

LDC Program Review – Annual Discipline Update for 2021-2022

PART A

SECTION 1: BASIC PROGRAM/DISCIPLINE INFORMATION

SAC Name: **Library**

Disciplines included in this SAC:

SAC Chair(s): Pam Kessinger (2021-2022), Chau Hoang Fossen (incoming)

Faculty Department Chair(s): Torie Scott, Alan Cordle Villegas

Program Dean/ SAC Administrative Liaison: Michelle Bagley

Pathway Dean: [vacant]

Please highlight where your classes are offered.

Classes/Services offered at: CA / RC / SE / SY / NB / HC / WCC / Metro / CLIMB

Other:

SECTION 2: REFLECTING ON DATA

All data cited below can be found here:

<https://www.pcc.edu/institutional-effectiveness/program-profiles/>

***Note the row of Tabs just below your Bookmarks Bar. Begin on the Home Tab. This is where you will choose your selection criteria for your data. Return to the Home Tab whenever you want to change your selection criteria. See the Help and Data Dictionary Tabs as well as the Data Directions Document included in the email with this template for more information.

Please include data from at least the last three years and up to the last five years. A 3-year enrollment review is recommended. SACs may have unique circumstances and reasons for looking more or less broadly.

Datasets and comparison data for Library Instruction:

[LIB_Data_2016-2021](#)

2A.Enrollment (SFTE) per year; Location (where course is taught); Modality

SEE Student FTE Tab

The average of SFTE for all LIB courses is at 5.3 with a high of 6.4 in 2019-20. Within this relatively small total we can identify some trends:

- The Online modality is trending mostly upward (2020-21 was understandably totally online -- one Web, and the rest Remote)
- LIB 127 has been totally online for the past five years
- RC has had zero Onsite sections in the past five years, and SE has had none since 2016-17. Cascade has consistently filled an Onsite section of LIB 101 for the past five years

2A1. Does this data suggest any questions that the SAC would like to pursue?

We have seen that the onsite section of LIB 101 at Cascade continues to be highly enrolled because of the partnership with the AD program. At Cascade, the Trio program and Women's Resource Center have expressed interest in the (new) LIB 100 course. The LIB SAC would like to look for other opportunities with Academic Foundations programs and Identity Centers at all of the campuses.

The LIB SAC plans to apply for course development funding for LIB 100 this coming Winter term, to develop the content, and then offer the course in Fall 2022.

LIB 127, with an area of focus for Health Care Careers has had steady enrollment and a waitlist. In the Online or Hybrid modality, it appears easier for students in cohorts (and closed programs) to add to their course load than an onsite course. The SAC would like to investigate the impact of LIB 127 completion for students in the NRS courses (each of which mention evidenced based research in their CCOGs):

- Do students more readily and successfully complete research related assignments for the NRS courses?
- Are they more likely to persist or complete the NRS degree?

If so, that could build a case for another LIB 127, with an area of focus for areas of study related to STEM.

Some examples of degrees where information literacy is specified, either by requiring specific WR courses, or, by courses in the program with information literacy-related outcomes:

Associate degree	WR 121	WR 122	WR 227	Course with info lit related outcomes
Bioscience Tech	X			BIT 181
Civil Engineering			X	
Computer Info Systems		X	OR 227	
Geospatial/Geomatics	X		X	
Microelectronics			X	MT 101
Building & Construction			X	

In addition, for students who indicate interest (career goals) in careers like Nursing, but leave, after other courses with research, critical thinking, and writing components (like [BI 234](#), Microbiology), would they benefit from an LIB 127 at an earlier stage?

There are likely other degree programs where students would benefit from LIB courses, building research skills to the degree that the career would require, but our efforts for the coming year will focus on developing content for LIB 100, and possibly increasing sections of the health professions focused LIB 127.

The Library SAC remains invested in identifying other partners for offering LIB courses in context with other academic programs. We see opportunities to align LIB courses with Pathways.

2A2. Do the data suggest adjustments be made in your discipline, such as schedule or course offerings, with regards to enrollment? If yes, what ideas/strategies do you have that you would like to implement or have help with in the upcoming academic year?

