<u>**Comprehensive Program Review Self-Study Report**</u>

Please provide the following information. Respond NA to questions which are not applicable to your division/discipline/area. The self-study reports of all divisions/areas will include responses to Parts 1-7. Self-study reports of academic divisions will include a division overview in Part 1 and analysis of each discipline in Parts 2-7.

Questions with an asterisk (*) were addressed in last year's program review report. The question numbers do not correspond with the numbers in last year's report.

Division/Area Name **Library**

2014

Part 1 - Division or Area Overview

1.1   Briefly describe how the division or area contributes to the district mission.

1.2   Place an "X" by each Institutional Learning Outcome (ILO) supported by the division or area.
<u>X</u> Analyze diverse perspectives from a variety of disciplines and experiences that contribute to the development of self-awareness.
<u>X</u>   Value and apply lifelong learning skills required for employment, basic skills, transfer education, and personal development.
__ Demonstrate a breadth of knowledge and experiences from the humanities, social and behavioral sciences, arts, natural sciences, and mathematics.
__ Solve problems using oral and written communication, critical thinking and listening skills, planning and decision-making skills, information literacy, and a variety of technologies.
__ Demonstrate good citizenship and teamwork through respect, tolerance, cultural awareness, and the role of diversity in modern society.
__ Identify career opportunities that contribute to the economic well-being of the community.

1.3   After completing Parts 2-7, prepare a one page summary of the division/area. Interpret the significance of the findings. Note successes in supporting district strategic goals and where improvements are needed.

1.4   Name of person leading this review: **Scott Lee**

1.5   Names of all participants in this review: **Van Rider, Carolyn Burrell, Maria Valenzuela, Meeta Goel.**

Part 2 - Data Analysis and Use

The following data is provided on the Program Review website. Additional data is available from the Department of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning (DIERP).

> Longitudinal data
>> District headcount and FTES
>> Division headcount and FTES
>> Discipline headcount and FTES
>> Number of sections offered by location/distance education
>> PT/FT faculty ratio by LHE
>> Efficiency (measured as FTES/FTEF)
>
> Data about student progress
>> Student achievement: success, retention, and term to term persistence
>> Progression through remedial courses
>> Program completion
>> Degree/certificate completion rate
>> Transfer rates to 4-year institutions
>> Licensure exam results
>> Job placement/post training

All divisions/areas will complete Parts 2-7. In academic divisions Parts 2-7 will be completed by each discipline; please identify the discipline:

_____

2.1   Please review the headcount and FTES enrollment data provided on the web link. Comment on trends over the past five years and how they affect your program.*

This is addressed in what is written for section 2.2.

2.2   Report program/area data showing the quantity of services provided over the past five years (e.g. number transactions, acreage maintained, students served, sales figures). Comment on trends and how they affect your program.*

Circulating Materials:
> Between 2009 and 2013 there was a 42% decline in the number of non-reserve materials checked out. However, we believe there are two major factor contributing to this change:
>
> 1) During this period there was a college-wide decline in student enrollment due to decreases in class offerings brought on by the budget crisis. This would clearly have an effect on student use of the library. This was especially hard on our summer and winter use as those sessions for the college were significantly cut or essentially deleted in some of those years.

2) Since 2009 we have been purchasing significant numbers of eBooks (we currently total around 170,000). It is likely that use of eBooks has begun to partially supplant the use of our print books. Given that our print book collection is significantly older than our eBooks, increases the likelihood of this. Currently, over 60% of our print book collection is over twenty-one years old while only 6% of our eBooks are that age. While 66% of our eBooks are between two and ten years old, while only 10% of our print books fall within this age range. Because of this significant age disparity, often the best book resources we have are eBooks. Between 2012 and 2013, eBook usage increased by 105%, and, although we only have 2014 data up through July, it was already 62% of the total for the entire year of 2012.

However, despite the growing use of eBooks, the experiences of library faculty working with students at the reference desk leads us to the opinion that eBooks are not an acceptable replacement for a print book collection. Library faculty have found many students are resistant to non-print books due to a lack of both experience with and access to technology. Based on a student survey we conducted in spring of 2014, 13% reported regularly using print books, while only 5% report using eBooks. Additionally, we also asked them to identify the library resources they use most. Books were ranked first and eBooks were ranked ninth. Using eBooks requires students to have the knowledge to use them and the technological equipment to access them, equipment that not all students can afford. According to the student survey, only 28% of students had a laptop or desktop and only 8% had a tablet. We have seen that many students rely on Library and other campus computers to access digital media and resources, and not having a strong print book collection would likely be a burden to many. From the survey, 65% of students reported using the computers in the Library to complete homework, access Blackboard or MyAVC, or take exams. To force these students to only use eBooks, could have a significant negative impact on their ability to succeed.

