*Although the college has made significant strides in developing institutional and program SLOs, the team found that approximately 75 percent of the college’s courses do not have SLOs as part of the course outline. Therefore, the team encourages the college to accomplish what it set out to do in meeting its timeline for reaching proficiency in its course-level SLOs by 2012. Furthermore, the team recommends that that process be implemented so that by 2012 the college will have developed and implemented methods for assessing those SLOs and use the results of those assessments to improve student learning. The Commission asks that LMC analyze its timeline for full implementation by the 2012 deadline and determine whether it needs to take any action to increase the rate of institutional progress.*

**1.B.7 - The institution assesses its evaluation mechanisms through a systematic review of their effectiveness in improving instructional programs, student support services, and library and other learning support services.**

Descriptive Summary:

Institutionally, The Shared Governance Council has charged the Planning Committee with systematically evaluating the college’s evaluation mechanisms (1.53). At the end of each planning process, the Planning Committee and/or SGC evaluate the processes themselves with the goal of improved effectiveness. For example, the college:

* Evaluated the new program review process for instruction and annual progress report, student services, support services and administrative Services (1.57).
* Conducted student and employee surveys in order to gather perception data to be used in institutional evaluation (1.5, 1.29).
* Recommended institutional effectiveness indicators (1.61).
* Conducted the assessment of student learning outcomes in many courses and programs (1.62).
* Submitted the separate program evaluations for accreditation of specialized programs by outside agencie: i.e. Nursing; Automotive; Child Development; Travel; Process Technology (1.63).
* Conducted categorical program review: i.e. VTEA; EOPS; Financial Aid, DSPS (1.64).
* Evaluated the Resource Allocation Process, including funded Financial Planning Model projects (1.57, 1.58).

In addition, the Office of Research is assessing the performance of the college goals through the indicators of Institutional Effectiveness. After data for the indicators are presented to the college community, the Planning Committee will evaluate how well the indicators lead to improvement of programs and services.

In instruction, programs are at different levels of assessment. Some programs, such as developmental English and math, have implemented assessment strategies. Other instructional programs are well on the way to evaluation development.

Student services is now redefining its services to students and evaluation plans will be developed and later assessed for their effectiveness.

Self Evaluation:

The college has a variety of mechanisms for assessing program and service effectiveness, but there is always room for improvement. After evaluation of the previous Program Review and Planning model, the Planning Committee found that there wasn’t enough data generated to efficiently evaluate improvement (or lack thereof) of all programs and services. As a result, a revised model was developed and implemented. The revised Program Review and Planning Model (1.65) was completed by all departments in fall 2006 and includes annual updates. (Annual updates are an improvement to the prior model which required updates every three years.) The new program review models, along with a sound Educational Master Plan (1.3) with measurable objectives for the goals, will guide program improvement, and will include follow-up and documentation. The process now emphasizes assessment of SLOs, a project three years in the making. This project, coordinated by TLP (Teaching and Learning Project), was developed jointly through administration, Academic Senate and Student Services. The TLP coordinates assessment of SLOs at the course, program and institutional level. The new Program Review and Planning models include the departments’ SLOs, with a plan for assessment at the program level. TLP read all completed instructional fall 2006 program reviews and provided follow up feedback to the instructional departments. Since this was a new process, it will take time to determine if it results in substantial improvement in this evaluation process.

The Financial Planning Model (FPM), recently a part of the Resource Allocation Process (RAP), is a method for organizational units to request funding for projects through a specialized application process. The SGC evaluates the RAP process annually (see SGC minutes) to see where improvements are needed in the process itself. For instance, in 2007, the name changed to RAP to eliminate confusion between the three different specialized applications in the process, one of them being FPM. The Classified Allocation process was added to RAP in 2006-07 to clarify staffing requests. Evaluation of the process also found the need to conduct training sessions by the Business Office about the application process itself, which are now offered at the beginning of each RAP period.

Planning Agenda:

All program leads will evaluate the results of assessment cycles in order to implement improvements in programs.

**II.A.1 - The institution demonstrates that all instructional programs, regardless of location or means of delivery, address and meet the mission of the institution and uphold its integrity.**

1. The institution identifies and seeks to meet the varied educational needs of its students through programs consistent with their educational preparation and the diversity, demographics and economy of its communities. The institution relies upon research and analysis to identify student learning needs and to assess progress toward achieving stated learning outcomes.

