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Appendix 5.1

Hiring
Table 5.1 Full-Time Faculty and CLT Hires 2002 to 2010 (10.02.05 Faculty Hires 2002-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Hires</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Reappointments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resignations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 Growth of Faculty From 2001 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full/Part Time</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full/Part Time</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>-16</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full/Part Time</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full/Part Time</th>
<th>Fall 2009</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
<th>Increase</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part Time</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10.02.06 Faculty Report)
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Table 5.3 Total Faculty Growth 2001–2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Associate or lower</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 Full-Time Faculty Highest Degree Earned (10.02.06 Faculty Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Associate or lower</th>
<th>Bachelor</th>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Doctorate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2007</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 5.2

Credentials
Table 5.4 Full-Time Faculty Highest Degree Earned (10.02.06 Faculty Report)
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Appendix 5.3

Diversity
Table 10.6 Faculty/Student (F/S) Diversity Ratio (10.02.06 Faculty Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>F/S</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>F/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>F/S Ratio</td>
<td>F/S Ratio</td>
<td>F/S Ratio</td>
<td>F/S Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>1 / 15</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>2 / 25</td>
<td>1:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>70 / 2,029</td>
<td>1:28</td>
<td>85 / 2,281</td>
<td>1:26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>123 / 1,877</td>
<td>1:15</td>
<td>141 / 2,450</td>
<td>1:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Non-Puerto Rican</td>
<td>37 / 4,127</td>
<td>1:118</td>
<td>78 / 4,607</td>
<td>1:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian American</td>
<td>37 / _</td>
<td>44 / _</td>
<td>43 / _</td>
<td>0 / _</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>17 / 14</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>16 / 0</td>
<td>15 / 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>447 / 1,729</td>
<td>1:3</td>
<td>516 / 1,837</td>
<td>1:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1 / 2,231</td>
<td>6 / 1,529</td>
<td>1:255</td>
<td>0 / 1,402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>_ / 577</td>
<td>_ / 739</td>
<td>_ / 928</td>
<td>_ / 513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 5.4

Faculty Hiring and Appointment Process
Faculty search committees follow the CUNY bylaws for appointment, tenure, and promotion to guide them in ensuring that faculty are prepared and qualified for their role and responsibilities. Each committee refers to the position definition, qualifications and equivalencies while reviewing candidate credentials (10.01.03 Instructional Staff Handbook). The Academic Chairs note that the “interview questions are framed so as to assess the candidate’s knowledge of the
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discipline and experience in teaching the discipline at the College/University level.” For librarians the interview questions address skills and experience required by the position. In addition, the Chairs indicate that “many searches include required teaching demonstrations by the final candidates” (10.04.01 Department Chairs Responses to Std 10 Questions) (10.04.02 Proposed Questions for Department Chairs) (10.04.03 Library Dept Chair Responses).

The methods for recruitment are determined by each division and department in consultation with the affirmative action officer. Each department develops a written recruitment document that includes a plan for advertisement and outreach to possible candidates, as well as efforts to recruit women and minorities. Departments then submit the document for approval by the affirmative action officer and forward the document to HR for review. They next form a search committee to interview candidates in consultation with the affirmative action officer and review each candidate’s diploma (or a letter from the registrar), official transcripts, and other credentials to determine if they meet the requirements for the position as defined by the CUNY bylaws. Departments also ensure that international candidates have their credentials translated and certified and that each candidate meets the minimum degree requirements for each position.

Lecturers must possess a Baccalaureate degree and such other qualifications as maybe necessary for the satisfactory performance of their instructional functions. Instructors must possess a Masters degree from an accredited university or be making active progress towards a doctoral degree. Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors must possess a Doctorate or equivalent degree.

The search committee is formally charged by the affirmative action officer with the responsibility to conduct the search. The committee determines a meeting schedule, reviews all resumes submitted making sure each documents the qualifications and standards for the position, ranks the candidate resumes, interviews the most qualified candidates, and recommends the final candidates to the department chairperson, followed by the vice president and finally the president for an interview.

In the case of adjunct faculty, the hiring department notifies HR about the prospective adjunct, then the applicant brings the hiring packet to HR with supporting documents, including official sealed transcript and highest degree original diploma for verification, various employment eligibility verification and tax forms, and the New Adjunct Hire Form with chairperson’s signature.

At the completion of the hiring process all documents are verified, checked against the appointment checklist and placed in the employee administrative file by HR. An administrative file is created in HR for each appointed full-time and adjunct faculty member. The administrative file contains the components of the hiring packet appropriate either for full-time or adjunct faculty. The hiring packet contains the Appointment Checklist (10.02.02 for full-time; 10.02.04 for adjunct faculty), which is used to ensure that each file has all required credentials as proof of qualifications. The candidate’s administrative file must contain the following documents: curriculum vitae, official transcript from the institution awarding the highest degree obtained, LaGuardia application for appointment, affirmative action certification, three written professional references, completed I-9, and tax and other personnel-related forms (10.01.03 Instructional Staff Handbook).
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Appendix 5.5

Evaluation Process for Instructional Staff
Table 5.7 Evaluation Process for Instructional Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ANNUAL EVALUATION</th>
<th>PEER OBSERVATION</th>
<th>STUDENT EVALUATIONS (SIRS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Tenure Track Faculty/Lecturers &amp; Instuctors</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>Once a semester (Fall I &amp; Spring I)</td>
<td>First 2 years of appointment, SIRS for 100% course load. 3rd year onwards, 50% course load. Courses determined by faculty member or Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured/CCE (Except Full Professors)</td>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>May be observed at the request of chair or faculty member</td>
<td>Once a year, class to be decided by faculty member or chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>May be evaluated at the request of chair or faculty member</td>
<td>May be observed at the request of chair or faculty member</td>
<td>At the request of the faculty member or chair person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty (teaching)</td>
<td>Once a semester for 4 semesters. After that, at the request of the chair or adjunct</td>
<td>Once a semester up to 10 semesters of teaching, after 10 at the request of the Chair or Adjunct</td>
<td>First nine semesters - all classes. Semester 10 onwards - once a year at the request of the Chair or Adjunct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Laboratory Technician (CLT) titles</td>
<td>At least once a year, preferably each semester</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education Officer (HEO) titles</td>
<td>At least once a year, preferably each semester</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: According to the CUNY Policy on Multiple Positions, HEOs, and CLTs may undertake teaching tasks as adjunct faculty (10.01.13 Multi-position HEO Form) (10.01.14 Multi-position Guidance 2011).

Peer Observations: Peer teaching observations are one factor in the total evaluation performance of the instructional staff. At least once each semester, non-tenured and non-certificated members of the teaching instructional staff must be observed in the classroom. According to the PSC-CUNY collective bargaining agreement (Article 18.2b), the observation must take place during the first ten weeks of the semester; faculty members being observed must be notified at least 24 hours in advance. The panel of observers is determined by the departmental P&B committee. Each observer will prepare the “Peer Observation Report” after a
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verbal discussion with the faculty member regarding the content and methodology of the class (07.4.24). A post-observation conference will be scheduled within two weeks of the written observation report and will be attended by the faculty member and the observer. After this conference a “Post Evaluation Conference” form is completed by the observer summarizing the discussion of the post-evaluation conference. This form shall be placed in the faculty member’s P & B file along with the Peer Observation Report. Tenured and certificated members of the instructional staff may be observed once each semester. Adjunct faculty must be observed once a semester for ten semesters and after ten semesters adjunct faculty may be observed at the request of the Chair or the adjunct faculty member.

The Peer Observation form has five sections: content, methodology, organization, student dynamics and ability to communicate. The observer rates the faculty member from “excellent” to “unsatisfactory,” provides narrative comments, and completes a section on “General Perceptions” with specific observations (10.05.07 Observation Form).