- Market LIB 127 to other programs in the Healthcare and Emergency Professions pathway
- Identify prerequisite courses for degrees, which have information literacy-related outcomes
- Develop tools and tutorials that instructors in courses with strong information literacy outcomes (such as BI 234) could implement, in addition to the library instruction sessions which faculty can request
- Select SACs to work with to explore co-enrollment with LIB courses

2A3. Are there other data reports that you would find informative/useful with regards to enrollment? How would this information support decision-making for the SAC/discipline?

Possibly, compare success rates for students in the [highly enrolled courses](#) who have had contact with our teaching to those without:

- Students who had a Research Help Appointment
- CRNs in Library Instruction Statistics for courses with:
 - Embedded Librarian
 - Library instruction session

However, this type of data diving is time consuming, and open to too many variables; it would be difficult to take a direct measure of our impact this way.

More interesting would be for students in our LIB classes to identify whether they had information literacy instruction in their previous education, or, if they had a certified (licensed) librarian at their high school. We could survey that informally within our classes.

2A4. Is your program aware of any external influences that strongly affect recent enrollment? For example, state requirements, transferability challenges, other university policies, etc. Please explain.

The Addiction Counseling program requires LIB 101 as a prerequisite to entry into the program.

Students who take LIB 127 for Health Professionals can earn points toward their application to PCC's Nursing program, and this largely drives enrollment for this LIB course.

Other degrees which would benefit from a LIB course already have enough credits required, so adding another required course could lead to excess credits.

The LIB courses transfer as elective credits. They are not required for any university degrees.

2B. Course Success Rates

Data Definition: Success rate represents the percentage of students who successfully complete a course. It is calculated as:

$$\% S = \frac{\text{Number of students receiving a grade of A, B, C, P, PR, or CM}}{\text{Number of students receiving a grade of A, B, C, D, F, P, NP, I, W, PR, CM, N, UP}}$$

PR, CM, N, and UP are non-credit grades used in the Adult Basic Education program.

Success rates for gender and race are not calculated when the enrollment is less than 5. For any success rate that is not calculated, the total for that column is also not calculated.

% Success By Course and Modality

SEE Modality Tab

2B1a. Are there any courses with lower or higher pass rates than others (over time, over many sections, or a notably higher or lower rate)? If so, which ones?

The average passing rate for LIB 101 over five years was 78.08%; for LIB 127 it was a slightly higher 78.96%.

There was a significant increase in the past two years for the LIB 127 passing rate, collegewide, at 93.3% in 2020-21, and 84.8% in 2019-2020.

LIB 127 was offered with a STEM focus in Spring 2017, and Winter 2018, as one-credit course, but with low enrollment.

Starting in Spring 2019, it was offered as a 2-credit course with a health professions focus and this is the version that has been taught since then.

2B1b. Are there any modalities with lower or higher pass rates than others (over time, over many sections, or a notably higher or lower rate)? If so, which ones?

Onsite LIB 101 had an average of 84.16% over the past five years, while Remote was at an average of 76.5% and Online at 73.15%.

LIB 127 has only been taught Online. In contrast, the average passing rate over five years for these Online sections of LIB 127 was 84.42%, and, continuously rising to that 93.3% for 2020-21.

Compare LIB to [highly enrolled courses](#)

LIB 101, 101 students, had a success rate of 79.6% in 2020-21

LIB 127, 45 students, had a success rate of 93.3% in 2020-21

LIB Collegewide had a success rate of 82.2% in 2020-21

High enrollment courses, 2020-21	Students	Success rate	LIB 101 SR v. other courses: + or - % pts	LIB 127 SR v. other courses: + or - % pts	LIB collegewide SR v. other courses: + or - % pts	Information literacy outcome or research project?
WR 121	6,748	72.50%	7.10%	20.80%	9.70%	Yes
WR 122	3,350	74.10%	5.50%	19.20%	8.10%	Yes
COMM 111	2,578	83.30%	-3.70%	10.00%	-1.10%	Yes
MTH 243	2,626	75.10%	4.50%	18.20%	7.10%	Yes
MTH 111	2,790	71.50%	8.10%	21.80%	10.70%	No
MTH 95	2,858	62.00%	17.60%	31.30%	20.20%	No
PSY 201A	2,480	76.80%	2.80%	16.50%	5.40%	Yes
BI 112	1,863	69.90%	9.70%	23.40%	12.30%	Yes
BA 101	1,946	79.10%	0.50%	14.20%	3.10%	Yes
HE 242	1,528	84.70%	-5.10%	8.60%	-2.50%	Yes