Descriptive Summary:

Los Medanos College collects student data in order to better understand and serve its student population. The data, generated by the Office of Institutional Research, is used in several ways, including:

* To track students currently enrolled;
* to prepare profiles of their personal characteristics;
* to identify their educational goals;
* to conduct a zip code analysis of them in order to better understand the degree to which the college is serving the community.

The office generates data on the demographics of the feeder community on a regular basis. Also, before each semester, the senior dean of instruction meets with new faculty to review community and student characteristics as part of a discussion on how best to serve student needs.

The Teaching and Learning Project’s “Next Steps in Institutionalizing Assessment” (2.1) describes the empowerment of five committees to coordinate the assessment of institutional-level student learning outcomes in Developmental Education, General Education, Occupational Education, Student Services and Library and Learning Support Services. Each committee is responsible for gathering:

1. Direct measures of student learning, e.g. holistic assessment of final exams or papers in capstone courses in order to measure student achievement of program-level student learning outcomes.
2. Indirect measures of student learning. Work is underway with the Office of Institutional Research to establish an on-going research agenda that provides indirect measures of student achievement of program outcomes, addresses research needs specific to program initiatives and provides information pertinent to making decisions for program improvement.
3. Qualitative measures – the use of surveys, focus groups, etc. in order to document students’ perceptions of their learning.

Self Evaluation:

To date, only the Developmental Education Committee has worked with the research office to define an on-going research agenda. The other committees are moving to establish similar research agendas. Preliminary work in this direction includes:

* The General Education Committee, in conjunction with the Curriculum Committee, has requested an English prerequisite validation study for two classes that meet the Ethical Inquiry requirement.
* The Occupational Education Committee has discussed research that will track student achievement in course sequences connected to locally approved certificates.

Planning Agenda:

None.

1. The institution utilizes delivery systems and modes of instruction compatible with the objectives of the curriculum and appropriate to the current and future needs of its students.

Descriptive summary:

LMC offers a variety of scheduling options to serve its students, including traditional semester-length face-to-face courses, short-term classes, weekend classes and off-site classes. Some departments also offer specific options in modes of instruction for students, i.e. self paced or lecture for some math courses. LMC also offers online classes, both as “hybrids” that meet partially online as well as in the “brick and mortar” classroom and completely online classes (2.2).

Regardless of the delivery mode, the Curriculum Committee must approve each course before it is offered. The committee’s evaluation process includes examination of the delivery of instruction, whether lecture, lab or online – or in combination.

Self Evaluation:

The primary dialogue concerning delivery currently centers on online instruction. The college’s Shared Governance Council, the Curriculum Committee and the Distance Education Committee are engaged in ongoing discussions. These discussions have resulted in:

* A supplement to the Course Outline of record addressing how student learning outcomes will be addressed in online classes and how direct student/instructor contact is defined in each course (2.3).
* A position paper from the Distance Education Committee on online instruction (2.4).
* A three-member advisory committee drawn from the Distance Education Committee as a whole that reviews course outlines and assists faculty with online course development.
* A “policies” document that outlines responsibilities and expectations for online instructors (2.5).
* A “best practices” document that outlines how courses should be set up (2.6).
* A “Blackboard Handbook” document on how to function technically in the online classroom software environment (2.7).
* A three-year plan for online instruction (2.8).
* A Curriculum Committee member drawn from the Distance Education Committee.

Planning Agenda:

During the 2008-09 academic year, the Distance Education Committee and Research Office will engage a study to evaluate effectiveness, retention and success rates of online courses at LMC; the committee will investigate the feasibility of an entirely online associate degree.

1. The institution identifies student learning outcomes for courses, programs, certificates and degrees; assesses student achievement of those outcomes; and uses assessment results to make improvements.

Descriptive Summary:

*Identifying/Writing Student Learning Outcomes:* The Teaching and Learning Project – a collaboration between the Academic Senate, Student Services and administration – was charged with coordinating college-wide assessment efforts in September 2004. The TLP began by defining “degree level” outcomes to be attained by students in five broad areas: general education, occupational education, developmental education, student services, and library and learning support services. All of the above, except library and learning support services, had an existing committee which took on the task of writing student learning outcomes for its respective area. A committee was formed for library and learning support services and it too wrote learning outcomes. The outcomes were written and approved by the members of those committees and reviewed by the Academic Senate in a document entitled “Next Steps in Institutionalizing Assessment Efforts at LMC.” (2.1) The senate approved this document in October 2006 (2.9). The document includes these “degree level” outcomes, and specifically defines the membership and charge of each of the committees. It expressly gives them the responsibility of assessing learning outcomes in their respective areas, as well as responding to assessment results with targeted professional development.