Building Use

Overall use of the AVC Library building has also declined. Gate counts (the measure of students and others who enter and leave the Library) dropped by 70% from 2009 to 2013. However, part of this was related to the installation of new gates, which was significantly hampered by failed communications between the Business Office, the Library and the vendor. The new security gate system was only partially installed during the fall 2013 semester and so there is no data from that semester (as well as for winter of 2014). This is a likely significant contributor to that drop.

Other data showing a decline in use of the Library building include: Head Count (a physical count of the number of people in the Library, conducted once an hour), down 29%; Use of study rooms, down 34%; Use of reserve materials, down 32%. However, another factor contributing to this was an overall reduction in Library service hours during the period.

The Library was not open for the winter and summer session of 2012. There was also a drop in open Library hours. In spring of 2009, the Library was open 65 hours per week. By fall of that year, we had been reduced, not of our own choosing, to 56 hours per week. In spring of 2009, the Library was open on Saturdays from 9am – 5pm, by spring of 2010 all Saturday hours has been removed. In fall of 2014, we began offering Saturday hours again (10am – 2pm) for the first time since 2009 (there was an attempt to restore them in spring 2014, but there was a failure of implementation). In spring of 2009 the Library was open 7:30am to 8pm, Monday through Thursday, and 7:30am to 3pm on Fridays. By spring of 2011, it had been reduced to 8am to 7pm Monday through Thursday and 8am to 3pm on Friday. In fall of 2014 the Library's hours were partly restored to 7:30am to 8pm, but Friday hours are only 7:30am to 11:30am, in keeping with the rest of the campus. For fall of 2014, the Library building is open a total of 58 hours, which is still short of the 65 hours it was open in 2009. This, in addition to overall drops in student enrollments, is likely a contributing factor in the decline in our building usage.

In fall of 2013, the Library began using its classroom (L-118) as an open lab in the late afternoon, when it is not being used to teach LIB courses (which primarily happens in the morning and very early afternoon). We have seen significant growth in the use over that time. From fall 2013 to spring 2014 there was an increase in usage of almost 1000% (96 vs. 964). Additionally, for the first three weeks of the fall 2014 semester, we outpaced usage for spring and summer of 2014 for that same length of time (spring:57, summer:315, fall:409).

Reference Service

There has been a significant decline in the raw numbers for reference service during the period of 2009 to 2014. However, there are several contributing factors, the most important of which is a change in how reference desk statistics are kept. In the fall semester of 2012, the Library began using a service call DeskTracker to collect reference use statistics. This service allows us to collect more detailed and specific data than before. Before DeskTracker, we used what were called 'tic' sheets. These were paper forms that we simply made tic marks when we helped someone. However, after DeskTracker, we discovered a flaw in that system. If we helped a single student with more than one concern (such as a catalog search, a periodicals search, and directions to the second floor), there were marked in separate categories, but tallied as three separate reference transactions (a transaction is whenever someone comes to the reference desk for assistance). Thus, this example would be counted as three transactions instead of one transaction with three components. DeskTracker allows us to be much more accurate and we would now be able to identify this example as one transaction with multiple components. As such, when comparing reference transactions counts from 2009-2011 to transactions from 2012-2014, the numbers drop significantly. For example, the totals transactions counted from spring of 2009 were 6,510. The totals transactions from spring of 2014 was 2,966. This is a 54% drop. When comparing the fall and spring semesters from 2012 to 2014 to their three years prior parallel term2 (2009 – 2011), there was an average drop of 58%. While not all of this is attributable to the change in data collection methods, we believe that a significant portion of it is. As a matter of comparison, within

DeskTracker, we can also count multiple components of a transaction (again, if one person is helped in two or more ways). When looking at the fall and spring semesters between 2012 and 2014, the average difference between the transaction counts and the components counts was 60%, close to the 58% cited above. Additionally, when combining the transaction counts and the components counts from those same semesters (fall and spring of 210 through 2014) and then comparing them to the old 'tic' sheets counts from their three-year prior parallel terms, they are within 90% of the old number (spring 2013 is within 99% of spring 2010) accept for spring 2014, which was eighty-seven percent.

