



Library Faculty Department Meeting

Minutes, February 15, 2017

(1:30 PM – 3:00 PM, 6-237)

	Deb Distant	x	Jared Burton	x	LeAnn Garrett
x	Hong Guo			x	Eva Rios-Alvarado
x	Pauline Swartz	x	Chisa Uyeki	x	Emily Woolery

Guest: Hugo Aguilera

Item	Leader	Prep (Read or Bring)	Action (Information, Discussion, Decision)	Time Allotted
Approval of Meeting Minutes – January 11, 2017			Approved with changes	5 min.
Basecamp explained	CU	Hugo to give 15 minute overview of Basecamp	Hugo provided an overview of Basecamp. He welcomes questions.	20 min.
Dual Enrollment Classes	lg	Should LIBR courses be taught?	Discussion: Content would be appropriate and useful for students, but faculty acknowledge a number of challenges to teaching students who are enrolled in both high school and Mt. SAC students. These concerns include not knowing what the students' local library resources and organization. Additional concerns were brought up, including making decisions of this import in a short time frame. Librarians expressed interest in the idea, but decided that we did not want to teach any dual enrollment classes at this time.	5 min.
ProQuest Research Companion	CU	Status update	We will be moving forward with implementing ProQuest Research Companion which will be embedded in a LibGuide and will replace the Research Tutorials. Hong will be working on getting it up by early March. Because faculty continue to assign the Research Tutorials	10 min.

			<p>we need to communicate these changes to faculty. Hong will send a campus-wide email to faculty.</p> <p>Resolved update schedule for related projects, including Online Workshops and migration to Discovery and validated steps to complete them.</p>	
Collection Development Guidelines	CU	Review of Guidelines	All reviewed updated CD Guidelines, librarians gave input and recommendations. Suggested changes will be integrated and distributed to library faculty. Librarians will review the draft and make any other suggestions to Chisa by next week Wed. 2/22/17 and will vote by email and reaffirm the vote at the next Librarians' meeting 3/1/17.	15 min.
Developing Topic Rubric	PS		Pauline will provide packets in Librarian mailboxes for initial work on the rubric for the Developing Topics workshop and will email librarians with details.	5 min.
Gathering Assignments	PS		We want to gather approximately 40 assignments to use as scenarios including assignments from Child Development, multiple ENGL 1A and SPCH 1A assignments, and History. If you contact faculty or have sample assignments please give them to Pauline. Chisa will announce at Academic Senate, and we will also ask faculty individually and other faculty groups with whom the Librarians work.	10 min.
Library Tour Analysis	JB	<p>1) briefly review of assessment analysis</p> <p>2) facilitate discussion for new, proposed assessment tool (see attachments)</p>	<p>Jared provided an overview of his analysis of the Library Tour assessment. Findings from the assessment show that students who attended the tour met the Measureable Objectives at an accomplished level (82.95%) or above.</p> <p>Jared presented an abbreviated tour survey and library faculty provided input for changes. The new survey will be used starting in spring semester.</p> <p>Tour registration is happening through SARS, so if a student drops in they should be added to SARS.</p>	10 min.
Student Equity Report	ERA	Update and information	Outreach during spring will be focused on the research process as data has shown that students are challenged in their understanding of the research process. Each week at pop-ups and embedded Librarians will be talking about a	10 min.

			<p>part of the research process. Additionally, we are trying to create a fun atmosphere. Every month there will be a program activity to promote Library instruction, services, and resources. A "Hack the Research Process," mini-zine craft has been created to guide students through their assignment.</p> <p>Equity librarians will be creating Research Guides that address the research process and support the outreach.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--



Library Information Competency Workshops

Participation and Course Outcome by Demographic

2013-14 through 2016-17

Student Equity Activity B-10

Prepared by John Barkman, Ph.D.

Research and Institutional Effectiveness

1/3/2018

Library Information Competency Workshops attempt to improve students' research and information literacy. This research investigates the demographic patterns of those who participate, and their course outcomes

Summary Results

- Students who participate in the Library information competency workshops have more positive course outcomes than students who do not participate.
- Women are more likely to participate, and men less likely to do so.
- Considering gender and ethnicity, all ethnic groups of women are more common among workshop participants than they are at Mt. SAC overall (except white women who are 9% less common than expected). Conversely, all ethnic groups of men are less common among workshop participants than they are at Mt. SAC overall (except Asian men who are about as common as would be expected).