At the program level, the fall 2006 program review process required that all programs write program-level student learning outcomes and develop a plan for assessing them. Since this was the first time for this requirement, during spring 2007 the TLP then reviewed the program level SLOs and assessment plans. It provided feedback to each program in September 2007 (1.55), using a rubric that assesses both the SLOs and the assessment plan. Every program needs to do an annual update to its program review and the TLP continues to monitor progress toward assessing program level outcomes and responding to the assessment results.

At the course level, the Curriculum Committee worked for a year on revising the official course outline of record (COOR) form to incorporate learning outcomes and assessment criteria. The COOR now includes the degree level and program level outcomes, and requires the course author to write course level outcomes that align and integrate with the other levels (2.10). Curriculum “coaches” (the current chairs of the TLP) are available to work with faculty on an individual basis to rethink their courses and rewrite their COORs from the perspective of assessing student learning relative to the stated outcomes for the course. All course outlines are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, and, where appropriate, by focused subcommittees, such as general education. The committee conducts a rigorous review and course outlines are not passed if the learning outcomes are inadequate, not aligned or not deemed to be college level. Since all course outlines are supposed to be updated every five years, theoretically all courses will have stated student learning outcomes by 2011. (See District report to the Board for actual numbers of courses that already have written student learning outcomes.) (2.11)

In general, LMC has elected to use course-embedded assessment as the overall approach to assessing student learning outcomes.

*At the degree or institutional level:* General education initially chose to assess one of five student learning outcomes for the GE program: “Students will think critically and creatively.” To this end, “teaching communities” were formed in ethnic/multicultural studies, social sciences, creative arts and humanities and biological science. Faculty volunteered to join the teaching communities and met over the course of two years to hone assignments and assessments of critical thinking in their courses. Student work on these assignments was collected and holistically scored in the teaching communities. Reports on these teaching communities and the results of these assessments will be available on the assessment website.

In developmental education, student work is assessed in “capstone” courses – the last English and math courses before the transfer level. Faculty in English and math collaborated on “template assignments” (English) or final exam questions (math) that were holistically scored. Flex workshops offered a forum for discussing results and sharing ideas about how to respond to the assessment. Reports on these assessments are available on the website.

In occupational education, a pilot assessment was completed in nursing. Nursing faculty assessed the effectiveness of a technological innovation on their students’ learning using a direct pre/post test design. They also collected qualitative feedback from their students. Results were shared in a flex workshop and faculty trained in the use of the new equipment (2.12).

In student services, a preliminary assessment of student use of online services was conducted in fall 2006. As part of program review, each Student Service unit defined more specific SLOs for the unit, some of which are aligned with the two broad outcomes. Current work is focused on identifying the best tools to use to assess student progress on unit-level SLOs. Units continue to receive feedback and technical support from the Student Services SLO Committee.

In library and learning support services, two assessments were conducted, one of the Reading and Writing Center and one of the Math Lab. In both cases, results were used to revise curriculum and pedagogy (2.13).

*At the program level:* Programs were required to write student learning outcomes and assessment plans in fall 2006. Outcomes that have actually been assessed were reported as part of the first annual update during fall 2007 (2.14).

*At the course level:* Instructors are responsible for assessing student learning outcomes in the courses that they teach. However, there are some instances of course-level assessment that look at student achievement of outcomes across sections; for example, the assessment of capstone courses in developmental education and an assessment project conducted by biology instructors.

As indicated above, there has been extensive institutional dialogue on student learning outcomes. Forums include: the Teaching and Learning Project, Curriculum Committee, Distance Education Committee, Academic Senate, Shared Governance Council, College Assemblies, and specific committees – General Education, Developmental Education, Occupational Education, Student Services and Library and Learning Support.