However, not all decline in use of the reference desk can be traced to a change in statistical collection practices. When looking within each phase of data collection, there is still evidence of a drop in usage. Between spring 2009 and spring 2012 (the last semester to rely on 'tic' sheets) there was a 28% decline in transactions. Between spring 2013 and spring 2014, there was a 14% decline. AVC headcount was only down 11% and up 2% for those same time periods, respectively. However, another likely contributor is what was discussed earlier, the reduction in hours of the library. Between spring 09 and spring 12, there was a 22% drop in Library hours. Between spring 13 and spring 14 there was a 15% decline in Library hours. If the library is not open, neither is the reference desk and we are unable to help students.

2.3   Use the discipline student success data provided by web link. Please note by race, gender, location and modality where improvement is needed to meet the Institutional Standard of 68% for student success (students earning grades of A, B, C, Pass, or Credit). Identify what actions are planned to address achievement gaps in success, retention and/or persistence in the current academic year.*

Race

The group with the lowest level of success in Library Science courses is African-Americans. From 2009–2013 their average rate of success was 49% where most other groups had an average rate of success for that same period of 70% of above. The only other group so low was Other/Unknown.

Gender

Males are just meeting the cutoff of 68%, but females are slightly lower at sixty-six percent.

Location

Within the time period, there is only one date point from the Palmdale Center, which is quite low at 46%. However, with so little data, it is hard to say if this is an anomaly or a trend. The average rate of success for the Lancaster campus was 67%, just slightly below the target.

Modality

 Both forms of delivery are above the target. The rate of success for Traditional courses is 92% and 79% for online.

Conclusion

> Clearly we are having mixed rates of success with our lowest rate among African-American students. There has been conversation about among Library Science teaching faculty that many of our incoming students lack the basic skills of reading and writing to be successful in the course. We have discussed establishing a prerequisite for some or all of the Library courses (currently there is only an advisory). The faculty will have more in-depth conversations about this and may develop prerequisites for one or more of our courses. We will then measure if rates of success improve.

2.4   Analyze and summarize trends in student progression through basic skills courses, if applicable.   Cite examples of using data, outcome action plans and/or other planning tools as the basis for resource allocation (e.g. human, facilities/physical, technology, financial, professional development) that resulted in or correlate with improvements in course success and progression over the past five years.

Library courses are not considered Basic Skills with all courses being at college level.

2.5   List degrees and certificates currently offered in the discipline. Discuss improvements in the   completion rates of degrees and certificates over the past five years. Also discuss improvements in license exam results, job placement/post testing and/or transfer rates to four-year institutions, if applicable. *

The Library offers no degrees or certificates.

2.6   Career Technical Education (CTE) programs: Review the labor market data on the California Employment Development Department website for jobs related to your discipline. Comment on the occupational projections for employment in your discipline for the next two years.   Comment on how the projections affect your planning. http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/Content.asp?pageid=1011 *

The Library is not part of CTE.

Part 3 – Outcome Analysis and Use

3.1   Cite examples of using outcome (PLO, SLO, and/or OO) action plans as the basis for resource requests and the allocation of those requests (e.g. human, facilities/physical, technology, financial, professional development) or making other changes that resulted in or correlate with improved outcome findings over the past five years.*

The Library has not used outcomes data as a tool for requests as we are generally not consulted when budget or other changes are made. As such, there have been no requests for and no obvious need to provide such data. The Library's budget for human, facilities/physical, technology, financial, and professional development has largely been out of our control for the previous five years.

As an example, in fall of 2013, we saw a significant reduction in our non-classroom adjunct budget. For that term, we were only budgeted to provide 55 hours per week of non-classroom adjunct duty. In fall of 2012 we were budgeted to provide 69 hours (which was also the budget for spring of 2013). This was a 20% reduction. Such a sudden and sharp reduction resulted in the faculty filing a grievance, through the AVCFT, against the dean at that time. This grievance made its way to the President. Ultimately, it appears that much of our adjunct budget for the year was used for summer of 2013, which was 68 hours per week. The previous summer, 2012, we had no adjunct hours as the Library was not open. This was also the case in summer of 2011 for the same reason. Summer of 2013 saw a dramatic increase in adjunct hours which was much closer to fall or spring numbers. However, it appears that our adjunct budget for the year had not been increased and, by fall, there was not enough left to provide our normal level of adjunct service at that time (69 hours per week were budgeted for spring 13, fall 12, spring 12, and fall 11). Had the faculty or staff of the Library been consulted, we could have provided a host of statistical and outcomes-based data to guide the decisions. We would have preferred to have fewer hours in the summer and more available in fall, where we have more students to serve. Allocating so many resources for summer at the sacrifice of fall is not a decision experience Library staff would have made and we would have advised against it. However, no one with knowledge, understanding or available data was ever asked or consulted.