Student Instructional Report II (SIR): LaGuardia has always maintained a strong commitment to the use of student evaluations in the assessment of teaching effectiveness. During the Spring 1981 session, the College Senate and the College-wide Personnel and Budget committee reviewed and approved the SIR student evaluation form prepared by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). In Fall 1999, the College moved to a newer version of the SIR form, the SIR II, which is currently in practice. The electronic version of this evaluation, the eSIRII (SIR II online), was first piloted in Fall 200; in Spring 2010, a total of 167 classes used the eSIRII. The SIR asks students to assess the courses and instruction in the following areas: (A) Course Organization and Planning; (B) Communication; (C) Faculty/Student Interaction; (D) Assignments, Exams, and Grading; (E) Supplementary Instructional Methods; (F) Course Outcomes; (G) Student Effort and Involvement; (H) Course Difficulty, Workload, and Pace; (I) Overall Evaluation. The scores have a rating of 1 to 5 for each question (5 being “very effective”). The results include an average score for each question along with an overall mean for each section. A comparative mean for two-year institutions are also provided (10.01.12).

Appendix 5.6

Study of Developmental Student Performance When Taught by Full-time and Part-time Faculty
Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, April 12, 2010, Qi-Jian Gau and Nathan Dickmeyer (10.03.01 Full v Part time Faculty Developmental)

Data for day and evening courses were separated to eliminate potential bias in the sample. Basic skills courses in Reading, Math, and English were considered. In the two math classes considered, MAT 095 and MAT 096, differences in results between full- and part-time faculty were much smaller than the overall faculty range. There were an insufficient number of evening courses to draw meaningful conclusions. In ENG 099, part-time faculty had a wider range of pass rates in both day and evening courses than full-time faculty. Part-time faculty had a higher average pass rate during the day, while full-time faculty had a higher average pass rate at night,
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making it difficult to make any affirmative determinations based on this sample. Only in the reading class, CSE 099, was there a higher pass rate for full-time faculty in both day and evening courses; however, the difference was minor and much smaller than the range between pass rates among individual faculty.

Appendix 5.7

Center for Teaching and Learning Overview
The mission of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is to serve as a hub for professional innovation, reflection, collaboration and transformation. Engaging the collective expertise of LaGuardia faculty and colleagues across the U.S. (through partnerships with national organizations such as the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the Association for Authentic, Experiential and Evidence-Based Learning, and the Carnegie Foundation), the CTL provides professional development opportunities that support student-centered pedagogies and scholarly approaches to teaching. In 2004 the CTL received the Hesburgh Certificate of Excellence for the Enhancement of Undergraduate Education. The CTL’s programs played a key role in LaGuardia’s selection for both the 2006 MetLife Community College Excellence Award and the 2007 Bellwether Award for Instructional Innovation. Through leading a network of 30 colleges and universities from the tri-state region in the Making Connections program, the CTL also draws attention to LaGuardia’s role in educational innovation (10.01.15 CTL History). The CTL also features prominently in a 2011 CUNY report on CTLs throughout the CUNY system (10.05.39 CUNY CTL Report 6-15-11).

The programs and seminars offered by the CTL include Design for Learning 2.0, Writing in the Disciplines, New Faculty Colloquium, Project Quantum Leap, and many more (10.05.01 CTL Prof Dev Opportunities). The CTL issues a widely publicized call for applications every spring semester via email, its website, departmental meetings, seminars, and college events. All full-time and part-time faculty are encouraged to apply, and most applicants are accommodated in their first or second choice programs. The number of faculty participants in CTL seminars has grown from 245 in 2007 to 327 in 2010 (14.7.09 CTL support for assessment.xls).

Many positive changes have taken place at the CTL since 2007. The CTL launched the Project Quantum Leap seminar, funded by a $500,000 FIPSE grant, to develop engaging contextualized curriculum to teach basic mathematics (10.02.11 News Release). The CTL received a Title V grant that helped create the Making Connections ePortfolio seminar, with participation from over 20 colleges and universities, and Project Rise (Re-Invigorating the Second-year Experience), which focuses on integrating ePortfolio into capstone courses, advisement and assessment. Since 2008, the CTL has offered mini-grants to assist academic programs with developing and improving methods for assessing student work by utilizing ePortfolios.

Appendix 5.8

Center for Teaching and Learning Student Outcomes
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In 2008–2009, 5,622 students were taught by faculty engaged in seminars and workshops that address pedagogy, practice and scholarship. The pass rates, retention rates and student CCSSE surveys in these targeted courses show improved outcome and engagement (10.05.15 CTL Report Summary, 2-11-2010). Specifically, when asked “How much has your course emphasized synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in new ways?”, 77% of ePortfolio students (taught by faculty participating in CTL ePortfolio pedagogy programs) said “often” or “very often,” compared to the national norm of 59% (10.05.02 CTL Data Summary). For the next semester (spring) retention rate, the figures are 82.1% for ePortfolio students, compared to 70.4% for non-ePortfolio courses.

Overall, the course pass rate in PQL classes is 54.7%, compared to 47.6% in non-PQL classes. The COMPASS pass rate for MAT 095 is 9 percentage points higher for PQL classes than comparison classes. The MAT 115 course pass rate for PQL courses is 10% higher than comparison classes. Outcomes for MAT 096 have not shown the same positive movement before 2009. However, PQL MAT 096 sections are doing much better in 2010 Fall (10.05.37 PQL Report 3-31-11).

Table 5.8 Survey Responses from Project Quantum Leap Students, Spring 2009 (10.05.15 CTL Report Summary, 2-11-2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PQL Classes</th>
<th>Non-PQL Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find math interesting and enjoyable. % responding &quot;Agree&quot; or &quot;Strongly Agree&quot;</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident writing reports using math data as evidence. % responding “Agree” or “Strongly Agree”</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much has your experience contributed to knowledge, skills, and personal developments in thinking critically and effectively? % responding “Quite a bit” or “Very much”</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.9 Pass Rates for Project Quantum Leap Courses (MAT 095, 115)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAT 095 COMPASS Pass Rate, 2008-9</th>
<th>PQL Classes</th>
<th>Non-PQL Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89.5%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAT095 Course Pass Rate, 2008-9</th>
<th>PQL Classes</th>
<th>Non-PQL Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAT 095 Rate of Exiting Basic Skills, 2008-9</th>
<th>PQL Classes</th>
<th>Non-PQL Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAT 115 Course Pass Rate, 2008-9</th>
<th>PQL Classes</th>
<th>Non-PQL Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.10 Pass Rates for Project Quantum Leap Courses (MAT 096)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAT096 Course Pass Rate, 2008-9</th>
<th>PQL Classes</th>
<th>Non-PQL Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAT 096 COMPASS Pass Rate, 2008-9</th>
<th>PQL Classes</th>
<th>Non-PQL Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MAT 096 Rate of Exiting Basic Skills, 2008-9</th>
<th>PQL Classes</th>
<th>Non-PQL Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 5.9

EDIT Funding
Table 5.13 Summary of EDIT application from Spring 2007 to Spring 2010 (10.05.17 EDIT Application Fall 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007 Spring</th>
<th>2007 Fall</th>
<th>2008 Spring</th>
<th>2008 Fall</th>
<th>2009 Spring</th>
<th>2009 Fall</th>
<th>2010 Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number received</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number funded</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total funds allocated</td>
<td>$9,070</td>
<td>$11,180</td>
<td>$14,934</td>
<td>$8,944</td>
<td>$8,854</td>
<td>$5,244</td>
<td>$12,678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 5.10

PATH Analysis
Table 5.11 Faculty PATH Survey Responses, 2009 (01.5.08 CUPA Presentation PATH)

Table 5.12 Faculty PATH survey responses, 2010 (01.5.08 CUPA Presentation PATH)
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PATH 2010 Overall Program Evaluation – 10 Responses to date

Appendix 5.11

Workshop Participation
Table 5.14 Faculty/Staff Participation in DegreeWorks Trainings (10.07.04 Faculty Training-DegreeWorks 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Faculty/Staff Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 2008</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2009</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2010</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15 Faculty Participation in Art of Advising Seminars (09.1.155 Art of Advising Faculty Attendance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Faculty Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2009</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 6.1

New and Revised Programs 2007-2011

New Programs

Music Recording Technology  2007
Writing and Literature  2007
Radiology Technology  2008
Digital Media Arts  2008
Criminal Justice  2008
Spanish Translation  2009
Philosophy  2009
Communications  2009
Industrial Design Technology  2010
Biology  2010
Environmental Science  2010

Revised Programs

Education – The Bilingual Child  2007
Business Administration  2008
Travel Tourism & Hospitality Mgmt  2008
Occupational Therapy Assistant  2008
Teacher Education – Social Studies  2008
Accounting AS  2009
Veterinary Technology  2010
Practical Nursing  2010
Liberal Arts: Soc. Sci. & Hum.  2011
Food Service Management  2011
Human Services  2011
Engineering Science: Civil Engineering  2011
Engineering Science: Electrical Engineering  2011
Engineering Science: Mechanical Engineering  2011

Appendix 6.2

LaGuardia New Program Development Process

1. Preliminary Collaboration: The Assistant Dean of Academic Affairs for Program Development and Evaluation consults widely about potential new programs with faculty, department chairs, and the CUNY Office of Program Review, Articulation, and Transfer. Before moving forward on a program, the Assistant Dean considers numerous factors, including the disciplinary interests of LaGuardia faculty, advancements in the field, potential student demand, equipment issues, potential revenue streams to support the
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program, existing CUNY programs, and possible transfer and articulation partnerships with four-year colleges. Other considerations include whether a program would build on LaGuardia’s existing faculty and space, and whether it would articulate well with the Division of Adult and Continuing Education (ACE).

