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Program Description

As one of the learning support service units at Kauai Community College (KCC), the library provides services to its students and faculty within the Learning Resource Center. The library also supports community college distance students and University Center distance students (upper division and graduate students). The library staff consists of four librarians, one library assistant, and one student worker. Circulation, reference, and instructional services are the primary public services offered by the library.

Along with access to a book collection of 58,683 volumes, the library also provides intra-system loan (ISL) from the entire University of Hawaii Library System. There are in excess of four million volumes available through this loan system. The library is currently subscribing to ebrary, an electronic book service with access to 132,047 titles, and Credo Reference that provides access to 770 electronic reference titles. Also, the library subscribes to 46 full-text electronic databases for journals and magazines that provide access to 28,707 titles. These are readily accessible by students from any remote location. Links to these databases are prominently displayed on the library’s web page.

The mission of the library is to provide an intellectually stimulating environment for the college community by providing a variety of resources and services that promote development of critical thinking and information literacy skills.

Part I. Quantitative Indicators

Overall Program Health: Healthy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student and Faculty Information</th>
<th>Program Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Annual Unduplicated Student Headcount</td>
<td>1,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Annual FTE Faculty</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a Annual FTE Staff</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Annual FTE Student</td>
<td>802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demand Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>Demand Health Call</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Demand Health Call

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of students attending presentations sessions per student FTE</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of circulations, electronic books used, full-text journal articles downloaded per student and faculty FTE</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of hits on library homepage per student/faculty FTE</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Efficiency Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of reference questions answered per FTE librarian (= Item #4 UH Library Council Statistics)</td>
<td>918.5</td>
<td>1,104.2</td>
<td>1,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Number of book volumes per student FTE</td>
<td>210.9</td>
<td>224.8</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Total materials expenditures per student FTE</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>5114</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Total library expenditures per student and faculty FTE</td>
<td>5475</td>
<td>5465</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Effectiveness Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student and faculty satisfaction measurements using Common Survey questions</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Common Student Learning Outcome: The student will evaluate information and its sources critically</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I usually find enough books to meet my course needs</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I get enough articles from the library databases to meet my class needs</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The library staff guide me to resources I can use</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The library’s instruction sessions have increased my ability to do research and use library resources</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The library website is useful</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I feel comfortable being in the library</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The computer resources in the library contribute to my success at the College</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part II. Analysis of the Program

**Glossary**

**Part II. Analysis of the Program**

**Demand**

The demand indicator for library instruction in 2014-2015 dipped under the 1:1 ratio that was consistent for the past two years. The drop in number of classes and students participating in library instruction is reflected in this lower ratio for this year. The lower figures in classes and students can be somewhat correlated with the decrease in the number of FTE students for the past year. However, there has been a drop in participation by some classes that have worked with the library instruction program in the past. Analysis of this occurrence needs to be looked at more closely and resolved with the return of these classes along with introduction of new courses brought into the fold.

Increase in demand indicators was quite evident in the use of electronic resources. For both demand indicator nos. 5 and 6 the numbers shot up significantly. They are indicative of the importance of electronic resources in student and faculty research work. Although circulation of books dipped this year after a slight increase over the previous year, electronic resources took center stage bolstering the number of downloads of e-journal articles and e-books, and the number of hits on the library home page.
The number of reference questions per FTE librarian continues to hover over the 1000 figure while book volumes per FTE student increased over the previous year. This increase in ratio of volumes per FTE student occurred despite a sizeable number of books that were withdrawn from the collection. In preparation for the move to temporary quarters in the Social Sciences building while the Learning Resource Center (LRC) undergoes extensive HVAC renovation, 4,045 volumes of books were withdrawn from the collection during FY 2014-2015. While this dropped the collection total to 58,683 volumes, the ratio of volumes per FTE student still rose due to the drop in numbers of students during the past fiscal year. However, even with the numbers dropping in the total physical collection there was an increase in the number of electronic books that were added via Ebrary and Credo Reference.

Both the total material expenditures per FTE student and total library expenditures per FTE student and faculty dipped somewhat from the previous year. In spite of the drop in material expenditures per FTE student, Kauai still has a higher ratio of expenditures in comparison with her sister campuses in the University of Hawaii System.

Effectiveness

The sixty-seven percentile for students successfully completing the common program student learning outcome (PSLO) via the pre and post-tests dipped below the seventy percentile mark that was set by the library as a passing score. While this is disappointing news since it shows a downward trend from two years ago, the students successfully passed the other two PSLOs with averages of 76% and 93%. These latter two PSLOs were added in to the 2013 APRU.