With the exceptions of COMM 111 and HE 242, the success rates for LIB courses is higher. Librarians have strong liaison ties to each of these programs, providing instruction sessions for students, subject guides, and some course guides. MTH 111 and MTH 95 do not require research projects, while MTH 243 does.

2B2. Strategy Insights

What strategies have you used to maintain high success rates?

- Timely response to emails and maintaining contact with students, especially with those falling behind
- Pairing students to work together through the term
- Ample time to revise work, and accepting late work, with an emphasis on practice, in order to learn (rather than expecting the students to get it right on the first try)
- Providing lots of feedback on discussion posts and assignments
- Weekly Zoom office hour available

What can be learned that might be applied to courses with lower success rates?

- Contact with students in an ongoing way is important. Follow up with students who aren't showing up or turning in assignments.
- Review course material and resources to ensure that it is contemporary and culturally relevant
- Use informal video content to lend personality and make the instructor visible, and accessible

What are possible actions to be taken to understand/address lower success rates?

Our success rates in the LIB courses are fairly high, but the SAC will look at the scope and sequence of content because it is a lot to cover in 5 weeks. Students need time to practice, as well.

Please clearly explain how your discipline intends to explore:

- content/curriculum
 - Consider an OER text
 - Include section about whiteness in scholarly publishing and research
- pedagogy/teaching
 - When back on campus, try a flipped classroom model for the F2F section(s)
 - Trauma-informed teaching
 - Facilitating group work (effective use of discussion boards; working in groups, but only when effective for student learning)
- course material selection
 - Incorporate more BIPOC authors and publications
 - Incorporate more of the PCC Library tools and tutorials
 - Incorporate a mix of video and readings for students to select from
- using culturally responsive teaching approaches throughout the next year
 - Centering non-white perspectives, and using material with diverse sets of voices
 - Discussing expertise in terms of personal experience
 - Add in a computer literacy tutor if needed

Try to identify a realistic one year goal.

Goal: Implement more equitable grading practices such as contract grading; revise the length of course (number of weeks) to allow for practice time; and improve the scope and sequence of content in LIB 101.

Enrollment and % Passing By Course and Student Demographics

SEE Gender, Race, and Pell Tabs

2B3. The data may indicate a pattern of inequities (in gender, race, or Pell eligibility) in student enrollment or success. Please clearly explain how your program intends to explore content/curriculum, pedagogy/teaching, course material selection, etc. using culturally responsive teaching approaches throughout the next year. Try to identify a realistic one year goal.

Goal: Monitor student success rates for BIPOC students in LIB 101, especially in comparison to those in the highly enrolled courses, and increase culturally relevant teaching approaches where needed.

Gender:

For LIB 101, the Male success rates were about the same as the Female success rate for the past five years, with a trend beginning in 2019 when the Female success rate began to run about 7 points ahead and slightly rising. Nonbinary success rates (8 students) were 100% in 2020-21.

2020-2021

Females, 81.7%, Males, 73.5%

2019-2020

Females, 81.8%, Males, 75%

The SAC will be reviewing the content for this course for our Learning Assessment project. There could be, however, outside factors related to the COVID-19 pandemic which disproportionately affected male students-- it is hard to determine.