Overall, there has been a significant decline in weekly adjunct hours over the years. Comparing 2009 to 2013:

Term	2009	2013	Change
Winter	68	48.5	-29%
Spring	111.5	69	-38%
Summer	66.5	68	+2
Fall	102	55	-46%

None of these changes came with a request for data, outcomes or otherwise, to support the decisions. As such, despite having some learning outcomes and operational outcomes assessment data available, it was never requested or used. Those responsible for the collection of that data, Library faculty and classified staff, were not involved or consulted. We hope to have more involvement as we move forward compared to the past. Currently, there is much more of an effort to involve Library faculty and staff in decision making by our current dean, and we have a positive outlook for the future.

However, there are still levels of significant confusion that we face regularly. For over a decade, the Library there has been significant confusion with regard to the Library's budget. While funding for electronic resources now appears to be stable, we seldom have a concrete dollar amount that we can identify as our "official" budget for books. In addition, whatever money we receive seems to come from a multitude of sources that are not predictable or consistent coming from an assortment of grants and district funds, with constantly varying percentages of each, fiscal year by fiscal year. Looking at our book budget as an example, in 2009 we had approximately $27,500 in dedicated district funds. By 2010, that had dropped to about $10,600 then went up to about $18,500 in 2011 and back down to around $11,300 in 2012. For 2014, it is

about $9,800. Additionally, during this time, Prop. 20 money has been used supplant district funding. The amounts vary widely, however, from $28,000 in 2013 to $6,000 in 2011. The last two years we have also been given "one-time" funding from the district, $23,000 this year up from $2,400 last year.

Ultimately, this creates confusion and disarray in the Library's budget as we can never be sure what will happen from year to year. At this point, we have little capacity to plan for next year as we will not know what our budget is until we receive it, which often happens suddenly and without warning.

As such, given that decisions about the Library's budget are made without any consultation of outcomes or other data and information about the budget is inconsistently and unreliable, there has been little need to analyze outcomes data for allocations. We hope the future will bring more consistency with better connections between data and budget allocation decisions.

Part 4 - Stakeholder Assessment

4.1   Assess how well the program serves the needs of the students, district, and community. Use surveys, interviews or focus groups to obtain feedback from stakeholders (students and/or others who are impacted by your services). Include documented feedback from other sources if relevant (e.g. advisory committees, employers in the community, universities, scores on licensure exams, job placement).

In the fall of 2011, the Library conducted a survey of AVC faculty and in the spring of 2014, there was a survey of AVC students. This section will provide information of the analysis of that data:

Faculty Survey

The AVC Library Faculty Survey was opened in October of 2011 and stayed open until December with an assortment of marketing activities to promote it including visits to division meetings, flyers and mass emails. Prizes were awarded to those who completed the survey and were randomly selected in a drawing.

By close of the survey on December 12th, we had received 119 completed surveys, which surpassed our goal of 100. A sample this size represented about 20% of all full-time and adjunct faculty, for that semester. Our survey sample contained 55% full-time versus 31% for the district. Seventy-six percent of the sample taught at the Lancaster campus, which matched the district, 24% taught at Palmdale, compared to 14% for the district, and 8% of the sample taught online, which matched the district. The average time of service at AVC for our sample was 11 years. There was no data available to compare it to the district.

The following chart demonstrate the representation by division of our sample with comparison to the district:

Division	AVC	Survey Sample	Difference
BCSED	13%	25%	12%
Health Science	9%	12%	3%
IRES	1%	1%	-
Language Arts	14%	12%	-2%
MSE	18%	19%	1%
KAD	5%	4%	-1%
SABS	10%	9%	-1%
Technical Ed	13%	6%	-7%
VAPA	15%	9%	-6%
Student Services	2%	4%	2%

We asked faculty about their use of the Library. Forty-eight percent reported regular or occasional use to prepare for classes and 54% reported regular or occasional use for personal enrichment. When asked about the integration of research into their class assignments 63% reported that they do integrate research assignment in to their classes. Seventy percent reported that they make sure to create assignments that require research. Only 14% reported regularly assigning their students to use the Library Tutorials, which are online lessons, with quizzes, that help to teach students how to use aspects of the library such as journals and the catalog as well as general research. However, 51% said that they never assign the Library tutorials. Another self-paced Library teach tool is the Library Waling Tour, which helps students get familiar with the layout of the library building. Only 9% regularly assign this to their students with 68% saying that they never assign the Library Walking Tour.

