APR Report—2018-2019

Section I: Program Description

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

INST SRVCS Tutoring

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 tutoring services 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.

Starting in Fall 2017, the Learning Center went from having two part time classified writing tutors, to having only one. This has proven to be a difficult position to fill, as it is still vacant as of end of Fall 2018. To make up for it, those 19 hours per week have been filled by extra duty hours for the remaining tutor and/or student tutors.
Fall 2017 was our last semester having a full time clerk at the front desk. Spring 2018, that temporary position ended and was replaced with a permanent 19 hour clerk position. The other 29 hours per week, the front desk was staffed by student workers. During this time period, the Learning Center was open 48 hours per week.
In spite of having less classified manpower, more students were served in the Learning Center than ever before. During the 2016-2017 academic year (primary terms only), there were 6114 log ins (each time a student comes to the Learning Center, they are "logged in"). During the 2017-2018 academic year, there were 11,366 log ins. This is an increase of 5252 log ins for the academic year.

Section II: Looking Back—2017-2018

IIA. Present the Results (Rubric Criterion 3)

Provide a descriptive summary of the outcomes from the 2017-2018 cycle of program review.

During Fall 2017, the Math Lab had 4079 log ins and Writing Lab had 1289 log ins. For Spring 2018, Math Lab had 1739 log ins and Writing Lab had 1259 log ins. The Math Lab had 4325 more log ins than the prior academic year. The Writing Lab had 927 more log ins than the prior academic year. Student tutor hours increased this year by 75.5 over the previous year. This meant there were 75.5 more hours per week that students could receive help, due to not waiting their turn due to being understaffed. This is partly due to the Math Department supporting the Learning Center with their student worker budgets.

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

In this section, judge whether the activities you implemented in 2017-2018 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.

Looking back on the goals from last year's Annual Program Review cycle, two of the three were met.

1. Pilot an embedded tutor in online English 1000
   This was done in Fall 2018. Grades have not posted yet, so whether or not success rates increased is unknown at this time.
2. English Faculty work two hours per week in the labs like math faculty do.
   This was done in Fall 2018. Grades have not posted yet, so whether or not success rates increased is unknown at this time.
3. Full time writing tutor, as in the math lab.
   At this time, we are still trying to replace the part time position that was vacated July 2017.

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

In this section, describe activities you believe would have an effect on your 2018-2019 outcome measures.

1) What if we had a full time Writing Tutor in the writing lab, like we have a full time math tutor in the math lab? Would communication with English faculty get to a level that we have with math faculty? Would there be constant guidance and modeling for student tutors like we have in the math lab?

2) What if TutorTrac was used to determine how many Disproportionately Impacted students receive tutoring?

3) What if we used targeted marketing to reach out to DI students to encourage them to use tutoring services?

4) What if we ran AVID socratic tutoring groups in addition to one on one tutoring?

Section III: Looking Forward—2018-2019

III. List Your 2018-2019 Goals—Be Quantitative!

List your 2018-2019 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. Replace the library tables that are currently being used in the labs with lighter weight, more mobile tables that can easily be moved around to accommodate one on one or group work. This would allow the library to have their tables back as well. We currently use heavy, largely immobile tables, that were purchased by the library. They do not have charging capability.

2. Increase the clerk position from part time to full time. Starting Spring 2019, the Learning Center will be open 52 hours per week (up from 50 this semester, and 48 last semester). Currently, the front desk is only staffed by a classified employee for 19 of those hours.

3. Larger space for the Learning Center, outside of the Library. This would allow us to set our own hours, allow food and drinks, and have a truly collaborative workspace that is not located inside of a quiet space.

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?