For LIB 127, Female enrollment has been significantly higher for the past two years:

2020-21

Females, 82.72, Males, 15.56

2019-2020

Females, 69.57, Males, 28.26

This is probably due to the connection to the NRS degree program, and its high percentage of female enrollment (2020-21, Female 198, Male 93; 2019-2020, Female 177, Male 128)

The success rates for LIB 127 were within ten points or less:

2020-21

Females, 94.6% success rate, Males, 85.7% success rate

2019-2020

Females, 81.3% success rate, Males, 92.3% success rate

Race

For LIB 101, the students were mostly those who identified as White:

2020-2021: 106 students, 80.2% success rate

2019-2020: 123 students, 77.2% success rate

Students who identify as LatinX have outpaced the success rates of students who identify as White:

2020-2021: 31 students, 83.4% success rate

2019-2020: 31 students, 77.4% success rate

We have an area of concern, with students who identify as Black:

2020-2021: 16 students, 50% success rate

2019-2020: 17 students, 76.5%

The numbers are so low, it is hard to accurately extrapolate. These numbers may represent outside factors related to the COVID-19 pandemic which disproportionately affected students who identify as Black-- it is hard to determine, but something to monitor.

For LIB 127, the enrollment was even higher for students who identify as White than in LIB 101.

Only students who identify as LatinX were statistically significant to be counted, and only in 2020-2021

- 2020-2021: White, 22 students (of 45), 95.5% success rate; LatinX, 10 students, 90% success rate
- 2019-2020: White, 30 students (of 46), 90% success rate

Pell

Exactly half of the 2020-21 LIB students were offered Pell grants.

LIB 101 - no discernible difference in the success rate:

107 students with Pell, 78.5%

84 students without Pell, 81%

LIB 127 - significant difference with non-Pell coming in higher:

11 students with Pell, 81.8%

34 students without Pell, 97.1%

2B4.

What support does your SAC need to fully explore inequities in enrollment or student success?

For example, are there any other data reports you would find useful to have related to student success?

With the help of Institutional Effectiveness in the past, we have surveyed students in classes where we taught an instruction session-- and we could gather similar data from the CRNs we capture in our own statistics-- but the question generated anecdotal evidence at best. We cannot reasonably determine a causal relationship between contact time with a librarian, and the standard measures of student success such as retention or progression to another course.

The LIB SAC would like to explore other tools for in-real-time, ongoing evaluation of student learning, and use data of shared learning objects such as tutorials and videos. We would like to test out Springshare's product [LibWizard](#), especially as combined with the [Information Literacy Reflection Tool](#), an established self-assessment measure.

SECTION 3: REFLECTION ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING

3A. Assessment Reports

Please note: The following questions link directly to your Annual Learning Assessment Reports for the Learning Assessment Council. Feel free to cut and paste between this document and your other assessment documentation.

3A1. Which student learning outcomes from your SAC's available courses will you assess this year and will you use direct assessment strategies?

(These can be larger, program-level outcomes or course-level outcomes from your CCOGs).

2019-2020 the LIB SAC assessed student learning in LIB 101 for Outcome 3: "Critically evaluate the relevance and credibility of an information source based on the question or information need." We analyzed student responses regarding their ability to identify the type of source (from given examples) and types of author authority, using a coding schema on student artifacts.

2020-2021 the LIB SAC did a reassessment analyzing student written responses, using a rubric, to assess students' ability to articulate indicators of author expertise, and to justify the use of a given source for a particular information need.

The assessment was an end-of-term assignment, not related to individual interests or research context, and thus not a good indicator of whether they had put thought into source evaluation for their course project. In this assessment, students showed a lack of thoughtful engagement: when they trusted a source they could give more criteria for using it (possibly indicating confirmation bias, or, reliance on traditional and standard academic indicators); but when they distrusted a source, they had less robust reasoning for doing so. It did not provide us with what we wanted, or hoped to learn, about student learning.

For 2021-2022, the LIB SAC will do an [*Integration Year Plan and Report*](#) for LIB 101, and look to determine better how students are putting thought into source evaluation.

We don't know where students in LIB 101 are starting from. We intend to change our instruction approach towards helping students identify their own learning gaps for information literacy and set their own goals:

- Self-reflection on schema, background knowledge, experience as an information seeker
- Set learning goals for increasing understanding and learning new knowledge

3A2. Which courses do you plan to assess this year; how and why will your SAC choose the sections?

The LIB SAC will focus on all sections of LIB 101

3A3. In general terms, describe the assessment project for the year from implementation to data collection. What steps will you take in carrying out the project?