The survey did not request additional information as to why faculty do not use these services in larger numbers. There have been discussion, within the Library, of having focus groups to get more in-depth data on these and other questions derived from the survey. However, some of the lack of use may be to limited knowledge of these services, which would indicate the need to increase awareness of them among the faculty. As an example to support this supposition, we asked faculty about their use of our Research Methods Workshops (RMW's), which are short training sessions that we conduct for faculty, at their request, for their students on how to use Library resources or perform general research. Eighty-five percent of faculty report not using RMW's. However, for this section of the survey, we did have follow up questions to their answers. For those who did not use RMW's, the most common response to why they did not use them was that they were not aware we offered such a service (20%). The second and third most common responses were that they did not have research assignments in their classes (18%) and

that their discipline did not require research (16%). This would seem to indicate the need to increase awareness among faculty of the host of resources and service we offer. Additionally, of faculty who do use RMW's, the most common response as to why was that they preferred the expertise of librarians (64%) followed by seeing an improvement in student work (32%). We also found most faculty (71%) do not work with librarians to recommend book purchases, however, 30% said they regularly or occasionally did. This is also an area that the Library faculty feels requires more promotion as 74% of faculty responding to the survey say they were not aware of who manages the collection in their discipline.

However, faculty are very supportive of the Library. Ninety-one percent call themselves advocates for the Library and 94% fell that librarians have the knowledge and experience to help students in their discipline. Additionally, faculty expressed a strong belief that students need the Library. Sixty-one percent strongly agreed or agreed that students need the Library to successfully complete their class, 96% strongly agreed or agreed that experience using libraries is valuable for students, and 96% also believed that information literacy was needed by students to be successful. However, only 61% believed they could teach these skills to students with 91% saying they feel librarians are better at this.

Faculty also had a good opinion of the Library's databases with 65% rating them excellent or good. A significantly lesser number rated the Library's print book collection favorably, with only 38% rating it excellent or good. Fifteen percent rated the print book collection poor and only 1% rated the databases poor.

Student Survey

In spring of 2014, an AVC Library Student Survey was administered between April 9th and May 10th. The two primary marketing tools were emails sent to all students each week during the survey and signs in the Library. The emails had the greatest affect with jumps of close to 100 surveys completed within a few days of the first two emails. Five-hundred dollars in gift cards were awarded to those who completed the survey and were randomly selected in a drawing. Additional gift cards were provided by Dr. Meeta Goel, the current Dean of the Library.

By close of the survey, 945 students had completed it (905 online and 40 on paper in the building).

We asked students how often they use certain Library services. Sixty percent said they visit the Library daily or weekly with another 30% saying they visit it at least monthly. Only 8% said they never visit the Library. Thirty percent said they use EDS daily or weekly and another 38% (68% total) reported monthly usage. Thirty-two percent said they have never used it. Twenty-six percent reported talking with a Librarian daily or weekly and another 37% monthly (63% total) with 37% reporting never having talked with a librarian. This would seem to further indicate that high percentages of students on campus make use of the Library, and that declining raw numbers stated above are more indicative of reduced student population overall as well as reduced operating hours. We also asked students about the last time they had visited the Library: 56% had been in the previous two weeks and another 26% (82%) had been within that semester. Thirteen percent reported last having visited the previous semester.

We also asked students to rate services in the Library.   When asked if circulation staff (classified staff or student workers) or reference staff (faculty) were courteousness and helpfulness, 84% strongly agreed or agreed that the circulation staff was, and 83% strongly agreed or agreed that the reference staff was. The percent who disagreed or strongly disagreed was 4% for circulation and 3% for reference. Seventy-nine percent strongly agreed or agreed the Library was quiet and 86% said it was comfortable. Forty-five percent strongly agreed or agree the Library has enough computers, however, 42% disagreed or strongly disagreed. This was the most negative rating for Library services we had. As reported above, 65% of students taking our survey reported using the computers in the Library to complete homework, access Blackboard or MyAVC, and take exams.   Only 7% said they do not use the Library's computers.

We also asked students about their research practices and how they value the Library and research. When asked how they begin research, 48% said they start with Google followed by EDS, at 34%, and the reference desk at ten percent. Seventy-seven percent strongly agreed or agreed that using the Library is necessary to successfully complete assignments (this is above the 67% of faculty who felt the same from their survey), with 12% who disagreed or strongly disagreed. Seventy-five percent strongly agreed or agreed that using the Library will help in pursuit of a degree in their major and 6% who disagreed or strongly disagreed. However, on this question, 18% had no opinion. There were similar results when asked about the value of the Library in helping them prepare for their career: 69% strongly agreed or agreed, 9% disagreed or strongly disagreed and 22% had no opinion. It is also worth noting that 71% of students reported never having had a research methods workshop, which is close to 85% of faculty from the faculty survey who reported never using them.