# Self Evaluation:

The college has gauged its progress in implementing Student Learning Outcomes Assessment by using a rubric advocated by the Research and Planning Group of California (RPGroup). What follows is a summary of progress based on the criteria in the RPGroup rubric:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| RPGroups criteria | Assessment of LMC progress |
| Implementation of a complete SLO Cycle framework | Between Stage 2 and Stage 3: LMC has a complete framework for SLO development at the course, program, and degree levels. SLOs have been defined for all academic programs and the five major “institutional” programs in Developmental Education, General Education, Occupational Education, Student Services, and Library and Learning Support Services. Preliminary assessment plans have been developed by all but a few academic programs, with approximately 25% of academic programs already implementing plans and using assessment results for program improvement. |
| Meaningful Dialogue | Between Stage 2 and Stage 3: Dialogue about assessment is embedded within structural practices across the college. For example, Student Learning Outcomes has been a recent focus for the following committees: Curriculum, Planning, Developmental Education, General Education, Occupational Education, Student Services, and Library and Learning Support Services, Teaching and Learning Project. Faculty and staff are engaged and aware of SLO Cycle framework. |
| Alignment of SLOs with Organizational Structures | Stage 3: The SLO Cycle Framework is embedded within and supported by the Teaching and Learning Project, a committee which coordinates assessment efforts at LMC. Student Learning Outcomes have been incorporated into program review, curriculum processes, resource allocation, and staff development. We have a timeline that is updated and followed. |
| Institutional Commitment | Between Stage 2 and Stage 3: Appropriate resources are being allocated to implement assessment through release time for faculty leadership and money to support on-going professional development. Professional development in the form of flex activities, Friday retreats, Teaching Communities, and departmental meetings have focused on the assessment of student learning. |
| Alignment of Practice with SLOs and Assessment | Stage 2: Our SLO Cycle framework includes processes for integrating SLOs and assessment findings into classroom practice and pedagogy. We use course-embedded assessment based on existing class assignments, though we analyze student work across courses and programs to develop action plans for improvement. Course-embedded assessment does not place additional demands on students and produces evidence of learning that is authentic, relevant to our SLOs, and useful for making improvements. Though we have processes set-up for aligning practice with SLO assessment, in many programs, broad-based integration is in an early stage. For example, GE faculty are encouraged by the Office of Instruction to include GE SLOs in their course syllabi and the college provides on-going professional development for GE faculty on designing assignments and grading criteria that reflect GE SLOs, but participation needs to be increased. |
| Evidence | Stage 2: SLOs for courses, programs, and degrees are documented in course outlines. Institutional SLOs will be included in the 2007-08 catalog, college website, and student handbook. We are currently developing a link to assessment information and the work of the Teaching and Learning Project through the LMC intranet. |

# *What is the evidence?*

The Teaching and Learning project conceives of evidence as an “institutional portfolio” which will be available on our assessment website. It will include:

Agendas/minutes from the Academic Senate, Minutes from Teaching and Learning Project meetings, Minutes from General Education and Occupational Education meetings, Developmental Education Research Agenda and research findings, Next Steps in Institutionalizing Assessment at LMC (10/06), Documenting the Institutional Dialogue, Holistic Assessment in English – a two-year cycle, TLP Assessment Reports, Course Outline of Record and Handbook and Program Reviews (2.15).

Planning Agenda:

The Teaching and Learning Project will develop and implement processes and professional development activities to ensure that the assessment cycle is completed – that is, that assessment results are used to make improvements at the course, program and institutional levels.

**II.A.2.h.The institution awards credit based on student achievement of the course’s stated learning outcomes. Units of credit awarded are consistent with institutional policies that reflect generally accepted norms or equivalencies in higher education.**

Descriptive Summary:

The evaluation of student learning and the award of credit have been based upon criteria found in Title 5 regulations and Education Code provisions, as stated in the College Catalog (1.11). Each class must conform to the approved course outline, which delineates student learning outcomes and methods of performance evaluation. Additionally, a course syllabus is required for each class, including objectives, content, assignments and evaluation procedures. Typically, the instructor also explains grading policies at the first class meeting.

