# APR Report—2017-2018

## Section I: Program Description

**IA1. Program (Select your program from the drop down list)**

INST SRVCS Supplemental Instruction

**IA2. Other Program (If your program is not on the above list, write it in here)**

**IB. Program Lead (Your first and last name)**

Lori Sundgren

**IC. Program Mission Statement**

Provide the Program's Mission Statement.

The mission of Taft College Supplemental Instruction (SI) is to provide students with learning assistance and academic support services needed to increase successful course completion, retention, and persistence, and to guide them into becoming independent learners.

**ID. Program Summary**

Provide a brief summary on the current status of the program being reviewed.

The supplemental instruction program at Taft College currently has two full time and one part time SIA. In the past, there have been two full time and four part time SIAs. During the 2017-2018 academic year, SI was requested for 36 classes and we were able to fill 28 of those requests. The classes that we were not able to provide an SIA for either fell at the same time as another class or simply would not fit in the schedule because it would fall during a potential session time. Our program also has a hybrid SI/Tutoring version for Math 1050 and 1060. This tutor does not attend class, but has review sessions that are scheduled according to when chapter tests are given. These sessions have historically been held in classrooms.

## Section II: Looking Back—2016-2017

**IIA. Present the Results** (Rubric Criterion 3)

Provide a descriptive summary of the outcomes from the 2016-2017 cycle of program review.

In fall of 2017, the average percentage of session attendees who earned an A, B, or C in the course was 78%. The average percentage of non-session attendees who earned an A, B, or C was 60% The average gpa of the SI group was a 2.73. The average gpa of the non-SI group was a 2.13.
In spring of 2018, an average of 84 % of session attendees earned an A, B, or C in the course. 51% of non-attendees earned an A, B, or C. Average gpa for attendees was 2.67, non-attendees was 1.9. This tells us that student success is positively affected by attendance in SI sessions.
Data used is only for courses that actually had sessions and attendees. Three courses had no sessions. One course had sessions but not attendees.
In our hybrid SI/tutor review sessions, for Fall 2017, ten students were served for a total of eleven visits. This is less students and visits than the previous Fall. Spring 2018, 13 students were served for a total of 30 visits. This is over three times as many as the previous Spring. Fall 2017, sessions started being held in (or started out in) the math lab as

**IIB. Probe the Results: I Wonder . . .** (Rubric Criteria 1, 3)

In this section, judge whether the activities you implemented in 2016-2017 to reach your goals were effective. Did the activities have an effect on the outcome? Please describe WHY you believe your outcomes came out the way they did. Did you reach your goals? If yes, explain why. If you did not reach your goals, explain why.

I wonder if session attendance would increase if the posted class schedule noted not only when an SIA would be present in a class, but when the session time would be? Did not implement this activity.

I wonder if we could have served the additional classes with two student SIAs? Thanks to the Social Science department, we will have a ten hour per week student SIA for Spring 2019. He will serve two classes.

I wonder if hybrid session attendance would increase if sessions were held in the labs, or in the PDC, for its proximity to the labs? This activity was implemented. We need one or two more semesters of data before we determine effectiveness.

**IIC. Ideate Innovations: What if . . .** (Rubric Criteria 1, 5)

In this section, describe activities you believe would have an effect on your 2017-2018 outcome measures.

I wonder if students would be more likely to register for a class supported by SI if it were posted in Cougar Tracks at scheduling time? It is noted in the PDF version of the schedule when an class will be supported with SI, but the SIAs have learned that not many students look at that version of the schedule.

What if we were to measure persistence of students who have attended past SIA sessions?

## Section III: Looking Forward—2017-2018

**III. List Your 2017-2018 Goals—Be Quantitative!**

List your 2017-2018 APR goals in terms of their expected changes on the outcome measures as indicated earlier. Each goal that requires resources, impacts other areas, or otherwise is substantive requires the submission of an APR Goal form. Keep in mind the scoring rubric criteria:

1. The relationship between program review narrative and the APR Goal is evident and strongly supported by evidence.
2. The APR Goal directly implements institutional planning document goals.
3. The outcome directly implements institutional planning outcomes, and is transferrable and/or scalable institutionally.
4. APR Outcome indicators, methods and/or timelines use institutional measures, transferrable/scalable institutionally
5. Before/after benchmarks and timelines are completely specified, identical methods, transferrable/scalable.

1. Begin to measure the persistence of past session attendees.

2. Increase hybrid 1050/1060 session attendance.

## Section IV (Optional): Evaluation of Program Review and Planning Process

### IVA. Evaluation of Program Review and Program Planning Process

In this cycle of program review, what aspects of the program review and program planning process worked best and why?

### IVB. Evaluation of Program Review and Program Planning Process

In this cycle of program review, what aspects of the program review and program planning process would you change and why?