2. The Letter of Intent: Once the decision is made to move forward, the relevant LaGuardia department prepares a Letter of Intent (LOI). As specified in the CUNY Basic Guidelines for New Programs, the LOI must specify the program’s purpose, educational and employment objectives, regional and national need and justification, student interest and enrollment expectations, curricular requirements, articulation agreements, the role of new and existing faculty, and anticipated costs and revenues for at least five years (11.3.89 Basic Guidelines for New Programs-CUNY 2010). The LOIs for two recently approved programs demonstrate how the process incorporates creative responses to changes in student population, technology, and the global economy, as required by the College’s mission. The LOI for Spanish Translation (AA) cites research about the expansion of Latino businesses in the United States and the need for Spanish/English translation skills (11.3.81 LOI Spanish Translation), while the LOI for Industrial Design (AAS) points to data indicating employment opportunities in manufacturing for first generation immigrants, as well as recent advances in design technology (11.3.83 LOI Design).

3. Role of College Governance: The LOI is sent to the College-wide Curriculum Committee (CWCC), the committee of the College Senate “concerned with all aspects of the formulation, development, evaluation, and modification of course and program proposals” (04.1.04 LaGCC Governance Plan). Guided by LaGuardia’s Handbook of Policy and Procedures on Curriculum (11.3.01 Handbook on Curriculum 10-27-08), the CWCC is comprised of one member of each academic department, the Registrar, and ACE. If approved by the CWCC, the LOI is sent to the College Senate for review. If approved by the College Senate, the LOI is sent to the CUNY Office of Program Review, Articulation and Transfer, which distributes the LOI to all CUNY campuses for review. If no objections are raised, the CUNY Executive Vice Chancellor provides President Mellow with approval to move forward with a full program proposal.

4. Preparation of the Comprehensive Program Proposal: According to the CUNY Basic Guidelines, proposals must include: relation to the college mission, evidence of student interest (including questionnaire results), detailed plans for student recruitment and advisement, projected enrollment, a two-year course sequence, new courses, and current and anticipated new faculty. In addition, there must be articulation agreements for all AA and AS program to ensure the maximum number of transfer credits, cost projections over five years, revenue sources, and internal evaluation procedures for the first five years. CUNY requires that these evaluation procedures include a description of desired student outcomes and the measures that will be used to assess these outcomes, which helps ensure that new programs contain appropriate learning objectives (11.3.89 Basic Guidelines for New Programs-CUNY 2010).

5. Final Steps: The program proposal is submitted to the CWCC and the College Senate for review. If approved, the proposal is submitted to the CUNY Committee on Academic Policy, Programs, and Research (CAPPR) for review. Finally, if approved by CAPPR, the program is presented at a CUNY Board of Trustees Meeting. If approved, the program is sent to the New York State Education Department (NYSED) for official registration. At that time, a NYSED program code is assigned, the program is added to
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the State Inventory of Registered Programs, and the NYSED assigns an official Higher
Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) code based on the program’s academic
area.

6. Implementation: Using a checklist, the Assistant Dean for Program Development
communicates with all relevant parties at LaGuardia and CUNY to ensure that the new
program is smoothly implemented. The division of Academic Affairs uses the strategic
planning process to assure that responsibilities are assigned and that periodic reports are
available to the College on the progress of program implementation.

Appendix 6.3
Curricular Revisions
The College-wide Curriculum Committee and College Senate actions regarding curricular
revisions are sent to the CUNY Board of Trustees for inclusion in the Chancellor’s Report
(11.3.02 Chancellor's Report) approximately four times per year. These revisions typically
include the following kinds of changes: (a) pre-requisites, co-requisites, credit values, and
pedagogical modifications, such as updated instructional and performance objectives and
enhanced use of technology; (b) changes in standardized testing; (c) compliance with
accreditation guidelines, such as revisions in the AAS Veterinary Technology Program (11.3.02
Chancellor's Report, June 2010); (d) improvements in articulation with four-year colleges, such
as revisions in the Liberal Arts: Social Science and Humanities Program (AA) (11.3.02
Chancellor's Report, April 2009); (e) focusing of electives towards specific concentrations, such
as in the Business Management: Entrepreneurship Program (AAS) (11.3.02 Chancellor's Report,
February 2009); and (f) changes in program structure such as moving the Human Services: Deaf
Studies Program from the Health Sciences Department to the Education and Language
Acquisition Department. In addition, programs are sometimes discontinued based on changes in
the field, changes in technology, or enrollment declines. Since 2007, the following programs
have been closed: Business Management: Finance (AAS); Microcomputer Systems and
Applications; Administrative Assistant (11.3.02 Chancellor's Report, January 2010); Joint
Accounting/Computer Option in Accounting (AAS) (11.3.02 Chancellor's Report, June 2010);
Digital Photography Option; and Mortuary Science.

Appendix 6.4
Enrollment by Degree Type Fall 2005 to Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. in Applied Sci</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>4,971</td>
<td>5,290</td>
<td>5,391</td>
<td>5,929</td>
<td>5,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate in Science</td>
<td>2,622</td>
<td>3,058</td>
<td>3,312</td>
<td>3,465</td>
<td>3,854</td>
<td>5,394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate in Arts</td>
<td>3,575</td>
<td>3,501</td>
<td>3,724</td>
<td>3,939</td>
<td>4,435</td>
<td>4,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Programs</td>
<td>11,396</td>
<td>11,972</td>
<td>12,801</td>
<td>13,310</td>
<td>14,912</td>
<td>15,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Degree</td>
<td>2,093</td>
<td>2,213</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>2,230</td>
<td>2,116</td>
<td>2,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>13,489</td>
<td>14,185</td>
<td>15,169</td>
<td>15,540</td>
<td>17,028</td>
<td>17,569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(11.1.03 2011 Institutional Profile)
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Appendix 6.5

Academic Preparation for Transfer to Baccalaureate Programs

- 57% of LaGuardia’s 2004-2009 graduating classes achieved a GPA of 3.00 or better, while 43% achieved a GPA of 2.00-2.99.
- LaGuardia’s one-year transfer rate for 2004-05 through 2008-09 averaged 40% (38-42%) (11.1.02 2010 Institutional Profile).
- The percentage of LaGuardia AA/AS graduates who transferred to CUNY baccalaureate programs increased from 46.3% in 2006-2007 to 50.7% in 2008-2009, which exceeds the CUNY community college average of 50%. There was a slight decrease to 50.1% in 2009-2010 (07.4.08 LaGCC Year-End PMP 09-10) (02.1.10 University PMP 10-11 Preliminary 6-9-11). The national average is 23% (11.1.02 2010 Institutional Profile).
- One-year after graduation, 2004-05 through 2008-09, 41% of graduates had entered senior colleges as follows (11.1.02 2010 Institutional Profile): 23.5% Queens; 17.9% Baruch; 11.1% Hunter; 6.8% York; 2.4% SUNY; 8.4% private/other.

Appendix 6.6

Pass Rates on Allied Health Certification Exams
Program directors check professional organization websites for licensure/certificate information and updates on graduate performance on national and statewide exams. Some programs receive information directly from their accreditation organization.

