

Tutoring



2019 ANNUAL REPORT OF PROGRAM DATA



UNIVERSITY of HAWAII®
KAUA'I
COMMUNITY COLLEGE

At a minimum, each program or unit Annual Program Review Update shall include measures described in [UHCCP 5.202](#). Additional measures may also be used for program or unit assessment.

1. Program Description

Program or Unit Mission Statement

Program Mission Statement: To help empower students to become efficient, confident, and independent learners and develop requisite skills they need to succeed in obtaining their academic, career, and personal goals, thus enabling them to lead self-directed and productive lives now and in the 21st century.

Part I. Program Description

Date of Last Comprehensive Review	2016
Date Website Last Reviewed/Updated	10/1/2019
Target Student Population	All
External Factor(s) that Affected the Program or Unit	None

2. Analysis of the Program

Strengths and weaknesses in terms of demand, efficiency, and effectiveness based on an analysis of the Quantitative Indicators. CTE programs must include an analysis of Perkins Core indicators for which the program did not meet the performance level. Include Significant Program Actions (new certificates, stop outs, gain/loss of positions, results of prior year's action plan).

Include the Annual Review of Program Data (ARPD; all [Instructional programs](#) and [Academic Support](#) programs - Library, Technology Resources, Testing Center, Tutoring, and Financial Aid), program-developed metrics (Institutional Effectiveness programs, Office of Continuing Education and Training, campus committees), or metrics required by [UHCCP 5.202](#) that are not

2019 Kaua'i Community College ARPD

Program: Tutoring

provided as ARPD ([Administrative Service](#) programs and some Student Support [programs](#)) under review in table format below (EP 5.202 and UHCCP 5.202).

The Overall Program Health is Healthy

Describe and discuss demand, efficiency, effectiveness, and overall health categories. What has been the trend over the past three years in each of these categories? What factors (internal or external) may have contributed to the program or unit health categories? For Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs, provide a discussion on any unmet Perkins Core Indicator that includes contributing factors (UHCCP 5.202).

Based on this analysis, what are the program's strengths and areas to improve regarding demand, efficiency, and effectiveness?

Describe any significant program actions that occurred in the prior year (e.g., new certificate(s), stop outs, gain/loss of position(s), reduction in funding, new or completed grant(s), etc.).

Career and Technical (CTE) programs should provide an analysis for any unmet Perkins Core Indicators.

Quantitative Indicators

#	Student and Faculty Information	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
1	Annual Unduplicated Student Headcount	1,724	1,752	1,860
2	Annual FTE Faculty	65	68	70
2a	Annual FTE Staff	97	97	97
3	Annual FTE Student	686	675	677

#	Demand Indicators	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
4	Unduplicated number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions per student FTE	0.4	0.3	.4
5	Unduplicated students enrolled in Dev/Ed classes who were tutored per number of students enrolled in Dev/Ed classes	0.3	0.2	.6

#	Efficiency Indicators	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
6	Tutor contact hours per tutor paid hours in one-on-one sessions	.66	.64	.51
7	Duplicated number of students tutored in groups per tutor paid hours	19.5	.61	.58

2019 Kaua'i Community College ARPD

Program: Tutoring

#	Efficiency Indicators	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
8	Tutoring budget per student contact hours	\$0	\$0	

#	Effectiveness Indicators	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
9	Students who receive tutoring should pass their tutored course	73	57	73

#	Effectiveness Indicators - Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)	2014	2016	2018
10	Tutored or taught other students (survey item 4.h)			
	Mean	1.61	1.39	1.43
	Very Often	5.3%	3.0%	3.5%
	Often	9.3%	5.6%	5.6%
	Sometimes	26.0%	19.2%	21.5%
	Never	59.3%	72.1%	69.3%
11	Frequency of using peer or other tutoring (survey item 13.1.d)			
	Mean	1.58	1.53	1.08
	Often	11.4%	9.7%	17.3%
	Sometimes	23.4%	21.8%	21.7%
	Rarely/Never	47.7%	45.8%	12.6%
	N/A	17.6%	22.7%	48.4%
12	Satisfaction with peer or other tutoring (survey item 13.2.d)			
	Mean	2.30	2.23	1.59
	Very	25.4%	21.8%	34.9%
	Somewhat	31.4%	24.9%	19.2%
	Not at All	6.3%	8.8%	1.7%
	N/A	36.9%	44.6%	44.2%
13	Importance of peer or other tutoring (survey item 13.3.d)			
	Mean	2.34	2.20	2.42
	Very	51.2%	44.3%	58.1%
	Somewhat	31.9%	31.6%	25.5%
	Not at All	16.8%	24.0%	16.5%
14	Frequency of using skill labs – writing, math, etc. (survey item 13.1.e)			