In Winter and Spring terms of 2022, LIB instructors will use part of the [Information Literacy Reflection Tool](#) (ILRT) for student reflection and self-assessment, and gather input on the ease and effectiveness of that approach.

In addition faculty teaching LIB 101 will try new teaching approaches and adjust curriculum, as informed by the assessment results:

- Capture why students take LIB 101, and look at achievement data.
- Survey students about the efficacy of peer-to-peer feedback on their work
- Audit and action plan for culturally inclusive teaching practices in LIB 101
- Examine equitable grading practices
- Scale the content better to a 1-credit course

3B. Response to LAC Assessment Question

Please respond to the question below, which relates to your SAC's 2020-2021 Learning Assessment Report to the Learning Assessment Council (LAC).

Commendations: This assessment project is a terrific effort at examining a critical outcome supported by LIB faculty that is needed for students participating in courses across the college! The amount of work involved in properly developing assessments, collecting and scoring artifacts, and involvement of the SAC faculty in using results to attempt to improve their instruction over several years is truly commendable.

Suggestions: The peer reviewers hope that this talented group of instructors will not despair even though their efforts have not yet resulted in marked improvement in source analysis by students.

Question: Are there a couple of new ideas that your faculty might now add to instruction based

on where they see students are still struggling with the concepts (e.g. “instruction and guidance on how to articulate details for why they might *not* trust a source”)?

SAC Response:

The LIB SAC will focus on finding ways to "enhance and amplify student achievement by focusing on teaching practices; learn if there are more equitable and culturally responsive practices we can infuse into the LIB courses. Conduct an audit of learning outcomes for LIB courses and current definitions of student achievement." [Integration Year Plan and Report, 2021-2022, Library SAC.](#)

Students need to gain confidence in their ability to discern objective indicators of untrustworthy sources, which requires learning about the complexities of information creation as a process, and the many motivations for creating information. To confidently spot hidden agendas, deception and misleading, unchecked bias, racism, ideology, political or marketing persuasion, logical fallacy, incompetence, and plain ignorance, would require lots of reading, comparing, and querying, and determining the context of the information for where it resides within the information cycle and within the ongoing, multi-dimensional conversations about topics.

LIB 101 *introduces* these concepts, and challenges students to at least break out of self-selected information channels, to be open to different types of authority, and to learn new ideas.

Using open pedagogy, with instructors as co-learners, students either on their own or working in small groups, select sources and devise ways to evaluate authority of sources, sharing their strategies and criteria, and then after reflection, revise their approach.

With ongoing reflection and practice, students will bring their own perspectives and life experiences to the evaluation of sources, surfacing their own understandings and strategies, and then through course content and collaborative learning, deepen their analysis.

SECTION 4: ADDITIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES or OPPORTUNITIES

4A. Is there anything further you would like to share about your program's achievements at this time?

There appears to be enough interest, with currently strong enrollment, to add another section of LIB 127 for Health Professions and offer it three terms a year, rather than two.

The LIB SAC looks for opportunities to support curricula by ongoing participation on the Curriculum Committee, tracking approval of new courses and significant changes to course outcomes.

We have aligned Library faculty to liaison with each of the Academic and Career Pathways, including the Academic Foundations, Essentials, and Gateways; and also with the Academic Support and Tutoring department, where we can liaison with the Reading and Writing Centers.

4B. Are there any challenges not described above that you would like to note here?

Our classes are funded by other departments, and the Library does not receive the FTE for them. The Nursing department funds sections of LIB 127. Sections of LIB 101 are currently funded by the Dean of Academic & Student Affairs Operations. This model is probably neither sustainable nor useful for curriculum development.

It will be essential for the cohesiveness of the Library program to incorporate all of the LIB courses under the auspices of the Library department. We need to be able to guide the allocation of funding, both for future planning and to be more nimble in developing and adjusting curriculum for student success.

4C. Do you see any opportunities in the near or long term that you would like to share?

As the college develops approaches to support entering students' gaining various essential competencies and academic literacies, Library faculty are prepared to participate in that process.

We are also looking for ways of increasing belonging for students, in outreach and collaboration with the identity centers, and finding ways to partner with student leaders.