1. Graduates of the Registered Nurse Program sit for the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN). The 2010 pass rate was 79%, slightly below the New York State rate (NYSED NCLEX-RN).
2. Graduates of the Licensed Practical Nurse Program sit for the National Council Licensure Examination for Practical Nurses (NCLEX-PN). The 2010 pass rate was 89.96%, significantly higher than the New York State pass rate of 78.40% (NYSED NCLEX-PN).
3. Graduates of the Physical Therapist Assistant Program sit for the National Physical Therapist Assistant Examination. The three-year pass rate (2008-2010) was 88%, which surpasses the accrediting agency’s required pass rate of 80%.
4. Graduates of the Veterinary Technician Program sit for the Veterinary Technician National Examination (VTNE). The 2010 pass rate for LaGuardia graduates was 100%.
5. Graduates of the Occupational Therapy Assistant Program are not required to sit for the national certification exam for employment, so only a small number take the exam. The 2010 pass rate was 74% on the certification exam administered by the National Board for Certification in Occupational Therapy (NBCOT).
6. Graduates of the Dietetic Technician Program are not required to sit for the national registration exam for employment, so only a small number take the exam. The 2010 pass rate was 44% on the Dietetic Technician Registration Exam administered by the Commission on Dietetic Registration.
7. Graduates of the Paramedic Program sit for the New York State Written Paramedic Exam. The 2010 pass rate for LaGuardia graduates was 100%.
8. The Radiologic Technology Program accepted its first cohort of students in Fall 2010. The first class of students will graduate in September 2011.

Appendix 6.7

Examples of Allied Health Curricular Revision
Three examples illustrate how recent changes in allied health program curricula are based on assessment linked to employability of graduates. Based on outside evaluator reports, the Foodservice Management Program and the Dietetic Technician Program were revised effective Fall 2011. Course offerings in Foodservice Management were changed to reflect current trends in the foodservice industry such as environmental issues, organic and natural foods, regional food options, and cultural awareness. In order to improve graduation and test pass rates, the Dietetic Technician Program adopted a candidacy process, which has been effective at increasing student success in most of the other Health Sciences majors. The integration of candidacy for Dietetic Technician students prior to acceptance into the clinical phase of the program will permit the development of a strong cohort of students who can progress through the program in a timely manner, and who are capable of mastering programmatic competencies.

Finally, to reflect changes in accreditation standards, in Fall 2010 the Veterinary Technician Program added two new courses (SCV 247 Pathophysiology and SCV 262 Pharmacology/Toxicology) and two electives became required courses (SCV 150 Animal Control and SCV 220 Exotic Animal Medicine). In addition, the general education requirements were changed to include a Math course, an Urban Studies course to complete a Social Science requirement. The program also began to take responsibility for the two fieldwork experiences required for students to complete the program. All the changes required an increase in total program credit requirements from 60 to 65, which was approved by New York State Education Department.

Appendix 6.8

Library Statistical Snapshot

The following table compares snapshots of the Library’s services and collections in academic years 2005/2006 and 2008/2009, using statistics from the College’s Institutional Profile 2010 (11.1.02, p. 56), except where otherwise noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Services and Collections</th>
<th>2005-2006</th>
<th>2008-2009</th>
<th>% increase (+) or decrease (-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Attendance</td>
<td>768,169</td>
<td>820,767</td>
<td>+6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005/06</th>
<th>2006/07</th>
<th>Change 2006/07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one-hour classes</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>+0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students</td>
<td>10,225</td>
<td>11,191</td>
<td>+9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Questions per Typical Week</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>+2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Consultations</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>+34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general collection</td>
<td>33,232</td>
<td>36,483</td>
<td>+9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reserve collection</td>
<td>37,823</td>
<td>50,950</td>
<td>+34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lab use</td>
<td>35,888**</td>
<td>50,480</td>
<td>+40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deliveries of equipment</td>
<td>31,900</td>
<td>23,702</td>
<td>-25.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>videotapings and audiotapings</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>2,311</td>
<td>+288.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provided</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLICS (intra-CUNY ILL)**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provided</td>
<td>1207(2007/08)</td>
<td>1984(2009/10)</td>
<td>+64.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>received</td>
<td>879(2007/08)</td>
<td>1022(2009/10)</td>
<td>+16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printed books (titles)</td>
<td>119,248</td>
<td>131,314</td>
<td>+10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eResources (e-books and full-text serials in databases)**</td>
<td>(37,940?)</td>
<td>(99,655?)</td>
<td>+162.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printed serial subscriptions</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>-51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government documents (titles)</td>
<td>7,405</td>
<td>7,309</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Archives (linear feet)</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>1,052</td>
<td>+59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Visits</td>
<td>487,874d</td>
<td>1,100,191e</td>
<td>+125.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*statistic corrected 11/2010
**statistic updated in 2007 PPR
Source: doc, 11.6.12
(http://www.cuny.edu/about/administration/offices/OLS/LibsStats.html)
Estimates: see discussion below
Source: WebTrends
Source: Google Analytics

While the number of reference questions has not risen very much, the questions are often more complex than in the past, perhaps reflecting the growing complexity of the information universe. Since 2004, students have the option of making an appointment for an individual research consultation of about a half-hour to deal with difficult research questions. The number of requests rose from 98 in 2005/2006 to 132 in 2008/2009, an increase of 34.7% (11.6.12 Library Research Consultation Statistics). Since Fall 2009, during Fall and Spring Statistics Weeks, the Library has kept track of the number of complex questions asked on a walk-in basis at the Reference Desk. Forty-six (46) such questions (6.9%) were asked in the Fall 2009 Stats Week;
thirty-four (34) complex questions (6.8%) in the Spring 2010 Stats Week (11.6.01 Library Stats Summary Sp10, p. 8).

The delivery of equipment to the classroom by Media Services is still an important service but it has declined substantially because of the conversion of most classrooms at the College to Smart classrooms equipped with a console PC and a projector, and the increasing availability of streaming video. The LaGuardia Library began digitizing video materials in 2008 and currently has on its server 474 items available for streaming to Smart classrooms. Statistics for November 1, 2009 through October 31, 2010 show that 421 items were viewed a total of 5,757 times (11.6.13 Lib Use Stats for Streaming Media 11-09 to 10-10).

Requests for videotapings and audiotapings, for pedagogical purposes and to meet assessment requirements, have mushroomed (up 288.4%).

The Library’s laptop loan program is extremely popular and the number of laptops available has grown to 75. The LaGuardia Foundation will be funding 25 more machines in 2011 and Student Government has pledged funds for another 50. In another successful initiative, the Library also loans graphing calculators (30). In Fall I 2010, the Library conducted a study of the use of SONY ebook readers in a Human Services class (HSN103) of 28 students. Course readings were loaded on the SONY readers and they were checked out to the students for the full semester. At the end of the semester, the students completed an online survey of their reactions to using the readers. Analysis of the survey data will take place in Fall II. This pilot study fulfills one of the Library’s Strategic Plan goals for 2010-2011.

Circulation of print books has risen a modest 9.8% (compared to the FTE increase of 29% (11.1.02 Profile 2010, p. 13)). For academic year 2009-2010, the Library received CUNY funding to help mitigate the problem of high textbook prices by buying extra copies of heavily used books and placing them on three-day Reserve loan. A total of 678 print volumes (440 titles) were purchased (11.6.20 Textbook Initiative Report, 6-28-10). Reserve loans and renewals of materials purchased with the textbook funding totaled over 19,000 (11.6.01 Library Stats Summary Sp10, p. 13). Given that reserve loans and renewals from 2005-2006 to 2008-2009 averaged about 46,000 (11.1.02 Profile 2010, p. 56), the textbook initiative seems to represent a substantial increase in service to students, although data for precise analysis is not yet available. Certainly, the non-renewal of the program is to be regretted.

The Library has also begun tracking the use of electronic books: the largest database of e-books, ebrary, which became available to Library patrons in January 2010, saw 120,425 uses from January through November 2010 (11.6.19 ebrary Report, Jan-Nov 2010). The rapidity of increase in use is evident from the fact that May figures stood at 50,000, October figures at 76,000. On the relative size of the print and e-book collections, see “Collections” section below.