The majority of student satisfaction measurements on the common survey questions had increases in the effectiveness indicators. A sizeable increase occurred with student satisfaction with “finding enough books to meet my course needs.” It went up significantly from 62% to 71%. Hopefully, this is an indication that students were utilizing the e-book databases such as Ebrary and Credo Reference, and were finding more up-to-date books in the collection. We have been aggressively updating the book collection via new purchases and donations from various sources.

However, it should be noted that with the relocation of the library and with no access to the book collection, students will need to refocus their research via e-books. The use of e-resources that provide full-text journal and magazine articles were also given high satisfaction marks. Last year’s APRU was 75% with an increase of 10 percentile points to 85% for this year. This is a good indicator that students are finding suitable material in the electronic databases.

The satisfaction level with assistance from the library staff has been consistent over the past two years. It rose slightly to 85% over last year’s 84%. This correlates well with the efficiency indicator of 1,018 reference questions per librarian.

The largest increase in satisfaction levels occurred with “library instruction sessions have increased my ability to do research and use library resources.” It rose from 73% to 92% and verifies the importance of library instruction in the success levels of our students.

Hits on the library website rose significantly this year (see demand indicators). However, the satisfaction level dropped from 85% to 82% in this year’s APRU. This is one area that we may need to revisit and evaluate the usefulness of items on the home page.

Since the most recent surveys were taken in spring 2015 there was still a respectable satisfaction level with the students using the library. It remained the same at 83%. However, it is expected that there will be a significant drop in student satisfaction with next year’s APRU. This will definitely be a reflection of the library’s relocation to their temporary site in the Social Sciences building. The smallness of the relocated site will probably factor in to students’ lower satisfaction ratings on the survey.

In the meantime there are already comments in this year’s Academic Support Services Survey from faculty and staff that points to dissatisfaction with our downsized library:

- With current LRC situation, I feel that the library is not a comfortable environment
- The current situation is bad
- Library: not enough space. And cannot make noise/talk.

We have accumulated statistics to show how the smaller location is impacting the number of patrons who are entering the library. To get an idea of how many patrons are entering our new site we focused on a snapshot view of one week (Oct. 19 to 23) by counting the number of people that entered the library. During that week there were 627 people that entered the library with a daily average headcount of 125.4. For a comparative look at an almost identical time period a year ago (Oct. 13-17, 2014) at our old facility there were 3500 people that entered the library with a daily average of 700. In other words, one day’s worth of patrons entering the library at the LRC was equivalent to
one week’s worth of people entering our temporary site at the Social Sciences building.

This diminishing number is even reflected in the evening hours. This year the weekly numbers from 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm was 55 which averaged out to 13.75 people per day. In contrast to last year’s weekly evening figures there were 300 with an average of 60 people per day. Thus, the number of students entering the library for the last three hours of operation dropped 82% for this semester from a year ago. The percentage drop for the evening hours matches exactly with the day time numbers of 82% from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

The number of students that the library can accommodate in its temporary site is undoubtedly determined by the actual space available. While this is something that the library staff has no control over, we will do our best in offering the highest possible services that is feasible in this downsized situation.

The increase in computers within the library probably contributed to a greater student satisfaction with access to hardware and with the feeling that “computer resources in the library contribute to my success at college.” The percentage increased from 69% to 84%. This was the second highest increase among the survey questions. A total of 35 desktops and 12 laptops were available for student use. But with the relocation in August of this year the library is down to 19 desktops along with the laptops. This may or may not see a drop in satisfaction levels in the coming year with the current drop in student use of the library.

Two statements in the Academic Support Services Survey look at the perception of faculty and staff on program learning outcomes (PSLOs) regarding library services. Seventy-Eight percent of faculty and staff surveyed agreed with the statement “I think student learning has increased as a result of the services and technologies provided by library services” while a 73% rating from faculty and staff agreed with the statement “I think my capability to instruct has increased as a result of the services provided by library services.”

There is some overlap in questions used in the Academic Support Services Survey and the common survey questions used as effectiveness indicators in the APRU. While the former surveys faculty and staff, the latter survey gathers student responses. The responses in the Academic Support Survey include: Adequate number of resources in the library (90%); Helpful and friendly library staff (93%); Library instruction (73%); Library as a comfortable place (82%); and Satisfaction with library services (94%).

A comment made by either a faculty or staff member in the above survey was that the library was over staffed and that information is much more easily accessible than before. Contrary to this person’s view, our library is understaffed by at least one library assistant and we are stretched thin trying to service the facility 55 hours per week. We have the smallest staff and facility among the UH community college libraries and yet we have maintained longer hours than many of our counterparts over the past years.