The Curriculum Committee designed a new format for the COORs for LMC classes in 2005 (2.10), as well as a handbook (2.16) to guide instructors in writing them. The handbook, which is available on the College intranet (1.19) as well as in hard copy, contains all current forms, instructions for completing them and criteria by which they will be evaluated. According to Title V regulations, the outlines should be reviewed by the Curriculum Committee every five years; as classes reach the date for review, updates will conform to the current format required at the time of submission. This format now requires institutional level, program level and course level student learning outcomes to be stated explicitly. The assessment criteria and assessment instruments must show alignment with the stated learning outcomes. If that alignment is in place, grades and credits will reflect assessments based on stated student learning outcomes. The Curriculum Committee has studied ways in which assessments, assessment criteria and grading can be “normed” as models for instructors developing COORs reflecting the implementation of grading criteria phased in during spring 2008, as well as staff development activities that can be supplemented by direct, individual consultations with “Curriculum Coaches.”

Self Evaluation:

Los Medanos has made significant progress in putting program and course level student learning objectives in place for all offerings. The current format of course outlines of record (2.10) is designed to facilitate the alignment of student learning outcomes and assessments. With feedback provided by college faculty, it is clear that the models placed on the Curriculum Committee website (1.19) need to be both exemplary and keyed to different disciplines. These models need to be dated as well, so that faculty and management will know if they are current; this provides a general impetus to assure that the website, instructions and evaluation criteria are regularly updated to reflect current standards. Program level student learning outcomes are now printed in the College Catalog (1.11) and course syllabi. Instructors are, in addition, strongly encouraged to add their PSLOs to their course syllabi for distribution at the first class meeting.

The college follows Carnegie unit criteria in setting unit value when a course outline is reviewed by the Curriculum Committee. The College Catalog (1.11), which is updated annually, clearly states, "guidelines for units of credits" in the section just before the list of course offerings.

Planning Agenda:

The Curriculum Committee and Teaching and Learning Project will develop and implement faculty development activities to improve alignment of student learning outcomes, assessment and grading practices.

**II.B.1 - The institution assures the quality of student support services and demonstrates that these services, regardless of location or means of delivery, support student learning and enhance achievement of the mission of the institution.**

Descriptive Summary:

In response to previous accreditation recommendations and standards of good practice, student services employees have been active participants on a number of committees in an effort to improve the quality of the programs and delivery of services. Representatives of all student services programs have been invited to join the Student Services Advisory Committee, the Student Services SLO Committee, the Student Services Facilities Committee, and most recently, the Student Services Planning Task Force. Student Services managers also meet twice monthly to discuss operational needs and the progress of each service.

Many Student Services programs are available at both college locations – services at the Brentwood Center continue to expand. Student Services are also available through the college website (1.12), including academic advising from the Counseling Department, new student orientation and Financial Aid.

The most recent program review process includes student learning outcomes as one measure of the success of Student Services programs. Additionally, college-wide and program-specific surveys gather data about programs. To help refine the assessment of SLOs, the Teaching and Learning Project continues to assist the Student Services programs in their assessment efforts.

College wide and program-specific surveys are also used to gather feedback about student awareness and the quality and delivery of student support services. Data is gathered from students using the various services, including an annual survey that is conducted at the Brentwood Center (2.51).

Categorical programs, including DSP&S, EOP&S, CARE, Calworks and Matriculation, recently completed a program review conducted by the System Office of the California Community Colleges (2.52). The system office review is based on the specific state requirements for each categorical program and how LMC programs meet these requirements.

Self Evaluation:

Many Student Service programs are available at both college locations and the services at the Brentwood Center continue to expand. Additional services continue to be developed and improved on the college web site, including academic advising, a new student orientation option, assistance with Financial Aid, the admissions application process, registration, and a number of other services available for students on WebAdvisor (2.53).

In summer 2007, the Student Services Advisory Committee was replaced by the Student Services Planning Task Force, a group that is committed to an in-depth review of the student services practices, the delivery of services and the organizational structure. The task force members include representatives from counseling, the classified staff, student senators and managers. The goal of the task force is to redefine the philosophy and mission of the Student Services unit and identify a structure that will improve collaboration, integration and the overall quality of services. To assist in this endeavor, a consultant was hired to facilitate the meetings during fall 2007 and to document the progress of the group (2.54).