Interlibrary loan (ILL), the program whereby faculty and staff and Phi Theta Kappa students can borrow materials from any other participating library, has been augmented since 2006 by the CUNY Libraries Inter-Campus Services (CLICS), which allows all CUNY-affiliated faculty, staff, and students to request materials from other CUNY schools for delivery within 3 or 4 days to their home campus. CLICS requests can be made online, 24/7. The number of traditional ILL
loans provided has remained more or less stable, while CLICS loans provided have increased dramatically as students across CUNY have become aware of the service available to them. The equally dramatic decline in ILL received may be attributable to faculty realization that CLICS materials are available to them on a more timely basis than via traditional ILL. The LaGuardia Library consistently loans more materials than it borrows. A new ILL service (ILLiad), with added functionality, was implemented in 2009. Limited service to students will be piloted in Spring 2011.

While the increase in the number of printed books in the LaGuardia Library collection has risen by 10.1%, e-resources have risen by an estimated 162.7%. The numbers for e-resources in the table above are estimates and vary from data in the 2010 Institutional Profile (11.1.02 Profile 2010, p. 56) because each set of numbers represent varying ways of counting electronic library resources. The numbers in the table above use the current standard: they include the number of electronic books and the number of electronic serial titles represented in the Library’s subscription databases. The LaGuardia Library has been working with the CUNY Office of Library Services to invest in cost-effective electronic resources. As more electronic books and serials are made available it follows that fewer print books and serial subscriptions are being purchased. The number of print subscriptions has been reduced by 51%.

The Institutional Archives continues to add documents from retiring faculty and re-organized departments, but in addition to increasing the number of linear feet of materials that it houses, Archives has undertaken projects to digitize College catalogs and early bulletins to improve access and to preserve the paper copies of these unique documents of College history. The next phase of digitization will include selected materials from early College history, photographs, and Cooperative Education documents. The materials thus far digitized are available to the public in the CUNY DSpace depository at <http://dspace.nitle.org/handle/10090/438>. Archives answers numerous questions about the history of the College and is currently providing resources for the 40th-anniversary celebration of the College in 2011.
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Appendix 6.9

Library Budget

The 2010-2011 budget posed several challenges. The Library had to cancel three database subscriptions. Some programs, notably the Paralegal program, have accreditation requirements which include standing orders for very expensive library materials. To help sustain the Paralegal program, the Library collaborated with the Chair of the Business and Technology department to negotiate a $5,000 reduction from Westlaw for its subscription database for the academic year 2010-2011.

The cost per title for academic titles in print rises steadily (Library and Book Trade Almanac, 2009, p. 486-87), limiting what the Library can add to the shelves. The price of print periodicals has risen even more dramatically. The latter are relatively lightly used as students and faculty...
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rely more and more on full-text databases; hence, the Library will be cancelling some print subscriptions in 2011-2012.

Some funding has been made available for computer hardware. In summer of 2010, Library staff had their seven-year old office computers replaced. The student machines are dependent on the availability of Student Technology Fee money. The Library’s laptops, which were out of warranty, have been replaced, and the number available for circulation continues to increase. All study carrels have been electrified to increase the number of opportunities for students to work with their own laptops and netbooks. The number of computer workstations (174) was unchanged from 2005-2006 to 2008-2009 (11.1.02).

With the budget allocated to Media Services, the Library can repair but not upgrade broken equipment, and little money is available for adding materials to the collection. The Library is nevertheless trying to provide new services, including the circulation of graphing calculators, acquired for free from a CUNY-wide initiative; digitizing materials for streaming video, facilitated by the purchase, using Library funds, of a computer server to support the work; and piloting the use of SONY ebook readers, 30 of which the Library was able to buy using funds from CUNY’s 2009-2010 textbook/ebook initiative.

Appendix 6.10

Volumes per Student in Library’s collections

2005-2006: printed books = 119,248
No. of books per student = 8.8
No. of books per FTE student = 11.8
2008-2009: printed books = 131,314
No. of books per student = 7.7
No. of books per FTE student = 10.1

Appendix 6.11

New Developments in the Library’s Information Literacy Program

The library offers three courses for credit, LRC 102, 103, and 104. LRC 102, Information Strategies (3 credits), was completed by 94 students in Fall 2007 through Spring 2010 with a 75% pass rate. Since Spring 2006, LRC 102 has been taught only in learning communities. LRC 103, Internet Research Strategies (1 credit), was completed by 928 students Fall 2007 through Spring 2010 with an 91% pass rate. The first online section was offered in Fall 2007; eleven have run through Fall 2010. LRC 103 is one of very few courses offered at LaGuardia in fully online as well as traditional face-to-face sections. Both LRC 102 and LRC 103 qualify as Liberal Arts electives and both have been taught in learning communities. LRC 104, Information in a Globalizing World (2 credits), also a Liberal Arts elective, was passed by College-wide Curriculum Committee in November 2010 and was offered in Fall 2011 (course proposal,
Appendices
LaGuardia Community College Accreditation Self-Study
Middle States Commission on Higher Education
11.6.09). LRC 104 helps students examine information critically (11.6.22 LRC Completion and Pass Rates 07-10).

Appendix 6.12
Overview of Library Assessment

For a history of the Library’s efforts to assess the information literacy (IL) of LaGuardia students, particularly its homegrown IL rubric, see the 2007 Periodic Program Review (07.5.01, p. 4-17). Library faculty could not come to consensus on the application of the rubric to student work. In the two ensuing years, the Library experimented with standardized testing of the iSkills exam of the Educational Testing Service, and the Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS) exam, developed at Kent State University. The results of these experiments were inconclusive (11.6.15) (11.6.16) (11.6.17). In Fall 2010, the Library began piloting a rubric that will assess only web evaluation skills and only in student work produced for the Library’s one-credit Internet Research Strategies course, LRC103. In the meantime, the College has adapted an IL rubric developed by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (see copy of the rubric on the College’s Outcomes Assessment website: http://www.lagcc.cuny.edu/uploadedFiles/T2/assessment/docs/Research_%20Information_Literacy.PDF). In January 2011, faculty from across the College used the rubric to assess LaGuardia students’ IL competencies (See Chapter 8).

For analysis of the student satisfaction surveys administered during Library Stats Weeks, see (07.4.39) (Spring 2009), (07.4.40) (Fall 2009), (11.6.18) (Spring 2010) and (11.6.21) (Fall 2010). The 2010 CUNY-wide Student Experience Survey provides comparative statistics of satisfaction with Library facilities, services, and collections at all the schools of CUNY (07.3.11).

Other assessment measures include the following:

1. Course-related library instruction: Some scheduling problems, missed classes, late receipt of faculty assignments, and the perceived need for an efficient way to inform new English faculty members about library instruction led Library faculty to search for a way to improve communication with discipline faculty. The result is an “instruction menu,” a checklist of potential content for course-related one-hour classes. In a pilot project in Fall II 2010 and Spring I 2011), English 101 faculty were asked to complete the form and Library faculty followed up by phone or e-mail when planning their presentations. Analysis of the results of the pilot effort will be done during Spring II and the Library faculty will meet to decide whether to expand the administration of the instruction menu, change it in some way, or abandon it.

2. Statistics of reference volume collected during Stats week in Spring 2010 (11.6.01) confirmed the effectiveness of our reference staffing model and level and, therefore, for the moment, they remain unchanged.

3. “Satellite reference” is currently being tested in the computer lab in the “B” Building (B333), which holds 215 machines and is very crowded at peak times of the semester. Library faculty
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have been offering reference service in B333 for several hours per week. The results of the pilot test will be analyzed after Spring I 2011 with a view to deciding what level of service, if any, to offer in Fall I 2011. “Satellite reference” fulfills one of the Library’s Strategic Plan goals for 2010-2011.

3. Comments on student satisfaction surveys from Spring 2009 through Spring 2010 (07.4.39) (07.4.40) (11.6.18) have led the Library to improve copy machine service.

4. The streaming video program is the outcome of the availability of the technology for digitizing media and screening it in Smart Classrooms, made attractive by the difficulties of delivering video resources and equipment to classrooms across campus. See usage statistics (11.6.13).