The following report is only possible because of the insight and assistance provided by Dr. LeAnn Garrett, Library Department Chair at Mt. San Antonio College. When you are referring to the data from this report, please remember to acknowledge that it was done through the Research and Institutional Effectiveness office in collaboration with the aforementioned persons and that it was completed on 1/3/18.

Introduction:

The goal of library competency workshops is to increase student information literacy. The goal of this research is to evaluate 1) the equity of the demographic distribution of students participating in the workshops, including the 2016-17 year when an intentional effort was made regarding recruiting students for the workshops, and 2) the impact of the workshops on course outcomes.

Analysis:

The following data was produced:

- 1) Workshop Topics by Year: These counts by workshop topic and by academic year constitute a background description of the numbers of students involved.
- 2) Library Workshop Demographics: These describe the demographics of students attending library information competency workshops. The data is split into two groups, 2013-'14 to 2015-'16 and 2016-'17. These groups are compared to the demographic distribution for all of Mt. SAC. Tables and charts are presented for gender, ethnicity, gender by ethnicity, age, parents' education, disability, low income, and AB540 status.
- 3 and 4) Success and Retention by Demographic: The course outcomes were calculated for all courses taken by workshop attendees in the same term as their workshop attendance. This is compared to a comparison group of students in the same sections who did not attend any workshop. The calculations and comparisons are done overall and by demographic.
- 5) A summary heatmap which brings together the equity results from the demographic participation analysis and the course success and retention analyses.

Results:

(This analysis focuses on the difference from what is expected based on a demographic group's overall prevalence on campus. For the absolute frequency of participating in the workshops, see the detail tables. For instance, while Latino men are the second most common group both at Mt. SAC overall and at the library workshops, they are much less common at the workshops than would be expected from their prevalence on campus.)

- 1) Students who participate in the library information competency workshops show more positive course outcomes, both in terms of course success and in terms of retention. The positive impact on course success (20% improvement) is larger than the positive impact on course retention (8% improvement).
- 2) For the most part, all students who participate enjoy similar positive impact on their course outcome regardless of demographic group. However, African Americans show a 5% greater course success and 3% greater retention than average, while Asians show 6% less of an increase in course success.
- 3) There is a major difference in participation by age, with students under age 20 being 42% more likely to participate. Nonetheless, in keeping with their prevalence on campus, students age 20 to 23 are the most common at the workshops.

- 4) There is a major difference in participation by gender, with women being 14% more likely to participate.
- 5) There are major differences in participation by ethnicity, with Asians being the most likely to participate and whites the least likely compared to their overall presence on campus. However, the differences by ethnicity are overshadowed by the gender by ethnicity differences.
 - a. Asian women are almost half again as likely to participate as would be expected from their prevalence at Mt. SAC (146%), while Asian men participate at close to their expected abundance (103%).
 - b. African American women are more likely to participate (115%), but African American men are much less likely to participate (66%).
 - c. Latina women are more likely to participate (110%), but Latino men are much less likely to participate (84%).
- 6) Relative participation rates in 2016-'17 show small movement toward more participation by Latinos/as and African Americans and less by Asians and whites.

Conclusion:

Students who participate in the Library information competency workshops have more positive course outcomes than students who do not participate. Women are more likely to participate, and men less likely to do so. Considering gender and ethnicity, all ethnic groups of women are more common among workshop participants than they are at Mt. SAC overall (except white women who are 9% less common than expected). Conversely, all ethnic groups of men are less common among workshop participants than they are at Mt. SAC overall (except Asian men who are about as common as would be expected).

Methods:

Data was provided by LeAnn Garrett from library records of the attendees of Library workshops from January 2014 through September 2017. These data were matched with Banner student records data to obtain demographic and course outcome data. A comparison group for course outcomes was created by taking all the students who did not attend a workshop but were in the same section (CRN) as students who did attend a workshop.

The comparative data in this report is given a percentage of what is expected. For participation, this compares the percentage of the group among workshop participants to the percentage of the group among all Mt. SAC students. For course success and course retention, the comparison is between the outcome rate (success or retention) for workshop participants and the rate for non-participants. This improvement percentage is further compared for each demographic group by comparing the group's improvement percentage to the overall improvement percentage for all workshop participants. (For more description see the Success or Retention detail tables.)

