO and/or OO assessment findings over the past five years. Cite examples of using data during that time as the basis for resource allocation (e.g. human, facilities/physical, technology, financial, professional development) or making other changes that resulted in the improvement of SLO, PLO and/or OO findings this past year.

Four years of SLO data are not available for Library courses. Currently there is only data for fall of 2011 and spring of 2012. LIB 107 also has data for one of its outcomes for the 2010 - 2011 academic year, but not by semester. Additionally, there are no PLO's currently identified for the Library. As such, this questions cannot be answered.

Review the program goals and objectives related to improving outcome results and/or student achievement identified in the most recent comprehensive self study and subsequent annual update(s). List program goals and objectives for this academic year, adding new ones if needed.

The following are the goals from the 2010 - 2011 program review comprehensive self study and the current status: 1. Increase student accessibility to technology and research capabilities in the Library by replacing and/or enhancing the computer equipment and software in the research area and establishing a computer lab in L-118. Not Met: Due to the upgrade in the Library's database system to the EBSCO Discovery Service (EDS), the computers in L118 are no longer capable of being used to teach Library courses. As there is no funding available to purchase new computers, Library courses will be moved to another building in the spring 2013 semester. 2. Transition IMC holdings to Horizon and increase student access to more current printed books and multimedia at both the Lancaster campus and the Palmdale Center. Partially Met: The IMC holdings were not fully transitioned to Horizon, but the change to EDS has allowed the Library to provide a wider range of multimedia options to students in Lancaster and Palmdale. Part of this was achieved through the addition of the Films on Demand database to EDS which was funded through a STEM grant awarded to the Palmdale Center. 3. Provide reliable access to computers in the reference area to facilitate student use of the online catalog and Library online databases. Met: Reference area computers were replaced in Fall of 2012 and are providing more reliable access to online Library resources. 4. Design a campus wide information literacy program that incorporates research needs, media, and new technology to increase student access and success by developing information competency skills. Not Met: As of fall 2012, this has not been started. 5. Identify and access outside funding resources. Not Met: No outside funding sources have been identified due to lack of knowledge or training by Library staff in grant research or grant writing. 6. Increase student access to print reference materials at the Palmdale Center. Met: A collection of reference materials (94 items) has been purchased and made accessible to students at the Palmdale Center. 7. Increase access to for credit Library courses at the Palmdale Center. Not Met: Due to decreased funding, there are fewer Library courses being offered per year in Lancaster than before. As such, there is no opportunity for expansion of Library courses to Palmdale. 8. Increase student access to circulating materials at the Palmdale Center. Not Met: Access to materials at Palmdale has been reduced as a result of decreases in funding to provide services or materials.

List significant new and continuing resource needs in rank order of importance. Identify the document (e.g. Educational Master Plan, action plan, state mandate, accreditation mandate) and/or data which corroborate each need.

The Library does not have specific PLO's as we do not have an official program. However, we can address issues regarding limits to our ability to support student achievement: 1. The Library classroom (L118) has not seen an upgrade student to computing in five years. While the instructor computer was replaced in the fall 2012 semester, the student computers remain outdated and underpowered to provide value to students or to empower student learning. This semester, the Library transitioned from the EBSCOHost databases system to the EBSCO Discovery Service (EDS) database system. EDS is a significantly improved system providing more access to more resources and an increase in power and functionality. However, these

increases have further demonstrated the underpowered and under performing nature of the computers in L118 and have, therefore, made the room incapable of supporting students in Library courses. As such, we have been forced to move all in-class Library courses to another classroom in another building. However this creates problems as other parts of the Library are regularly used by LIB course faculty to support and enhance student learning LIB courses. The need to move to another building will make connecting the Library to Library courses significantly more difficult. The Library needs to have usable computers in its classroom to enable students getting full education value from LIB courses. Ultimately, L201 should be established as the official Library classroom which will require installing computers and a network. 2. While the Library's databases have undergone a significant upgrade, the print book collection remains woefully out of date due to limited funding for purchasing books over the past decade. Additionally, this funding has proven to be unpredictable as it comes from multiple sources, few of which are used the following year. Specifically, district funding has proven to be unreliable from year to year and prevents Library faculty from engaging in adequate collection development. This affects our ability to properly support students in courses through our book collection. 3. Library services at the Palmdale Center have been reduced to two days per week as a result of decreased funding. This severely limits the ability of Library staff to serve the information and research needs of Palmdale students.