5. The results of the Library’s Web usability studies were used to make changes to the Library’s website.

6. Other initiatives that are responses to anecdotal needs assessment by librarians and to open-ended comments on Stats Week surveys include one-on-one research consultations (11.6.12), loans of laptops, calculators, and e-readers, and purchase of additional textbooks and their circulation on three-day loan.

Appendix 6.13

Tutoring Facilities and Support

Academic ESL Lab
Although the main function of the ESL Lab is to provide mandatory scheduled tutorial large group settings in support of ESL classes, the ESL lab also offers non-mandatory tutoring geared towards further developing students’ English language skills in a supportive, individual setting to students enrolled in ESL courses. Students sign up for an appointment online or in person in the department office or ESL lab itself. Sessions are individual and are 30 to 45 minutes long. Staffing consists of one or two tutors each period. Students are invited to bring marked essays or other assignments such as journals for short stories, articles or grammar questions. Students can also receive help with non-essay writing assignments such as reading, elements of grammar, oral presentations, or pronunciation. Students taking ENG 099, ENG 101, ENG 102 or other academic courses who still have ESL problems may also attend the ESL lab with a referral from their instructors or from the Writing Center. Students may receive a drop-in session only when a scheduled student is absent.

ESL non-mandatory tutoring serves a small fraction of the total students taking ESL classes. In Fall I, 2010, 76 ESL students (plus four ENG students) received 244 sessions, although 1,133 students took ESL classes. The ESL Lab reports that the demand for individual tutoring surges after midterms and continues to increase nearing finals, both budgetary limitations and the near-impossibility of temporarily increasing staff size preclude meeting that demand.

Extensive student evaluation (11.6.39 ESL Lab Survey), with careful analysis of its results
Academic Peer Instruction (API)

Academic Peer Instruction (API) is a peer tutoring program that targets difficult or “high risk” students in non-remedial courses with a previous D, F and W rate of 25% or more. API provides a minimum of three scheduled weekly drop-in tutorial study groups facilitated by carefully trained LaGuardia peer tutors (11.6.54 API Schedule) for each course it supports. Sessions last from one to two hours, with a tutor –student ratio ranging from individual and small group, 1:3 or 4, to 1:20. The emphasis in tutors’ work is getting students to become active, participatory learners so that they become more successful students. Modeled after the nationally recognized Supplemental Instruction program, a wide array of courses receive support through API, including but not limited to Anatomy and Physiology, Principles of Accounting, Chemistry, Calculus, Economics, Technical Mathematics, Philosophy, Psychology, and Statistics.

From Spring 2010 through Fall II, 2010, 1,058 students attended API sessions three or more times, almost 10% more than the previous four semesters, 965 (11.6.55 AOU Statistics 1993-2010). In Fall I, 2010, the 353 students who attended represented approximately one third, 34%, of the total students (1,026) taking the course sections served (11.6.56 API Pct of Users from Classes). API maintains data on both student evaluations and grade point differentials between program users and non-users, and the results for both are impressive. In Fall I, 2010, 94% of all API students rated their sessions as “good” or “excellent (11.6.57 API Student Evaluation Means),” offering numerous additional positive comments on their tutors (11.6.57B API Student Evaluation Comments). Although outcomes measurements usually do not reveal significant differences between users and non-users of tutoring programs, students who attended API sessions three or more times averaged .75 higher grades than their classmates in Fall I, 2010. Even more impressively, this positive differential extends back through the life of the program, starting in 1993 (11.6.55 AOU Statistics 1993-2010).

API also provides a meaningful, sometimes inspiring, experience for the students who go through its training program and then serve as peer tutors, a number of whom choose to go on in various avenues of academics to become career educators themselves. So, both its impact on its staff and its clients, API supports the LaGuardia missions of “providing extensive support services,” of “offering career as well as liberal arts and science curricula,” and “upholding high standards through a focus on program assessment and innovative approaches to learning” (01.1.03 Mission Statement).

Computer Tutoring

LaGuardia offers considerable tutorial support for computer utilization through ongoing workshops sponsored by IT and by peer tutors located in the computer study hall, the B Building Study Hall, along with area-specific tutorial support provided in the Accounting lab and the
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Math Lab (discussed in their respective sections). In doing so, the College fulfills its mission to “respond creatively to changes in student population (and) technology (01.1.03 Mission Statement).” The IT workshops provide students with direct training in an array of computer programs and functions, including Word 2007 Level I, II, and III, Blackboard Orientation, Computer Basics Level I and Level II, Excel 2007 Level I, II, and III, Access 2007 Level I and Level II, Dreamweaver (Web Design) Level I and Level II, Fireworks Level I, II, and III, Photoshop Level I, PowerPoint 2007 Level I, and Windows 7 Level I. Students are informed of these workshops by repeated emailing. Although the B Building Study Hall is an open computer lab hosting 220 computers available to students for their schoolwork seven days a week, it also provides two (on average) peer tutors for actual computer tutoring (separate from technical/mechanical problems, for which there is a staff of laboratory technicians). Student-tutor interactions are relatively short, generally ranging from two to fifteen minutes, and covering any aspect of how to use computers and computer programs for which a student requests help.

IT staff involved in computer tutoring include 1 full-time IT training coordinator, one part-time technical coordinator, and three part-time trainers, along with twelve peer tutors available for tutoring in the B Building Study. Tutor-student interactions in the study hall are usually individual. Workshop attendance varies, but tends to average between nineteen and twenty-four students per session. Since July 2010 there have been 158 workshops attended by total of 3784 students, averaging 24 students per session, with 108 workshops and 2105 students averaging 19 students per session in 2011 (11.6.60 IT Workshops). A massive number of students use the B Building Study Hall each semester; although the total number is not tabulated, sample single-day utilization figures provide a picture of the volume of student demand, with from twelve hundred to over fifteen hundred per day attending mid-week (11.6.61 Computer Study Hall Utilization). A small percentage of the students in attendance request tutorial support, which is not recorded.

IT administers an evaluation of each workshop (11.6.64 IT ISMD's Workshop Survey). Categories of evaluation include organization and clarity of content, clarity of instructor’s speech, pace of material, instructor knowledge of material, and responsiveness of instructor. IT workshop evaluation results are almost entirely positive (11.6.64 IT ISMD's Workshop Survey).

Although the volume of students using the B Building Study Hall makes ongoing recording prohibitive, it might be useful to attempt to record a sample of requests for tutorial assistance, along with student evaluations, perhaps for a few days in a term.

The Mathematics Tutoring Center (Math Lab)
The Mathematics Tutoring Center offers non-mandatory tutoring on an open-lab, walk-in basis for any level of mathematics, providing assistance with homework, courses, and projects. Walk-in students work individually or in small groups, calling over tutors for assistance as needed. The average time a tutor spends per student is 15 to 20 minutes per “contact;” tutors may have several “contacts” with the same student during a visit. Visits range widely in length, but tend to average one hour. The lab can, and often does, accommodate as many as forty to fifty students per hour.

The Math Lab conducts scheduled walk-in during midterm and final exams, and compass reviews for small groups of students from MAT 095 and MAT 096. The lab also runs small
group tutoring for higher-level math courses including MAT 115, MAT 120, MAT 200, MAT 201, MAT 202, and MAT 203. Online tutoring is also available; eTutors and students share a live workspace in which they communicate using chat, voice and video, whiteboard, file sharing, and application sharing. In addition, mandatory laboratory tutoring is offered for basic skills classes, MAT 095, MAT 096. Special sections of MAT 096 for students who have repeated the course two or more times include in-class and online tutoring.

Tutors of the computer lab also help students to master computer software needed to do their projects during open labs, in addition to providing technical support to instructors during computer lab sessions.