Retention Rate by Demographic

2013-2014 through 2016-2017

Comparing the groups of
Used Workshop
and **No Workshop**

This table addresses the questions:

- 1) Overall impact: Is there an overall difference between the two groups being compared? (Look at the rows for "All Enrollments")
- 2) Impact by demographic: Is there a difference by demographic between the two groups? (Look at "Ratio")
- 3) Equity: Are the differences by demographic greater or less than the overall differences? (Look at "Ratio as % of Overall Ratio")

Demographic	Group	Success Rate	Ratio	Enroll-ments	Odds the difference between Used Workshop and No Workshop is random (p.)	Ratio as % of Overall Ratio
All Enrollments	Used Workshop	93%	108%	10570	0%	
	No Workshop	87%		175805		
Gender						
Female	Used Workshop	93%	107%	6331	0%	100%
	No Workshop	87%		91418		
Male	Used Workshop	93%	108%	4091	0%	100%
	No Workshop	87%		82060		
Unknown	Used Workshop	91%	105%	148	8%	98%
	No Workshop	86%		2321		
Ethnicity						
African American	Used Workshop	95%	111%	414	0%	103%
	No Workshop	86%		7321		
American Indian	Used Workshop	95%	114%	22	Too few enrollments	106%
	No Workshop	84%		253		
Asian	Used Workshop	94%	105%	2693	0%	97%
	No Workshop	90%		35189		
Latino/Latina	Used Workshop	93%	108%	6172	0%	101%
	No Workshop	86%		107770		
Pacific Islander	Used Workshop	93%	108%	14	Too few enrollments	101%
	No Workshop	86%		746		
Two or More Races	Used Workshop	93%	107%	325	0%	100%
	No Workshop	87%		5401		
White	Used Workshop	94%	108%	855	0%	100%
	No Workshop	88%		17988		
Unknown	Used Workshop	96%	111%	75	0%	103%
	No Workshop	87%		1137		

Demographic	Group	Success Rate	Ratio	Enroll- ments	Odds the difference between Used Workshop and No Workshop is random	Ratio as % of Overall Ratio
					(p.)	
Age Group						
Under 20	Used Workshop	94%	105%	2972	0%	98%
	No Workshop	89%		40333		
20 to 24	Used Workshop	93%	108%	5000	0%	100%
	No Workshop	86%		92325		
25 to 29	Used Workshop	92%	109%	1331	0%	101%
	No Workshop	85%		24713		
30 to 49	Used Workshop	93%	110%	1085	0%	102%
	No Workshop	85%		16080		
50+	Used Workshop	93%	109%	182	0%	101%
	No Workshop	85%		2354		
Income						
Low Income	Used Workshop	92%	108%	7704	0%	100%
	No Workshop	86%		125454		
Other	Used Workshop	96%	107%	2866	0%	100%
	No Workshop	89%		50351		
Parents' Education						
First Generation	Used Workshop	93%	108%	3790	0%	101%
	No Workshop	86%		58823		
Not 1st Generation	Used Workshop	93%	107%	5051	0%	99%
	No Workshop	88%		83339		
Special Populations						
Disabled	Used Workshop	93%	108%	687	0%	100%
	No Workshop	86%		11116		
Foster Youth	Used Workshop	92%	110%	449	0%	103%
	No Workshop	84%		6697		
Veteran	Used Workshop	95%	109%	285	0%	101%
	No Workshop	88%		4466		
AB540	Used Workshop	92%	107%	474	0%	100%
	No Workshop	86%		7043		

Retention Rate by Demographic - Summary

Comparing the groups of
Used Workshop
and **No Workshop**
2013-2014 through
2016-2017

The Groups: The library offers workshops on how to use the Library. "Used Workshop" are the enrollments by students who attended a workshop. "No Workshop" are all the other enrollments in the same sections.