2019 Kaua'i Community College ARPD

Program: Tutoring

#	Effectiveness Indicators - Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)	2014	2016	2018
	Mean	1.70	1.75	0.82
	Often	13.9%	17.3%	15.2%
	Sometimes	26.7%	25.4%	13.8%
	Rarely/Never	37.0%	37.1%	9.2%
	N/A	22.5%	20.3%	61.8%
15	Satisfaction with skill labs – writing, math, etc. (survey item 13.2.e)			
	Mean	2.25	2.31	1.51
	Very	18.4%	25.6%	24.1%
	Somewhat	39.2%	28.6%	17.3%
	Not at All	3.3%	6.9%	2.1%
	N/A	39.1%	39.0%	56.5%
16	Importance of skill labs – writing, math, etc. (survey item 13.3.e)			
	Mean	2.29	2.26	2.20
	Very	48.0%	47.3%	43.8%
	Somewhat	32.9%	31.2%	32.0%
	Not at All	19.1%	21.5%	24.1%

Demand: The number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions (QI 4) increased from the previous year from .26 in the 2017-2018 AY to .36 in the 2018-2019 AY, on par with the 2016-2017 AY. The number of developmental students who used tutoring services (QI 5) increased from .21 last year to .52 this reporting year, far surpassing AY '16-'17. These increases are mainly attributed to an increase in the Academic Support Center (ASC) use by English 75 and 100L students, which in turn, may have been affected by an increased presence of English faculty in the ASC. This reporting year most of the English instructors held office hours in the ASC. In addition, the developmental English instructor spent considerable additional time in the ASC for tutoring and to be easily available to students. Math faculty continued their long standing practice of each instructor holding, at the very least, one tutoring hour per week in the ASC.

Efficiency: The efficiency of one-on-one sessions is down compared to the last two reporting years from a high of .66 in AY '16-'17 to .51 for this year. Although students are using the ASC more, there has also been an increase in on-duty tutors particularly in writing. This increased availability of English tutors was a purposeful effort to attract more writing students.

2019 Kaua'i Community College ARPD

Program: Tutoring

Effectiveness: Dev/Ed students who received tutoring services passed their courses at a rate of 73%, which is the same rate as two years ago and an increase from last reporting year. The 73% pass rate for Dev/Ed students when they received tutoring is much better compared to a pass rate of 63% if they did not receive tutoring services. For college level students who received tutoring the pass rate was 73% compared to 76% for those who did not receive tutoring services. Looking at the number of all students who received tutoring 73% passed compared with a 72 % pass rate for those who did not. It is possible that the pass rate for each of these categories indicates that the tutored students passed at a rate close to or slightly higher than the non-tutored students because of the support received in the ASC. In addition, it may be that the non-tutored students did not seek tutoring because they were more skilled and confident students.

QI 9 examines the pass rate of developmental classes, IS 103, Math 103 and English 100. The pass rate increased from 57 in the previous year to 73, which is on par with 2016-2017 AY, the highest rate in recent years. Examining the pass rate of English 100 students, the rate was 60% for tutored students compared with 53% if they did not receive tutoring.

Efficiency: QI 6 examines the efficiency of tutor contact hours compared to tutor paid hours in one-on-one sessions. While the number of contact hours in one-on-one sessions increased (QI 4), the efficiency as compared with the number of paid hours is down. As has been the case for the last five years, efficiency is greatly impacted by the number of paid tutor hours that are spent in embedded tutoring assignments and the high rate of students who participate in group tutoring sessions. This expenditure of resources is regarded as valuable by instructors and students.

The number of duplicated students tutored in groups per tutor paid hours (QI 7) is also down from the previous years. This QI is also negatively affected by the number of hours that tutors are paid to be in embedded assignments, because these paid hours are not deducted from the total paid hours when calculating QI 6 and QI 7.

Embedded Tutors: In the fall of 2018 eight peer tutors were embedded in 14 math or science classes, most with 2 or 3 meetings per week. For the spring of 2019, nine peer tutors were embedded in 18 classes. Two of those classes were online. For the online classes, the tutor held regular hours in the ASC using Zoom and an electronic drawing tool.

In the spring of 2019, there were eight peer tutors embedded in 18 math or science classes, with two of those classes being distance classes. For the online classes, the tutor again held regular hours in the ASC using Zoom and an electronic drawing tool.

Math Boot Camp: In May of 2019 two peer tutor and two professional tutors assisted, mostly in class. The program served approximately 37 students and prospective students.

2019 Kaua'i Community College ARPD

Program: Tutoring

Student Evaluations of Tutors: Students were asked to fill out an evaluation of tutoring sessions for a specified period in the fall and spring semesters. The evaluation consists of eight questions with possible answers of Yes, No, Somewhat, and NA. Of the 85 respondents, there were 6 who answered NA to the question asking if the tutor was prompt for the appointment. There was one 'Somewhat' response to the question about the tutor's knowledge about the content area. One answered 'Somewhat' to a different question asking if the tutor responded positively to questions and concerns. For the question asking if the tutor provided adequate explanations, 3 students answered 'Somewhat' and two students answered 'Somewhat' when asked if the student felt better prepared after tutoring than before the tutoring session. All other responses were 'Yes' with the number of 'No' answers being 0. See Appendix A, Figure 1 for combined results.

