**AC Amarillo College**

**PET FORM**
**Planning and Evaluation Tracking**
**(2012-2013 Assessment Period)**

Division of: Center for Teaching and Learning

Person Responsible for this Division: Patsy Lemaster

Department of: Library

Person Responsible for this Form: Mark Hanna

Purpose Statement (With Last Updated Date): Our purpose is to

- empower our patrons to be self-sufficient information consumers and to possess critical evaluation and thinking skills;
- create a physical environment that encourages personal study, collaboration and networking, and inspires creative and academic growth; and
- place the best information and research tools for project completion at our patrons' disposal. (2011)

---

**Goal Statement #1:**

**Adjust instruction and services based on assessment data (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.1).**

**Outcome/Objective Statement**
**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**

1a. After receiving instruction on one or more information literacy competencies, participating students will improve on their pre-test scores by at least 40 percent on the post-test, and students will average at least 70 percent correct on the post-test (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Task 1.1.1; No Excuses Goal: Complete the courses they take with a grade of "C" or better).

1b. After receiving instruction on one or more information literacy competencies via online micro-tutorials, participating students will average at least 70 percent correct on assessment questions (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Task 1.1.1; No Excuses Goal: Complete the courses they take with a grade of "C" or better). The assessment is optional.

- Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)
  - **2011-2012 Data:**

    **1a. Library Instruction Classroom Assessment Averages**

    | FALL 2011 | | SPRING/SUMMER 2012 | |
    |---|---|---|---|
    | Pre-instruction | 57% | Pre-instruction | 59% |
    | Post-instruction | 85% | Post-instruction | 83% |
    | % improvement | 58% | % improvement | 45% |
    | # of students assessed | 952 | # of students assessed | 560 |
    | Total number of students receiving instruction | 1051 | Total number of students receiving instruction | 670 |

**1b. Optional Online Tutorial results**

September 2011 – Aug 2012

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of participants | 99 |
| Number of Lessons | 8 |
| Average of scores | 92% |

- **2010-2011 Data:**

  **1a. Library Instruction Classroom Assessment Averages**

| FALL 2010 | | SPRING/SUMMER 2011 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-instruction | 43% | Pre-instruction | 46% |
| Post-instruction | 84% | Post-instruction | 85% |
| % improvement | 95.93% | % improvement | 85.86% |
| # of students assessed | 634 | # of students assessed | 650 |
| Total number of students receiving instruction | 664 | Total number of students receiving instruction | 1033 |

  **1b. Optional Online Tutorial results**

  July 2010 – Aug 2011

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of participants | 15 |
| Number of Lessons | 7 |
| Average of scores | 93.55% |

- **2009-2010 Data:**

  **1a. Library Instruction Classroom Assessment Averages**

| Fall 2009 | | Spring/Summer 2010 | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Pre-instruction | 58% | Pre-instruction | 44% |
| Post-instruction | 85% | Post-instruction | 89% |
| % improvement | 45% | % improvement: | 101% |
| # of students: | 523 | # of students: | 333 |

  **1b. Optional Online Tutorial Results**

  April-June 2010

| | |
|---|---|
| Number of participants | 5 |
| Number of Lessons | 7 |
| Average of scores | 79% |

- Analysis
  - Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis
    (Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):
    **2011-2012**

    1.a. The benchmark was exceeded. Compared to the previous year, 2011-12 students showed less percent improvement, but scored higher on their pretests.

    The number of students assessed in both semesters rose, especially in the Fall 2011 during which library instruction marketing efforts showed positive results, nearly doubling the number of students assessed compared to Spring/Summer 2012. This continues the upward trend we have experienced.
    The 2011-2012 chart above indicates both the total assessed and the total instructed. Assessments were not done every time due to faculty priorities, available class time, and instructional setting limitations. Many more students received library research instruction but were not assessed.

    1.b. The benchmark was exceeded. This PET form includes data from July 2010 through August 2012. More students participated, but the online tutorials are optional. Students can watch a tutorial without taking the quiz. The total number of participants the library can track is lower than desired. Tutorials are now a resource provided to speech classes as part of an information literacy assignment partnership.

- Improvements and Successes (combined)
  - List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2010-2011** PET Results/Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:
    1. Library instruction touches more departments.
    2. Library instruction classes now include the use of audience response systems that results in better student engagement. Anonymous evaluation of the classes show students like this approach.
    3. Speech department collaboration to increase use of library instruction by this academic department.
       The library collaborated with the Department Chairman of Communications and Theater to embed information literacy skills into an active learning assignment in which students do group presentations on core skills related to library research. Fall 2011/Spring 2012 academic year was the first SY that the project was fully implemented.