The Math Lab has made significant strides in the past two years in its collection of utilization and client evaluation data. Having faced assorted difficulties in recording student attendance on entry because of its open lab walk-in system, two years ago the lab instituted a system using a “Follow-Up Sheet” that students must sign at the point of getting help from any tutor. With this device the lab records actual interventions, referred to as “contacts,” with students (11.6.47 Math Lab Utilization and Staffing). While this system does not obtain the actual number of students attending, it is clear from this data that the Math Lab sees an enormous quantity of students per term, with 14,492 contacts in Fall I, 2010, and the student-tutor ratio is unfortunately rising, with a 7:1 ratio in Fall I, 2009 against an 11:1 ratio in Fall I, 2010. These numbers are consistent with student evaluation data (11.6.23 Math Lab Student Evaluation), with 79% responding that there were not enough tutors on the floor to assist them, 52% responding that the amount of tutoring they received was insufficient (also 11.6.26 amount of tutoring received), and only 33% receiving help within 15 minutes of their request (also 11.6.24 waiting time). Effectiveness ratings were considerably better, particularly given the time constraints under which Math Lab tutors operate: 84% found the tutoring helpful, 83% of students felt their tutors respected them, 71% reported tutors’ command of subject matter as effective, 71% found the quality of explanation received from tutors good or excellent, 67% improved their grades, and an impressive 61% thought they might have dropped out without tutoring.

The Reading Lab
While the primary focus of the reading lab is to act as an extension of the reading courses, the lab also offers drop-in tutoring in the form of a variety of weekly workshops and designated tutorials. The Reading Lab supports the mission of LaGuardia Community College by providing academic support services and learning opportunities with a focus on the core competency of critical literacy. The Reading Lab attempts to be a comprehensive service; tutors work with students on strategies that will aid in the comprehension of reading assignments for all content area courses, and help students develop the critical reading (and thinking) skills needed in upper level courses. Tutoring sessions are also held with a specific focus on reading comprehension, vocabulary improvement, locating main ideas, major/minor supporting details, paraphrasing skills to be used in summary writing and term papers for reading courses.

The lab offers scheduled time for additional tutoring needed by students in CSE 095 or CSE 099; there are make-up lab sessions scheduled for students who miss a required lab class (students are given one week to make up any of three missed labs); and voluntary, walk-in tutoring services are available in the Reading Lab as well.
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The Lab has also scheduled hours for ACT test review, a high stakes exam currently used to exit from developmental reading courses at the College. Review sessions frequently utilize the practice computer ACT examinations created by the Communications Skills Department faculty, as well as on-paper practice exams and reading materials available in the lab. Students work with tutors to gain an understanding of reading passages and reading strategies needed to pass this examination.

Utilization of non-mandatory tutoring at the Reading Lab has increased by almost 36%, from 331 in Fall I, 2008 to 515 students in Fall I, 2010 (11.6.41 Reading Lab Utilization). This increase occurred exactly as the lab offered additional drop-in tutoring hours in response to past student evaluations of the mandatory scheduled tutorial lab program in which students requested more time to work in the lab. The lab now offers twenty-seven periods of tutorials with a student-tutor ratio that varies 5-10:1. Although the mandatory lab evaluation does reveal considerable positive regard for the whole-class labs (11.6.40 Reading Lab Student Eval and Comments), a survey form is needed and has been created to collect student feedback on non-mandatory tutorial services, to be implemented in Spring I, 2011.

The Reading Lab should scrutinize the responses to its new student evaluation of non-mandatory tutoring to help determine whether the increase in availability is sufficient and whether the focuses of the specific workshops offered do meet the students’ needs, as well as to help assess the actual effectiveness of the tutoring itself in each of its offerings.

The Writing Center
The Writing Center offers individualized tutoring to all enrolled LaGuardia students in any course past the ESL level. Writing Center tutoring addresses all phases and areas of writing, from essay planning, rhetorical strategies, grammar and proofreading to citation issues, research techniques, scholarship, college transfer essay and resume writing. The Writing Center provides a structured drop-in system, with sessions available each class period at a maximum student-tutor ratio of 2:1. The Writing Center supports both students who need long-term intervention in a matrix of writing problems, and students who seek only short term work on a single project or issue. The majority, 59%, of the 6,530 students served in 2009-2010 were taking an English class while seeking tutoring; 30% (1,952 students) sought help with writing for courses across the curriculum, such as Sociology, Business Management, Human Services, Critical Thinking etc., and 11% (716) sought tutoring in preparation for the standardized CUNY writing tests, the ACT (now the CATW) and the CPE (Writing Center Utilization: 11.6.43 Sp II 07 to Fa II 10 and 11.6.46 Sp II 09 to Fa II 10). As the direct support service of the English Department, the Writing Center’s whole-class lab program provides a weekly tutorial with each section of ENG 099 as a mandatory, scheduled extension of ENG 099 classes. The Writing Center also provides a program for students repeating ENG 099, supporting retention efforts by offering special tutoring appointments in place of large group labs.

The Writing Center is exactly aligned with the LaGuardia mission of “providing extensive support services …for the needs of a highly diverse student population” (01.1.03 Mission Statement), modulating materials and techniques for the array of language and writing backgrounds and skill levels that its hundreds of weekly students bring. In keeping with the
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College Vision Statement (Catalog p.4), the overall Writing Center tutorial style specifically seeks to “create a supportive environment where each member (student) is encouraged,” a style emphasized both in personnel selection and weekly training sessions, and monitored via student evaluations (11.6.42 Writing Center Evaluations Sp10 and 11.6.45 Writing Center English Faculty Survey Sp10). Writing is the biggest stumbling block in many students’ paths towards success at LaGuardia. By supporting students in their writing efforts at every point in their progress towards their degree for any course they are taking, as well as offering tutoring in specific areas of grammar and rhetoric for basic skills and composition classes and writing test preparation for tests required by CUNY for upper level students, the Writing Center significantly contributes to the stated mission goals of overall student persistence, retention and graduation at LaGuardia.

In response to repeated feedback from students and staff, in 2005 the Writing Center ended its system of allowing every student who arrived on time (before a LaGuardia class period) to join a session regardless of the resulting group size and student-tutor ratio. Many students (and tutors and teachers) had actually requested the institution of exclusive individual sessions. However, individual sessions would have rendered tutoring completely unavailable to enormous numbers of students; the Writing Center has a substantial budget but a much more substantial demand for tutoring. The Writing Center compromised with a maximum 2:1 student-tutor ratio and a system to attempt to guarantee sessions to the significant number of turnaways that even this ratio produced. In the years following this change the Writing Center has scrutinized its relative success and made a series of smaller adjustments in an attempt to frustrate fewer students.

The Writing Center is a heavily used tutoring center with significant increases in user demand each year – 11% from 2007-8 to 2008-9, and over 14% more from 2008-9 to 2009-10 (11.6.43 Sp II 07 to Fa II 10). The most significant increases in Writing Center utilization continued trends observed in recent years: for the second year in a row, students from the array of subject-area courses subsumed under the WID program, viewed as a group, comprised the single largest population at the center, surpassing the total students from any single English course level. Total subject-area students increased by 16.6 %, from 1,508 in 2008-09 to 1,759 for 2009-10 (Writing Center Utilization: 11.6.43 Sp II 07 to Fa II 10 and 11.6.46 Sp II 09 to Fa II 10). This trend points to the increasing role the Writing Center plays as a support service to the entire college in addition to its traditional function within the English Department.

Evaluations of the quality of tutoring are high among all types of raters: 93% of Writing Center tutorial students felt that tutoring improved their writing; 93% found explanations clear; 99% felt tutoring helped them find their own errors; 95% were likely to use the Writing Center in the future; and 94% checked one or more positive interpersonal traits such as “helpful,” “sensitive,” “patient” etc. on a checklist of positive and negative characteristics (11.6.42 Writing Center Evaluations Sp10). 100% of English faculty ‘strongly agreed’ or ‘agreed’ that their students were helped by Writing Center tutoring; 95% could see a difference in their students’ writing after tutoring; 86 % found tutors sensitive and patient and 14% perceiving tutors as “somewhat” sensitive and patient (11.6.45 Writing Center English Faculty Survey Sp10). Writing Center staff received 94% approval ratings from college –wide faculty and 100% from college-wide staff
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(07.5.04 Faculty Staff Satisfaction Survey Scores 2008).

However, availability and sufficiency of Writing Center tutoring received far lower ratings. 37% of Writing Center students reported being turned away without receiving tutoring; 44% of them stated this as a problem, and 31% were not able to return satisfactorily. Indeed, 37% used the comments section of the student evaluation to voice complaints about availability or sufficiency of staffing, often after directly complimenting the tutoring they received (11.6.42 Writing Center Evaluations Sp10). 48% of English faculty reported their students being turned away, with 85% feeling that this discouraged their students, and 52% perceiving the Writing Center as understaffed (11.6.45 Writing Center English Faculty Survey Sp10). Surprisingly, the college-wide perception was less critical, with 10% of faculty seeing availability as an issue (07.5.04 Faculty Staff Satisfaction Survey Scores 2008).