Demographic	Comparing between Used Workshop & No Workshop	
	Impact	Equity

All Enrollments	108%	
-----------------	------	--

Gender

Female	107%	100%
Male	108%	100%
Unknown	105%	98%

Ethnicity

African American	111%	103%
American Indian	114%	106%
Asian	105%	97%
Latino/Latina	108%	101%
Pacific Islander	108%	101%
Two or More Races	107%	100%
White	108%	100%
Unknown		

Too few enrollments

Too few enrollments

Age Group

Under 20	105%	98%
20 to 24	108%	100%
25 to 29	109%	101%
30 to 49	110%	102%
50+	109%	101%

Income

Low Income	108%	100%
Other	107%	100%

Parents' Education

First Generation	108%	101%
Not 1st Generation	107%	99%

Special Populations

Disabled	108%	100%
Foster Youth	110%	103%
Veteran	109%	101%
AB540	107%	100%

Success Rate by Demographic

2013-2014 through 2016-2017

Comparing the groups of
Used Workshop
and **No Workshop**

This table addresses the questions:

- 1) Overall impact: Is there an overall difference between the two groups being compared? (Look at the rows for "All Enrollments")
- 2) Impact by demographic: Is there a difference by demographic between the two groups? (Look at "Ratio")
- 3) Equity: Are the differences by demographic greater or less than the overall differences? (Look at "Ratio as % of Overall Ratio")

Demographic	Group	Success Rate	Ratio	Enroll-ments	Odds the difference between Used Workshop and No Workshop is random (p.)	Ratio as % of Overall Ratio
All Enrollments	Used Workshop	82%	120%	10570	0%	
	No Workshop	68%		175805		
Gender						
Female	Used Workshop	83%	120%	6331	0%	100%
	No Workshop	69%		91418		
Male	Used Workshop	81%	121%	4091	0%	100%
	No Workshop	67%		82060		
Unknown	Used Workshop	79%	116%	148	0%	96%
	No Workshop	68%		2321		
Ethnicity						
African American	Used Workshop	79%	127%	414	0%	105%
	No Workshop	62%		7321		
American Indian	Used Workshop	82%	129%	22	Too few enrollments	107%
	No Workshop	64%		253		
Asian	Used Workshop	88%	113%	2693	0%	94%
	No Workshop	78%		35189		
Latino/Latina	Used Workshop	80%	123%	6172	0%	102%
	No Workshop	65%		107770		
Pacific Islander	Used Workshop	86%	140%	14	Too few enrollments	116%
	No Workshop	61%		746		
Two or More Races	Used Workshop	79%	114%	325	0%	95%
	No Workshop	70%		5401		
White	Used Workshop	85%	115%	855	0%	96%
	No Workshop	74%		17988		
Unknown	Used Workshop	93%	137%	75	0%	113%
	No Workshop	68%		1137		

					Odds the difference between Used Workshop and No Workshop is random (p.)	Ratio as % of Overall Ratio
Demographic	Group	Success Rate	Ratio	Enroll- ments		
Age Group						
Under 20	Used Workshop	82%	122%	2877	0%	101%
	No Workshop	67%		40333		
20 to 24	Used Workshop	81%	120%	4826	0%	99%
	No Workshop	68%		92325		
25 to 29	Used Workshop	83%	121%	1290	0%	100%
	No Workshop	69%		24713		
30 to 49	Used Workshop	86%	121%	1008	0%	101%
	No Workshop	71%		16080		
50+	Used Workshop	87%	124%	155	0%	103%
	No Workshop	70%		2354		
Income						
Low Income	Used Workshop	81%	121%	7380	0%	101%
	No Workshop	67%		125454		
Other	Used Workshop	86%	120%	2776	0%	99%
	No Workshop	72%		50351		
Parents' Education						
First Generation	Used Workshop	81%	123%	3725	0%	102%
	No Workshop	66%		58823		
Not 1st Generation	Used Workshop	84%	119%	4780	0%	99%
	No Workshop	70%		83339		
Special Populations						
Disabled	Used Workshop	78%	120%	662	0%	99%
	No Workshop	66%		11116		
Foster Youth	Used Workshop	84%	134%	430	0%	111%
	No Workshop	63%		6697		
Veteran	Used Workshop	86%	127%	276	0%	105%
	No Workshop	68%		4466		
AB540	Used Workshop	81%	120%	467	0%	99%
	No Workshop	67%		7043		

Success Rate by Demographic - Summary

Comparing the groups of
Used Workshop
and **No Workshop**
2013-2014 through
2016-2017

The Groups: The library offers workshops on how to use the Library. "Used Workshop" are the enrollments by students who attended a workshop. "No Workshop" are all the other enrollments in the same sections.