    Success:
    Participation by speech faculty has increased probably encouraged by the success of the pilot program.

    Online library tutorials are now a constituent part of the speech information literacy effort.

    Completion is tracked by the Library Learning Commons supervisor.

    Library instruction was given to students in departments that had not participated in many years: paralegal, humanities, music, and history.

For speech class topics for which students used the tutorials to research the topic, pre-test and post-test scores for the related question can be evaluated over time and tutorials can be changed if needed. There was not enough pilot data to make a change at this time.

- o Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details):
  Budget information needed to make past improvements: None

- Recommendations/Actions for **2012-2013**

  **1.**
  - o Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?): Kaki Hoover
  - o Action Plan(s):
    Participate in college QEP (Quality Enhancement Plan)

    Method: Participate in all 2012-13 classes for Learning Frameworks (First-Year Seminar) by providing library instruction. Evaluate results and propose ideas for future participation focused on improving college readiness, retention, and completion.
  - o Expected time frame: By the end of the Spring semester 2013.
  - o Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details): None known at this time. However, if the First-Year Seminar becomes mandatory for first-year, first-time-in-college freshmen, the estimate is 60 sections per semester. This dramatic increase will impact library faculty and computer classroom availability.

  **2.**
  - o Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?): Emily Gilbert
  - o Action Plan(s):
    Instruct more classes for adjunct faculty.

    Method: Present at adjunct academy and contact all adjunct faculty in English and Speech departments.
  - o Expected time frame: By the end of the Spring semester 2013.
  - o Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details): None known at this time.

---

**Goal Statement #2:**
**Print and electronic collections will be relevant and useful to students, faculty, and staff, especially for programs which require discipline accreditation (No Excuses Goal: Complete the courses they take with a grade of "C" or better).**

**Outcome/Objective Statement**
**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**
2a. After analyzing course syllabi, discipline accreditation standards, and receiving faculty recommendations, technical services staff will purchase all required readings as measured by LMS holdings report.

2b. After completing purchases of all required sources in course syllabi in nursing, surgical tech and dental hygiene, use of the sources will increase 25% as measured by automated library system reports.

- Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)
    - **2011-2012 Data:**

      2a.

      Dental Hygiene: 9 titles were added.

      Nursing: 12 titles were added.

      Surgical Tech: 1 title was added.

      2b.

      Dental Hygiene: **2010-2011** circulation 58, **2011-2012** circulation 71, an increase of 22%.

      Nursing: **2010-2011** circulation 771, **2011-2012** circulation 409, a decrease of 47%.

      Surgical Tech: **2010-2011** data not available, **2011-2012** circulation 0.

    - **2010-2011 Data:**

      2a.

      Dental Hygiene: No titles were added.

      Nursing: No titles were added.

      Surgical Tech: No titles were added.

      2b.

      Dental Hygiene: **2009-2010** circulation 123, **2010-2011** circulation 58, a decrease of 53%.

      Nursing: **2009-2010** circulation 1220, **2010-2011** circulation 771, a decrease of 37%.

      Surgical Tech: data not available.

- Analysis
    - Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis (Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):

      **2011-2012**

      2a. After analyzing course syllabi, discipline accreditation standards, and receiving few faculty recommendations, required readings that were not textbooks were purchased by the technical services department.

      2b. Dental Hygiene, Nursing, and Surgical tech printed materials did not meet the stated goal of 25% increase in circulation. Nursing print resource use significantly declined probably because many electronic resources are available and are preferred by students. Dental Hygiene print item use did grow substantially despite availability of many quality electronic resources.

- Improvements
    - List any Improvements Made in the **2011-2012** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2010-2011** PET Results: The library did purchase some new items for the three programs selected for review by the technical services department.

- o Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful: Due to lack of response (input) by faculty, few materials were purchased and students may not be aware of the printed resources available to them through the library.

- o Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details): None

- Recommendations/Actions for **2012-2013**
  - o Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?): Mindy Weathersbee

  - o Action Plan: Interview Surgical Tech, Mortuary Science, and Radiology faculty about current print resources—their value and appropriateness; about potential new print resources they want; and about their preferences for print or electronic items.

  - o Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date): By the end of the Spring semester 2013.

  - o Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details): None