It is partially correct that “information is much more accessible than before” but librarians provide guidance in research and how to navigate through this maze of information overload that is presented on the web. The last concern of this commentator revolves around the allocation of resources. In just the past two years we have included reallocation of funds in our goals and action plans in the library’s APRU. We have increased the funding of more electronic resources, both books and journals, to accommodate a growing trend of utilizing online resources.

**Significant program actions**

All three of the following action plans from last year’s APRU played a major role in the transition from the Learning Resource Center (LRC) to the library’s temporary site at the Social Sciences building.

1. Weeding of collection to upgrade holdings

The initial goal of this action plan was for collection development but it served double duty in updating the collection via discarding of outdated books and preparing the library in its move to the current site. The library was already conducting a major weeding project of the reference book collection during the spring 2014 semester but it was accelerated once news of the upcoming renovations was communicated to the library staff. The reference collection was pared down significantly with 1,292 volumes removed from the collection as of spring 2015. Simultaneously, with the accelerated weeding of the reference collection during fall 2014 it was decided to tackle the general collection...
On the second floor, by the end of the spring semester in May 2015, 2,571 volumes had been removed from the second floor collection. Additional withdrawals included 177 Hawaii/Pacific, 2 Rare, and 9 Read for a total of 4,045 volumes withdrawn. It should be noted that the criteria for the removal of volumes were based on condition, age, content value, and appropriateness for the community college level.

2. Reallocation of funds for additional e-resources

In August 2014 the library staff became aware of an impending move to a temporary location in 2015. With the realization that many of the library's physical resources would be unavailable during the renovation an action plan in the 2014 APRU was formulated to investigate the possibility of acquiring more electronic resources. Currently the library is evaluating two e-resources—Opposing Viewpoints and Ebsco Community College eBook Subscription Collection. Free trial runs of both databases are in place for all the librarians to test. Preliminary assessment is that both databases would add immensely to the current offering of e-resources to students. Funding for reallocation would be forthcoming from book funds that were made available with the discontinuation of some ongoing subscriptions to print titles. Estimation of cost is about $1500 for Opposing Viewpoints and $3,550 for Ebsco Community College eBook Subscription Collection.

3. Preparation and planning for renovation

This action plan had the highest level of priority since the library staff was given an approximate time frame in which we were to vacate the LRC. Primary attention was paid to the cleanup of the library by each staff member. This presented an opportunity to discard unwanted files and paper work, weed out various formats of materials from all collections, clean out supplies that were no longer being used, and toss out basic clutter in the facility.

A subset of this action plan was a general weeding of the collection. It was determined that if we downsized the collection of unwanted books it would lessen the number of items that needed to be boxed and placed in storage containers. The next major step in the move to a temporary site was the hiring of student workers in May 2015. Tina Castro, Learning Center Coordinator, provided her tutors who were available for summer work. They assisted in the packing of library books in boxes that would eventually be stored away in containers. With the completion of the book packing project by student workers in mid-August, the final step was the physical relocation of office and library furniture to the temporary site in the Social Sciences building. A week prior to the first day of the semester on August 24 the maintenance crew assisted the library staff in moving selected office and library furniture, and equipment. During the spring semester and prior to the move the library staff had access to the Social Sciences building on several occasions to assess and plan the furniture and equipment layout in a much smaller location. Success was achieved with the reopening of the library in its new site on the first day of the semester.

Part III. Action Plan

Current Situation in 5-year Plan (Comprehensive Program Review)

Since the submission of the Comprehensive Program Review in 2013 we have completed the following goals:

- Increase the number of PSLOs in the assessment of student learning
- Promote system-wide collaborative efforts with the expansion of more consortium purchases
- Revise collection development plan to provide a diverse inventory of resources

Goals that are currently being evaluated before implementation are:

- Assessment of service outcomes
- Provide support to workforce development by adding pertinent resources to library's collection

Goals that are on temporary hold:

- Enrich the learning environment with completion of upholstery project
- Enhancement of professional development for library staff

Current Situation with Last Year’s APRU Goals:
• The primary goal was completed on Aug. 24, 2015 with the reopening of the library in its temporary home at the Social Sciences building.

• Expansion of e-resources is an ongoing goal with two titles currently being considered: Opposing Viewpoints and Ebsco Community College e-Book Subscription Collection.

• The weeding aspect of collection development was undertaken in a large way with the upcoming move to the temporary site. Over 4,000 volumes were removed from the collection. This removal of outdated material can only enhance the collection with the addition of newer titles.

• Development of service outcomes was not implemented but has been extended into this year’s APRU.