Finally, we asked students their opinion of possible future services we could offer. We provided a list of possible new or expanded services and asked them to select which they would like to see. The most highly ranked option was a vending machine that would provide academic tools such as paper, pens, pencils, and test forms. Eighty-seven percent strongly agreed or agreed that would be a valuable service to offer. The second and third most selected changes (with 85% strongly agreeing or agreeing) was being open on weekends or later (weekend hours was slightly ahead with 53% strongly agree compared to 52% for later hours). Thankfully, in the fall 2014 semester we have been able to provide both of these as the Library is now open until 8pm Monday through Thursday and is now open for four hours Saturday. Both of these were successfully implemented by Dr. Goel working with Library staff. Additionally, the fourth most valued change was a color printer (81% strongly agree or agree). This is now also in place with the addition of two WEPA printing stations in the Library, which have color printing capability.

Part 5 - Goals and Objectives

5.1   Review the goals identified in your most recent comprehensive self-study report and any subsequent annual reports. Briefly discuss your progress in achieving those goals.*

2010 Goal	Objective	Results	Met / Not Met?
Provide access to current computer technology for	Replace computers in L-118 with new	New stand-along PC's were installed	Met

students using L-118.	stand along computer stations or blade system (24 stations).	in L-118 in summer of 2013 after all LIB courses had to temporarily moved to the BE building when classroom computers had reached a point of failure that courses could no longer be taught.	
Provide reliable access to computers in the reference area to facilitate student use of online catalog and Library databases.	Replace or upgrade 12 Library students reference area computers.	New reference area computer stations were installed in fall of 2012.	Met
Design a campus wide information literacy program that incorporate research needs, media, and new technology to increase student access and success by developing information literacy skills.	Design and implement information literacy programs to improve information literacy through embedded information literacy components in pre-selected courses across the curriculum.	This goal was deemed far too broad and large to be accomplished and is not being pursued at this time.	Not Met
Identify and access outside funding resources.	Increase financial resource to improve and update current print and electronic resources.	This has not been done, primarily due to lack of knowledge about such resources.	Not Met
Increase student access to print reference materials at the Palmdale Center.	Develop and sustain a permanent reference collection at the Palmdale Center.	A small reference collection of approximately 45 volumes is now housed in the Library area of the Palmdale Center.	Partially Met
Increase access to for-credit Library courses at the Palmdale Center.	Offer Library courses at the Palmdale Center.	Staring in fall of 2013, sections of LIB 101 or LIB 110 have been offered at the Palmdale Center.	Met

5.2   List discipline/area goals and objectives related to advancing district Strategic Goals, improving outcome findings and/or increasing the completion rate of courses, certificates, degrees and transfer requirements. Discipline/area goals **must be guided by district Strategic Goals** in the Educational Master Plan (EMP). They **must be supported by an outcome action plan, data analysis, national or professional standards, and/or a requirement or guideline from an outside agency** (e.g. legislation, Chancellor's Office, accrediting body, professional board).*

Current (up to three years)
Goal: A specific target
- Guided by district Strategic Goal(s) #___
- Supporting action plan, data analysis, or other documentation
Objectives: Significant steps or actions needed to achieve the goal

Current (up to three years)

Goal #1: Increase value of Library spaces and services for students (also part of IERP Program Review).
- Guided by district Strategic Goal(s) #_1_
- Guided partly by the Student Survey from spring of 2014 as well as observations and evaluations of Library faculty and staff.
Objectives:
1. Determine nature and types of services and space usage to best meet students needs using current student survey data.
2. Implement additional surveys and other student feedback tools to gather additional and/or more specific data.
3. Gather funding to make needed changes to Library building and/or request additional service tools.
4. Implement changes.
5. Use additional student feedback to determine success.

Goal #2: Re-develop and expand the collection of Library online tutorials.
- Guided by district Strategic Goal(s) #_1__
- Currently, there are three tutorials offered to students to learn information literacy related skills. There were four, but the change from EBSCOhost to EBSCO Discovery Service (EDS) made the EBSCOhost tutorial obsolete. Additionally, the tutorials currently available have not been changed in approximately five years and need significant updating in both content and design.
Objectives:

1. Identify the current standard for online tutorials products.
2. Acquire the necessary training to cerate new tutorials to the current standard.
3. Acquire the necessary technology to create new tutorials to the current standard.
4. Remake the current tutorials and develop new ones as needed.