*Information from Chancellor’s Office Program Review:*

EOP&S has improved outreach to new students and the campus community. Additional efforts are targeted at recruiting male students, who are underrepresented in EOP&S. EOP&S maintains a high number of students with educational plans. An online EOP&S application (2.55) has been instituted to increase student access. The expansion and increased student demand for EOP&S services has resulted in a need for additional staff. EOP&S has noted an increased student need in transfer support. A goal to increase completion of the BOGG waiver of the students served by CalWORKS has been a focus for program staff. CalWORKS has implemented a mandatory student-counselor contact each semester to increase retention and success. Matriculation and Counseling share the goal of increasing the number of students who have an educational plan. Counseling partnerships with instruction have continued to be successful, resulting in an increased number of students with educational plans. Puente has been restarted at LMC. Students participating in the Puente program have an approximately 30 percent higher transfer rate than the general LMC population (2.56). EOP&S plans to request an additional full-time counselor to better meet the needs of the expanding program.

All student service programs report positive student feedback when students are surveyed (1.5).

Student Learning Outcomes for individual student services have been developed and continue to be refined. Pilot assessment projects are in the process of implementation. The Student Services SLO Committee meets regularly to provide feedback and to continue progress on the assessment projects.

Planning Agenda:

The Student Services Planning Task Force will develop annual goals for Student Services as a whole, during 2008-09. These goals will be folded into student learning outcomes for each program/service and an annual assessment will follow at the end of the academic year, evaluating the progress and/or achievement of those goals.

**II.C.2. - The institution evaluates library and other learning support services to assure their adequacy in meeting identified student needs. Evaluation of these services provides evidence that they contribute to the achievement of student learning outcomes.** **The institution uses the results of these evaluations as the basis for improvement.**

Descriptive Summary:

The Library and Learning Support Services (*Library, Reading Writing Center, Campus Computer Labs, and High Tech Center)* group began meeting during the latter part of spring 2006 to develop a broad set of student learning outcomes for students who use various campus library and learning support services. This meeting of Library and Learning Support employees was initially an ad-hoc gathering to develop broad SLOs, but it was subsequently designated as a sub-committee of the Teaching Learning Project and empowered to coordinate the creation of program-specific SLOs for each of the Library and Learning Support services and to provide support for the services to undertake assessment projects. (2.85)

Presently the various Library and Learning Support Services are in different stages of developing program- specific SLOs and pilot assessment projects – the Library, Reading Writing Center and Math Lab are the furthest along. The Library and Learning Support Services Committee is co-chaired by two faculty librarians. The agreed-upon overarching SLOs for Library and Learning Support Services are:

LMC students utilizing various Library and Learning Support Services will:

1. Access and effectively utilize available campus Library and Learning Support Services.
2. Apply knowledge learned and competencies gained from using Library and Learning Support Services to academic coursework and assignments.
3. Demonstrate information competency skills needed to meet the research demands of academic course work and life-long learning.

*Library*

The library participates in the campus wide program review process; the last major program review was completed during fall 2006. Thereafter, the library annually updates its program review as required by the college wide planning process. Based on the last major program review, the library generated the following questions to guide its efforts in better serving the needs of students and faculty.

1. Are the library’s resources and services adequate to meet the needs of students and faculty?
2. How effective are library orientations in teaching students the use of library resources?
3. How can we encourage a greater use of the library by students, faculty and community?
4. How should we proceed in our efforts towards an information competency requirement?
5. How might we realign functions and job duties of library faculty and staff to make the library a more effective learning support service?
6. What collaborative pilot projects might library faculty pursue with interested classroom faculty to integrate library/information literacy skills into classroom instructional objectives?

The program review process, as well as the campus assessment efforts, required the creation of library program-level SLOs to help guide the priorities of the library and to provide measures of what students gain from utilizing the resources, services and instruction the library provides. Here are the library’s program level student outcomes (PSLOs):

As a result of interacting with the library, students will be able to:

1. Use information resources available through the library in support of class assignments and course instructional objectives.
2. Demonstrate a knowledge and utilization of the broad range of library resources and services available (i.e. interlibrary loan, remote access to databases, eBooks, Ask a Librarian etc.).
3. Utilize the library as a resource center for independent study and lifelong learning.
4. Acquire needed information competency skills. These skills entail demonstrating a proficiency in locating, retrieving, organizing, critically evaluating, analyzing, synthesizing, and communicating information in all its various formats.