• Integration of new PSLOs was placed on hold while the library evaluates the current PSLOs

Impact on Health Indicators

• Expansion of e-resources puts us on the right track with the ever increasing number of downloads of e-books and e-journals.

• The need to closely monitor current PSLOs is indicative of what can happen with one of the average scores for the PSLO falling below the passing level of 70%. This can be easily remedied with a careful evaluation of questions on the pre and post-tests.

Goals for Current year and Alignment with KCC’s Priority Goals

• Strengthen library instruction program/Goal 2 (Learning and Teaching)

• Improve performance of students on PSLOs/Goal 2 (Learning and Teaching)

• Develop service outcomes/Goal 2 (Learning and Teaching)

• Expansion of e-resources/Goal 1 (Access) and Goal 2 (Learning and Teaching)

Action Plans in APRU Leading Towards These Goals

• Work with faculty in incorporating library instruction into their classes

• Re-evaluate assessment tool used in current PSLOs

• Assess library statistics for service outcomes

• Continued reallocation of funds for e-resources

Indicators of Improvement

• Increase in the number of classes and students participating in library instruction

• Revision of pre and post-tests so students can attain scores of 70% or better in all three PSLOs

• Implementation of service outcomes to complement existing program student learning outcomes

• Additional electronic resources in place

Anticipated Problems

• Getting widespread cooperation from faculty to embrace library instruction as a vital component of their student learning process

• Coordinating with faculty in the distribution of both tests for PSLOs assessment

• Limits to how much reallocation can be done with existing budgetary funds

ACTION PLAN

Action Plan(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Goal &amp; Campus Strategic Priority or Goal</th>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Resources Needed</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Indicator of Improvement</th>
<th>SPLO impacted</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Part IV. Resource Implications

Due to the relocation of the library to a temporary downsized site there will be no requests for additional funding in this current fiscal year. The library staff will need to adjust to a new working environment and will need the first year to evaluate any needs. However one thing is quite evident in that without access to our physical book collection students will need to be encouraged to utilize more of the electronic resources. Reallocation will be the primary method in funding new electronic resources with money diverted from the book account. Also, the use of book sale funds in the UH Foundation account will help supplement the library’s budget.

Program Student Learning Outcomes

For the 2014-2015 program year, some or all of the following P-SLOs were reviewed by the program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed this year?</th>
<th>Program Student Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Yes</td>
<td>Students will be able to access needed information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Yes</td>
<td>Students will be able to evaluate information and its sources critically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Yes</td>
<td>Students will be able to acknowledge sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A) Expected Level Achievement

The expected level of achievement for the library's three PSLOs is a score of 70% or better on each outcome of the information literacy post-test.

B) Courses Assessed

A total of 7 courses in 13 classes were assessed with post-tests after undergoing library instruction. However, only four of these courses in five classes were administered with the pre-tests before receiving instruction. Due to a periodic evaluation of the test questions that occurred during spring 2015, three courses (9 classes) for various reasons were not able to complete the pre-tests. Students in these classes were given a revised post-test. With this change in test composition and the lack of pre-tests for comparison, only the five classes that completed both tests were assessed on PSLOs for this APRU. The classes included:

Botany 105 (F 2014)
English 100 (F 2014 and S 2015)
Health 155 (F 2014)
Science 121 (F 2014)

Beginning in Fall 2015 it is hopeful that the revised tests will be firmly in place and that more classes will complete both tests to allow a more comprehensive review of PSLOs.
C) Assessment Strategy/Instrument

A pre-test is administered to students during a library instruction session. Later in the semester a post-test (together with a survey with results in the quantitative indicators of the APRU) is presented to the same class. A comparison is checked between the pre and post tests to determine if there were improvements in scores for the three PSLOs that are being measured in the tests. It should be noted that the number of students taking both tests may vary due to students dropping courses by the end of the semester or not being present when either the pre-test or post-test are being administered by the librarian. Both the pre-test and post-test consist of a multiple choice quiz with 8 questions that test a student's understanding of all three program learning outcomes.

D) Results of Program Assessment

This year's program assessment saw a drop in the scores for one of the measures while the other two measures had increases in their passing marks. The average score for students performing on PSLO 2 dropped below the passing mark of 70% with a 67% score. Last year the average score was in the passing range with 73%. However, for PSLO 1 and 2 the marks increased to 76% and 93%, respectively. This was an improvement over the previous year scores of 73% for PSLO 1 and 89% for PL.

E) Other Comments

No content.

F) Next Steps

The questions in both the pre-test and post-tests are not static but are continually being evaluated each year and assessed whether they are effectively measuring PSLOs. The use of pre and post test measurements in PSLOs has been ongoing for quite a while and it may be time to look into other possible measures as assessment tools.