Goal #3: Develop a consistent and reliable budget for Library books.
- Guided by district Strategic Goal(s) #_1_
- As discussed before, the current budget for books varies significantly in amount and sources of funding, is not informed by any data analysis or evaluation by Library faculty, and prevents the Library from making reliable short or long-range plans.

Objectives:
1. Collect reliable data from the budget office on past and current budgets for books.
2. Communicate to important stakeholders the need for increasing maintaining consistent levels of funding for books by use of budget data and other sources.

Goal #4: Move the Horizon catalog to a cloud-based service.
- Guided by district Strategic Goal(s) #_5_
- The current Horizon Catalog server will need to be replaced soon. However, there is now a cloud-based service to run the Library catalog available. This would reduce the attention needed by IT staff, of which there is never enough, to maintain our server and would likely increase functionality and reduce down time. Use of such a service is also becoming a new standard in academic libraries.

Objectives:
1. Determine costs and processes needed to move to a cloud-based service.
2. Acquire needed funds.
3. Coordinate through Library Technical Services, IT and the vendor to move to a cloud-based service.
4. Acquire budget increase to pay yearly service fee, which would be partly offset by eliminating costs to maintain our own server.

Near Term (three to five years)

Goal #5: Convert L-214 into a student-centered space.
- Guided by district Strategic Goal(s) #_3_

- From the student survey, students indicated a desire for additional services, some of which could be provided in L-214. Additionally, there has been declining use of the room for its current purpose, the Faculty Reading Room, and increased use by student clubs.

Objectives:

1. Discuss among Library faculty and classified staff ideas for the room, partly informed by the student survey.
2. Collect additional data from students on their opinions on the collected ideas.
3. Discuss among Library faculty and classified staff the outcomes of the student data.
4. Determine list of necessary changes to L-214 to meet it new purpose(s).
5. Identify sources of funding to make necessary upgrades and changes to the room.
6. Implement upgrades and changes.

Long Term (five to ten years)
We have none at this time.

Part 6 - Resource Needs

Identify significant resource needs that should be addressed currently (up to three years), near term (three to five years) and long term (five to ten years). If there may be safety issues, enrollment consequences or other important concerns if a resource is not provided please make this known.*

6.1   List needed human resources. List titles in priority order. Identify which discipline/area goal(s) guides this need.

There is a need for a Technical Services/Reference librarian. This position has been frozen since 2007 and is party being fulfilled by an adjunct. However, this has led to backlogs in the processing new books, difficulty installing upgrades to the Horizon library catalog and its other systems and concerns about technical failures during periods when the adjunct librarian is not available. Additionally, the growth in the supply and use of electronic resources indicates a continued and increased reliance on the Horizon system, thus increasing the potential for failure and increasing the effects of such a failure on the Library and students. Also, as the Palmdale Center grows, the Library's services to Palmdale will grow and this further increases the need to have a consistent and reliable Horizon catalog, which cannot be fully achieved by an adjunct. As such, there is a need to restore this position back to full-time. This is partly guided by Goal #3.

The Library has already experience growth in the use of our technology resources, as indicated above, and students clearly rely heavily on that technology, as indicated in the survey. Assuming continued growth in its use as well as growth in the amount of technology the Library can make available, there will be a need for a dedicated Computer Technician/IT Specialist. We currently have difficulty keeping all of our computers consistently in full working order. A technician housed in the Library would be a valuable asset. This is guided by Goals #1, #2, & #5.

6.2   List needed technology resources in priority order. Identify which discipline/area goal(s) guides this need.

There is a need to increase the number of computers available in the Library. When we are able to make better use of L-214, there will be a need to install new computers and other technology. There will continue to be a need to replace computers as they fail. The Library's computers are heavily used, as seen by staff and indicated in the student survey. Additionally, now that L-118 is open as a computer lab (and experiencing heavy use) the Library will find it necessary to maintain a reliable and consistent replacement cycle. This is guided by Goals #1 and #5.

There is a need to acquire software, hardware, and other technology services to support the continued development and growth of the Library online tutorials. This is guided by Goal #2.

Most of the Library's systems are heavily technology dependent. There will be a continued need to replace and upgrade ancillary systems of the Horizon catalog system (such as the security gates). This is guided by Goals #1, #3 & #4.

6.3   List facilities/physical resources (remodels, renovations, or new) needed to provide a safe and appropriate student learning and/or work environment. List needs in priority order. Identify which discipline/area goal(s) guides this need.

The area of the Library previously occupied by the IMC has not been converted to serve Library needs. Currently this is occupied by IERP whose dean is also the dean of the Library. Additionally, other parts of this area are used as a part of Technical Services, but extensive remolding of the area needs to happen to fully serve that purpose. This is guided by Goals #1, #3.