*Reading Writing Center*

Student Learning Outcomes have been developed in conjunction with the Library and Learning Support Services Committee. In spring 2008, the Reading and Writing Center developed service-level outcomes and an assessment plan for fall 2008. The center has completed evaluations which focused on meeting the needs of students and improving success. Evaluations included: student satisfaction surveys; a study of students in Philosophy 2 classes who use the RWC; a Developmental Education study (October 2007) which looked at RWC usage by students of color in English 60, 70, 90 and 100; and a study using Reading Apprenticeship and the RWC (spring 2008) to see whether students’ attitudes and perceptions toward reading changed (2.86, 2.87, 2.88).

*Tutoring*

Evaluations have been conducted for all departments working with tutors and reported yearly to the Tutoring Committee. These evaluations have included numbers of tutors and tutor hours, and student and faculty satisfaction. As a program of the Library and Learning Support Services Committee of the TLP, draft program-level student learning outcomes have been developed in conjunction with this group:

Students will:

* Access and effectively utilize tutoring services.
* Become independent critical thinkers.
* Demonstrate competencies gained through utilization of tutoring services to academic coursework and assignments.

*Campus Computer Labs*

As the Library and Learning Support Services Committee matures into conducting widespread assessment of student learning outcomes, program-level and lab-specific learning outcomes will be developed and used as the basis to assess campus computer labs.

Self-Evaluation:

*Library*

Strategies to address library questions generated by the program review process are currently underway and their status:

Adequacy of library’s resources and services to meet the needs of students.

The librarians use various means to determine the adequacy of library resources needed by students:

1. The Curriculum Committee process requires that all new and updated course outlines get the signature of a librarian. The librarian signature signifies that the course outline author or designee has met with a librarian to assess what library materials are needed to support the course. In general, this sign off process has proved to be of value, but all too often the faculty wanting signatures on course outlines come to the librarian at the last minute. On the positive side, the librarians are able to follow up with instructors to have a more in-depth conversation about library resources once the rush of getting the course outline to the committee has subsided.
2. Through helping students at the reference desk with research questions, the librarians are made aware of the kinds of information resources students are seeking for course assignments. To insure that the proper resource materials are ordered, librarians also contact faculty to get further input on resource materials the library is considering purchasing in support of student research assignments.
3. Using standard book review resources, librarians regularly order books, periodicals and other resource materials to meet the research needs of faculty and students and to ensure a balanced library collection. Faculty are also encouraged to submit book and periodical requests to the library for purchase.

Effectiveness of library orientations in teaching students the use of library resources.

With the hiring of an instruction librarian for fall 2007, LMC initiated a more formal assessment effort to determine the effectiveness of the library orientations that are provided to classes. The library started its assessment effort with English 100 (College Composition) because this course requires a formal research paper and the English faculty have asked that the librarians be formally included in the research component of the course.

The data generated thus far indicate that students who go through a library orientation generally include more library-based resources (books and periodical databases etc.) in their research papers. This is significant because information from the library’s book collection and subscription databases represent a higher quality of information for students doing research than relying solely on information they “GOOGLE” from the internet. Instructors frequently and explicitly tell students that they are not to include information from Wikipedia and other questionable internet resources. Thus students’ use of high quality resources available through the library helps support the instructional objectives of courses and instructors. (2.89)

Encouraging a greater use of the library by students, faculty and community.

With the move to the new building, the library has experienced a significant increase in use, both by individual students using the library for study and research and by instructors who schedule library orientations for their classes. (2.90)

Also contributing to the increasing regard for the library has been the two new library faculty who were hired in fall 2007. Both the new faculty members have shown themselves to be energetic, service oriented and eager to make the library a central part of the college’s educational mission. Adding to the positive perception of the library is the involvement of the librarians on several campus committees. Through this regular contact and interchange with classroom faculty from several departments, the librarians are able to promote and encourage the utilization of the library in support of various campus initiatives.

The library’s visibility has been further increased because of its sponsorship of cultural events highlighting prominent writers and poets. In addition, the LMC library was the recipient of a Big Read grant sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts to encourage a renewed interest in reading and literature. (2.91)

The new library building also houses the campus art gallery. This new setting for the gallery provides an increased level of visibility and access for this valuable cultural resource.