Demographic	Comparing between Used Workshop & No Workshop	
	Impact	Equity

All Enrollments	120%	
-----------------	------	--

Gender

Female	120%	100%
Male	121%	100%
Unknown	116%	96%

Ethnicity

African American	127%	105%
American Indian	129%	107%
Asian	113%	94%
Latino/Latina	123%	102%
Pacific Islander	140%	116%
Two or More Races	114%	95%
White	115%	96%
Unknown		

Too few enrollments

Too few enrollments

Age Group

Under 20	122%	101%
20 to 24	120%	99%
25 to 29	121%	100%
30 to 49	121%	101%
50+	124%	103%

Income

Low Income	121%	101%
Other	120%	99%

Parents' Education

First Generation	123%	102%
Not 1st Generation	119%	99%

Special Populations

Disabled	120%	99%
Foster Youth	134%	111%
Veteran	127%	105%
AB540	120%	99%



Library Faculty Department Meeting Agenda, March 20, 2019

(1:30 PM – 3:30 PM, 6-237)

x	Esteban Aguilar	x	Jared Burton	x	LeAnn Garrett	x	Hong Guo
	Eva Rios-Alvarado	x	Pauline Swartz	x	Chisa Uyeki	x	Emily Woolery

Item	Leader	Prep (Read or Bring)	Action (Information, Discussion, Decision)	Time Allotted
Bookables	PS	<p>Logistics reminder about bookables and RIE study – pre/posttests, assessing the completed worksheets, etc.</p> <p>Snacks provided by HBRC related work/funds for bookables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ways to integrate food insecurity issues and campus resources into the bookable workshops o Additional Cal Fresh promotional items (while supplies last) 	<p>Pauline reminded faculty to participate in the ongoing assessment using pre-tests (white handout) and post-tests (pink handout).</p> <p>Snacks are currently located in the storage room in 6-238. If we need more space, snacks will be stored in 6-222. Pauline will provide updates about storage.</p> <p>Pauline shared a tip about using food insecurity for article workshops. This topic works well with the current learning objectives.</p> <p>Pauline noted a possibility of collaborating with the Arise Program for “super” extended hours during final exams. Arise currently offers study hours from 11:00 PM – 1:00 AM in the Ragan Room during finals. Pauline will report further details as known.</p>	20 min.

Approval of Meeting Minutes – March 6, 2019	lg		Minutes approved with clarification.	5 min.
Farm News	lg		Pending LeAnn Garret's retirement	5 min.
Credit Course Schedule	lg	Fall 2019 – recommendations LIBR 1 – 3 credits – F2F LIBR 1 – 3 credits – Online LIBR 1A – 1 credit – F2F LIBR 1A – 1 credit – Online – late start	We agreed to these course assignments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jared: LIBR 1 – 3 credits – F2F • Nora/Linda/Hong: LIBR 1 – 3 credits – Online • Eva: LIBR 1A – 1 credit – F2F • Pauline (tentative): LIBR 1A – 1 credit – Online – late start 	10 min.
Adjunct Hiring Committee	lg	Request for two volunteers to screen prospective new adjunct hire Additional hours available from Chisa's backfill May be shifting multiple adjunct librarian schedules – related to need and availability - to support LSP and Chisa's duties	Hong and Emily will screen a prospective new adjunct hire with LeAnn.	5 min.
PIE	lg	Hong and Emily will screen a prospective new adjunct hire with LeAnn.	Hong and Emily will screen a prospective new adjunct hire with LeAnn.	10 min.
ILEAC	JB	Library web page info change - discussion (review purpose/policy posting)	Library faculty agree students from IEALC institutions may check out books, audiobooks, and DVDs for home use. They may use reserve books within the Library. IEALC students may use open study spaces, including study rooms, however, they may not reserve study rooms. Jared is working with Suzanne Maguire and Romelia Salinas to review current practices and develop policies and procedures. Hong will update the	10 min.

			Library website when Jared has new information.	
LAG/Perkins	JB	Review Spring meeting input from attendees– discussion (see minutes)	Jared asks all librarians to review the minutes. Chisa will assist Jared in getting together documentation for the Perkins order.	8 min.
Nursing Program Accreditation	JB	Update on library visitation – informational	Jared library had a successful visit with the Nursing Program accreditation team.	7 min.
Academic Senate	PS	Report	Voting this week to fill terms for Co-VP and Sec Opening nominations for Co-VP, Sec, Directors, Senators-at-Large Reviewed action and discussion items – contact Pauline, Hong, or Chisa if questions.	5 min.
Faculty Association	Ig/EW	Information if needed	Next meeting is scheduled on April 2.	5 min.
				90