L-214 will need remodeling and reconfiguration, perhaps extensively, when it is repurposed for student use. This is guided by Goals #1 & #5.

6.4   List needed professional development resources in priority order. Identify which discipline/area goal(s) guides this need.

There will be a need to provide faculty with training to create and expand the Library online tutorials. This training could involve, but not be limited to: software use, hardware use, computer programming languages. This is guided by Goal #2.

There will continue to be a need to update Library staff and faculty with training related to operating Library technology systems such as Horizon, EDS and LibGuides. This is guided by Goals #3 & #4.

6.5   List any other needed resources in priority order. Identify which discipline/area goal(s) guides this need.

We have none to list at this time.

Part 7 - Recommendations and Comments

7.1   List recommended changes to the Educational Master Plan to:
- Address external issues or mandates such as legislation, industry, and professional standards, etc.
- Respond to outcome findings.
- Reflect changes in technology, methodology, and/or disciplines.
- Address student achievement gaps and/or meet other student needs.

We have no recommendations to make to the Education Master Plan.

7.2   What changes in the program review process would improve institutional effectiveness or make the results more helpful to the program?

We have no changes to recommend.

Addendum to 2014-2015 Report

Division/Area Name: Library

Date: 12/8/15

Name of person submitting addendum: Mr. Van Rider

Names of all participants in this addendum: Dr. Meeta Goel, Dr. Scott Lee, Mrs. Carolyn Burrell

Identify which part(s) of the 2014 report is being revised:
___ Division or Area Overview
___ Data Analysis and Use
___ Outcome Analysis and Use
___ Stakeholder Assessment
_X__ Current Goals (up to three years)
_X_ Resource Needs

Describe what has changed since writing your 2014 report and how that impacts the program.

Amending the description of Near Term Goal #5 in the Library's 2014 Comprehensive Program Review Self-Study Report:

> **Goal #5**: Convert L-214 into a Library Commons focused on providing space, resources and technology for student collaboration and learning.
> - Guided by district Strategic Goal(s) #_1, 5_
> - From the student survey, students indicated a desire for additional services, some of which could be provided in L-214. Additionally, there has been declining use of the room for its current purpose, the Faculty Reading Room, and increased use by student clubs.
>
> **Operational Outcomes**: TBD
>
> **Action Plan**:
>
> 1. Discuss among Library faculty and classified staff ideas for the room, partly informed by the student survey.
> 2. Collect additional data from students on their opinions on the collected ideas.
> 3. Discuss among Library faculty and classified staff the outcomes of the student data.
> 4. Determine list of necessary changes to L-214 to meet its new purpose(s).

5. Identify sources of funding to make necessary upgrades and changes to the room.
6. Purchase identified resources such as white boards, computers, furniture and related materials.
7. Implement upgrades and changes.

Adding Near Term Goal # in the Library's 2014 Comprehensive Program Review Self-Study Report:

Goal #6: Continue to develop and support Antelope Valley College Archives.
- Guided by district Strategic Goal(s) #_5, 6_
- The AVC Archives was established in April 2014 to help preserve the history of Antelope Valley College. In the spring of 2015 the archives became part of the Library. Infrastructure and supplies are needed to help preserve and protect donated historical materials. Funds should be budgeted for the Archives to facilitate ordering of special archival quality supplies, shelving, and pay for a short-term hourly classified staff member who participates in the Oral History Project (the short-term hourly is currently being paid a total of $600, but more funding should be budgeted as the project is ongoing).

Operational Outcomes: TBD

Action Plan:

1. Select and purchase archival quality supplies.
2. Install shelving to house and organize archival materials.
3. Hire short-term hourly classified staff to support current and future archival projects such as the Oral History Project.

Adding to the language of Resources Needs 6.1 in the Library's 2014 Comprehensive Program Review Self-Study Report:

Additionally, as use and students population of the Palmdale Center increases, in particular the opening of the new facility in Fall of 2016, the Library will require additional library faculty and classified staff to continue to provide services.

Adding to the language of Resources Needs 6.2 in the Library's 2014 Comprehensive Program Review Self-Study Report:

The Library must work with the Information Technology Department to continue updating the computer hardware being used by students in the reference area.

Amending the language of Resources Needs 6.3 in the Library's 2014 Comprehensive Program Review Self-Study Report:

L-214 will be converted into a Library Commons focused on providing space, resources and technology for student collaboration and learning. This is guided by District Strategic Goals #1 & #5.