The library has initiated a “Friends of the Library” group to promote development of the LMC library as a center for learning, study and research for students and faculty and as a cultural resource for members of the community in general. By joining the Friends of the Los Medanos College Library, community residents have borrowing privileges at the library and have the opportunity to provide support for the library, particularly through enhancing the collections and services it provides. (2.92)

Realignment of functions and job duties of library faculty to make the library a more effective learning support service.

In spring 2007, in anticipation of hiring two new library faculty to replace retiring librarians, the functions and job duties of all full-time library faculty positions were realigned to more clearly delineate the responsibilities of each librarian position in order to better serve both the functioning of the library, as well as the needs of students, faculty and the college organizational structure. The three library faculty positions were restructured as:

1. electronic and technical services librarian,
2. instruction librarian,
3. and reference and public service librarian. (2.93)

Efforts toward an information competency requirement.

The librarians keep abreast of continuing efforts to advance the implementation of information competency in California community colleges through attending conferences, workshops, reading and participating in listserves focusing on information competency.

Locally, the librarians are working with faculty and other college constituencies to garner support for the consideration of an information competency requirement. Individually, librarians are members of key campus committees such as the General Education Committee, Academic Senate, Curriculum Committee and Teaching Learning Project, which will be key allies as consideration of information competency. Presently both DVC and CCC have implemented an information competency requirement for their associate degrees.

The librarians have made gains in getting faculty acquainted with the concept of information competency and integrating aspects of those competency standards into courses. The most progress has been made with English courses. The use of the library was also officially integrated into the CSLOs of the transfer English 100 course outline in fall 2007. The use of the library and some aspect of information competency will also be integrated into the two developmental English courses below English 100. (2.94)

Collaborative pilot projects between library faculty and classroom faculty to integrate library/information literacy skills into classroom instructional objectives.

The formal integration of library/ information literacy skills into faculty classroom instructional objectives is an ongoing process. Among the strategies implemented thus far are:

1. The librarians have been officially integrated into the teaching of research skills for all sections of English 100.
2. Librarians are working with English Department faculty to integrate the use of the library into developmental English 70 and 90 courses.
3. Guided research instructional assistance is available to instructors who bring their class in to the library to work on a course-specific assignment and would like to have a librarian available to act as a research consultant for the class. The LMC librarian leading the session consults with individuals or groups and gets them connected with the resources they need. During the guided research sessions, librarians also help students evaluate the information they are finding and determine what is appropriate for an academic project.
4. Library orientations are provided for various courses across the curriculum in lecture format utilizing the library’s instructional lab. Students are led though the different tools and resources available to them in the library. (2.95)
5. Course-specific library assignments are provided to instructors who would like to have their students become familiar with library resources through a self-paced library worksheet. (2.96)
6. An instructor may request that a librarian provide a series of mini library instructional sessions to their students over the course of the semester.
7. In the newly-revamped campus tutoring program, librarians will become one of the suggested resources students will be encouraged to utilize.

Library Program Level Student Outcomes.

The 2006 program review process required that each organizational unit choose one of its PSLOs to assess. The library selected:

“As a result of interacting with the library, students will be able to use information resources available through the library in support of class assignments and course instructional objectives*.*” The library chose to assess the effectiveness of library orientations in helping students working on English 100 research papers. (2.89)

*Reading Writing Center*

In response to student surveys, the Reading and Writing Center has adjusted hours at the main campus and piloted a Reading and Writing Center in Brentwood. Online consultation was also instituted to provide students more access to the services. When evaluation studies are complete, they are shared with the Developmental Education Committee and the Library and Learning Support Services Committee to discuss the results and suggest any changes or generate additional research questions. This process has been an effective way to disseminate the information from these studies.

*Tutoring*

Assessments for the tutoring program are currently being designed and will be in place for the 2008-09 academic year. Results of the assessment will be used for program improvements. Results of the tutoring assessment and improvement plans will be reported to the campus annually.

*Campus Computer Labs*

Since most of the staff responsible for providing services in the computer labs are non-faculty, it will take additional professional development to introduce the concept and process of SLOs and their assessment to this group.

Planning Agenda:

*Reading Writing Center*

RWC staff will provide professional development on ways to utilize the center for faculty and students, including a FLEX activity on writing clear assignments and connecting students to the RWC for reading and writing needs.

*Campus Computer Labs*

The Library and Learning Support Services Committee will work with the professional development committee to offer targeted professional development in SLOs and their assessment to campus computer lab staff by spring 2009.