The CSTEP Science Lab
The CSTEP (Collegiate Science and Technology Entry Program) Science Lab offers a schedule of drop-in tutorial sessions respectively focusing on each of the Chemistry, Biology and Physics courses running per term, and offers tutoring for Practical Nursing, Registered Nursing and Veterinary Technician courses upon request. In Fall I, 2010 the Science Lab scheduled tutorial settings for the following courses: Chemistry (peer tutored + bi-weekly seminar) 101, 201, 202, 205, 210, 251; Biology (peer tutored + periodic seminar) 115, 201, 202, 203, 204 (260 - upon demand); Physics (peer tutored) 101, 201, 202, 231 and 231; Nursing (peer tutored) 103, 110, 210 and 290; and Veterinary Technology (peer tutored) 201, 202 and 211.

The lab staffs approximately four tutors for biology and four tutors for chemistry, plus one faculty member for the chemistry seminar and two for physics. The student-tutor ratio varies from small (two or three students) to large groups depending on however many students elect to attend a given session. On average, peer tutors see approximately four students per session; seminar instructors see as many as 15 students per session. Chemistry classes (highest number of students) receive 2 ½ hour workshop-seminars twice weekly. The lab’s schedule is based on the Natural Science and Health Science Departments’ schedule of classes in order to accommodate as many students as possible. The lab does not require or exclude any students from tutoring, offering tutoring on a walk-in basis for all LaGuardia students. The lab does promote the CSTEP program and encourages interested students to complete an application to become part of CSTEP.

The Science Lab saw a total of eight hundred students from Spring I, 2010 to Fall II, 2010 (11.6.38 CSTEP Science Lab Utilization Stats). Specific attendance records are maintained and available but have yet to be tabulated (11.6.30 - 11.6.37: Fa10 I, Fa10 II, Fa09 I, Fa09 II, Sp10 I, Sp10 II, Fa08 I, Sp09 I).

Currently CSTEP is expanding its assessment of the tutoring program; grades of tutored students are being collated (without identifiers) for the tutored course. Once all grades of tutored students for a given course in a given semester are collated, the GPA will be calculated and tested for significant difference with the overall course GPA for that semester. A student evaluation form is also in development.
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The Science Study Hall
Science tutoring is also available in the Science Study Hall. Available seven days a week on a walk-in basis, the Science Study Hall is primarily dedicated to tutorial support of Fundamentals of Biology I and II, SCB 203 and SCB 204, the two most popular biology classes at LaGuardia, with a much smaller utilization by SCB 115, microbiology, anatomy, and Nursing students. An average of two tutors are in duty during peak hours each day; the staff totals twelve tutors. The tutor: student ratio varies widely, from 1:1 or 2 to 1:20 or more as exams approach. The length of visits also varies; thirty or forty minute sessions are common, as are stays of three to four hours. Because SCB 203 and 204 use a standard syllabus and curriculum, students from different sections can attend the same session and work effectively with one another. The Science Study Hall provides a number of actual anatomical models that students also come to study collaboratively, sometimes without the assistance of a tutor.

Although attendance by SCB students is not mandatory, the majority of SCB students do in fact attend sessions. In Fall I, 2011, over 62% of SCB 203 and 70% of 204 students used the lab. (11.6.49 Table 1 Science Study Hall Use 10-11). Fall I Lab users showed higher retention rates than non-users (84% vs. 76%) and higher GPAs (2.29 vs. 1.46). Similar results, with deviations often showing even higher relative retention among lab users, can be seen in other semesters such as all of Spring II, 2009 – Spring I, 2010; GPA differences vary, sometimes small (0.04 in Fall II, 2010) and sometimes large (1.23 in Spring II, 2010) ((11.6.49 Table 1 Science Study Hall Use 10-11). Student evaluation results are positive but not entirely clear because of an ambiguity in the evaluation categories: “agree somewhat” may be perceived as a negative response, with a rank of 3 on a 1 (high) – 4 (low) scale, or it may mean something closer to “good but not great” or “OK.” Thus, of the four main items in the evaluation (11.6.50 Table 2 Science Study Hall Fa09 I questionnaires), that 81% agree or strongly agree that “My science background is much stronger now” is very positive regardless of the meaning of a 17% “somewhat agree” statistic, but 56% “strongly agree/ agree” and 31.5% “agree somewhat” responses for “The science hall met all of my expectations (11.6.50 Table 2 Science Study Hall Fa09 I questionnaires and 11.6.53 Table 5 Science Lab Fa10 I Surveys)” is harder to interpret. It is at least notable, and quite encouraging, that “do not agree” responses, the clearly negative category for each item, never exceed 10% (11.6.50 Table 2 Science Study Hall Fa09 I questionnaires).

The Science Study Hall does not tabulate overall number of visits or number of visits by each student, reporting that these figures were found to be less meaningful in its correlation- to-outcomes data than whether of not students attended at all. However, utilization data, perhaps including mean attendance figures for different points in the term, would provide a clearer picture of student demand and adequacy of staffing in the lab.

The Business Academic Resource Center/ Accounting Lab
The Accounting Lab offers non-mandatory tutorial assistance to students taking accounting, business, marketing, and management courses. The Accounting Lab operates on an open drop-in system, with students permitted to visit at any time during open hours and stay as long as needed. Tutors “float” among students seated at computer terminals, responding as requested.

Tutoring addresses problems with homework, preparation for exams and for assigned projects,
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training and/or assisting students to create, develop and post their ePortfolios in the business area and how to do assessment when required. Throughout the semester tutors also provide training sessions to several business and accounting classes, with the instructor an active participant of the session as well.

The Accounting Lab has a small staff of six tutors, but 5,704 sign-ins were recorded for accounting, business and management tutoring in 2009-10, along with 2,310 sign-ins for assistance with ePortfolios. The tutorial sign-ins represented a 16.5% increase over 2008-9. These numbers would seem to suggest a significantly understaffed program, but the lab does not administer a student evaluation to determine, among other things, whether students feel they do not receive sufficient assistance in their visits to the lab.

The Speech Lab
The primary function of the Speech Lab is to offer mandatory scheduled whole-class lab sessions to support oral communication classes, in particular HUL 100: Oral Communication for the Non-Native Speaker, HUC 104, Voice and Diction and HUL110: Group Communication for the Non-Native Speaker. The lab does offer a small tutorial capacity for individual and small group tutoring by appointment, to provide assistance with pronunciation, the preparation, videotaping, delivery and/or editing of speeches, and the technology of digital stories, PowerPoint and ePortfolio. Four tutors, generally one per hour, comprise the staff. The lab also offers open hours for students to use its resources to work with each other and to record and deposit assignments/projects on ePortfolio. Additionally, the lab offers group tutorial sessions for student’s college-wide, including International Phonetic Alphabet workshops, conversation workshops and pronunciation workshops.

The Speech Lab does not maintain consistent statistics on student utilization. In Fall I, 2010, 52 students came in for individual tutoring, receiving 110 sessions. A student evaluation is not administered.

The Student Services/Student Government Study Hall
The LaGuardia student government sponsors a separate tutoring program that complements and supplements several of the tutoring centers. The Student Services/Student Government Study Hall offers a schedule of tutoring in Accounting, English, Math, Biology and Chemistry, which students attend on a drop-in basis. The Study Hall maintains a staff of approximately five tutors per period, allowing for a tutor: student ratio varying from 1:1 to 1:3; session length varies from fifteen minutes to approximately one and one half hours. From five to fifteen students attend each period. The Study Hall includes eight computer stations, some of which are used for tutoring and others simply for study without tutorial support.

1,535 students received tutoring in 2010, the majority of which focused on English 101 and 102, Elementary Algebra, and Math in Action II. The program is now housed in and supervised by the Office of Student Services and Disabled Students (OSSDS); the office is developing a student evaluation, which it intends to implement in Fall 2011.