Online Tutoring: The fall of 2018 was the last semester that the UH CCs used Brainfuse as its online tutoring service. Limited data is available for this semester due to a loss of data in the spring of 2019. An examination of the available data shows that usage was overall consistent with previous years. Although item to item comparisons are difficult because of differences in the manner of reporting.

In January of 2019 a new contract with Tutor.com began, although the service was not launched until mid to late January. For the entire spring 2019 semester, there were 147 live sessions; 97 drop off essay reviews; 24 math sessions; 90 total hours used; 86 accounts established. See Appendix B, Figure 2. Use of drop off writing essay reviews are up from previous fall semesters as compared to Brainfuse, which offered a very similar service. So far math usage is down from previous years where there were an average of 82 live math sessions (per semester) compared to an average of only 24 in the first semester of Tutor.com. There is no explanation for the decrease in math usage, except perhaps students are becoming accustomed to the new service. Math usage will continue to be monitored. Unlike Brainfuse, Tutor.com reports session feedback and comments each month. Feedback is overwhelmingly positive.

The last Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSEE) was administered in 2018. No new data available.

Health Call Rubric: See Appendix C, Figure 3.

3. Program Student Learning Outcomes

- a) List of the Program Student Learning Outcomes
- b) Program Student Learning Outcomes that have been assessed in the year of the Annual Review of Program Data.
- c) Assessment Results
- d) Changes that have been made as a result of the assessments.

2019 Kaua'i Community College ARPD

Program: Tutoring

Report on PSLO assessment for the prior year.

1. List of the PSLOs.
2. Indicate PLSOs that were assessed in the year of this APRU.
3. Assessment findings.
4. Changes that have been made as a result of the assessment findings.
5. Next planned assessment date.

PSLO	Assessed During this APRU Cycle (Y or N)	Findings	Improvements Implemented	Next Assessment Date
Students who receive tutoring will pass their tutored courses	Y	All students (combined) passed at a rate of 73% compared to students who were not tutored who passes at a rate of 72%	More faculty input. Continued increase in training for tutors	End of spring semester 2020

4. Action Plan

Include how the actions within the plan support the college's mission. In addition to the overall action plan for the program, include specific action plans for any Perkins Core Indicator for which the program did not meet the performance level.

Action Plan	Anticipated Outcome	Actual Outcome
Increase number of unduplicated students using the learning center as measured in QI 4	More student use of tutoring services	Increase from .3 to .4 from previous reporting year
Increase efficiency (QI 6)	Increase in efficiency compared to previous year	Decrease from .64 to .51

List any additional significant actions that impacted your program (e.g., new certificate, loss or gain of faculty or staff, stop outs, etc.).

The increase in unduplicated students was due to increased use of Dev/Ed students using tutoring and the consistent use of tutors for students working in groups. Efficiency rates were not as positive as expected. Consistent efforts will be made to offer class visits and other attempts to reach out to the student population in order to inform them of the services offered in the ASC. Continued and increased use of embedded tutors adversely impacts QI 6 . As a result, this rate is not expected to improve greatly in the future, but attempts will continue to be made to optimize resources by selectively scheduling tutors.

Analysis of Alignment with CPR

List the goals that were identified to be initiated, continued, or completed during this APRU cycle, in your last CPR, and if they were achieved. Be sure to include the benchmark, desired outcome, actual outcome, and unit of measure. If you completed your last CPR prior to 2018, please refer to * in this section.

Goal/Strategic Goal or Priority**	Achieved (Y or N)?	Benchmark	Desired Outcome	Actual Outcome	Unit of Measure
Increase the number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions.	KCC goals 1&2 and 20172021 Strategic Goals 1,4,6, and 7.	.26 in QI 4	Increase to than 3.5 or greater.	Raw score/FTE	QI 4, next CPR 2021
Increase the number of students in developmental classes who are tutored	KCC goals 1&2 and 20172021 Strategic Goals 1,4,6, and 7.	.21 in QI 5	Increase to .25 or greater.	Raw score/number of students enrolled in developmental classes.	QI 5, next CPR 2021

**All Strategic Goals and Priorities are Aligned to the College Mission.

Describe any impacts these goals had on your health indicator(s).

The increase in the number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions changed the Demand health call from cautionary last to healthy this year.

*Based on findings in Parts I – IV, develop an action plan for your program or unit from now until your next CPR date. This should include goals that align with the College Mission, measurable outcomes, benchmarks, and alignment to the College’s Strategic Priorities, and/or Strategic Goals. Be sure to focus on weaknesses identified in ARPD data, PSLO outcomes,

2019 Kaua'i Community College ARPD

Program: Tutoring

results of survey data, and other data used to assess your unit or program. This plan should guide your program and subsequent APRUs, but may be amended based on new initiatives, updated data, or unforeseen external factors.

Goal	Strategic Goal/Priority (List number)	Benchmark	Desired Outcome	Unit of Measure	Year(s) Implemented
Maintain the number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions.	KCC goals 1&2 and 2017-2021 Strategic Goals 1,4,6, and 7.	.4 in QI 4 (results of this reporting year)	Maintain .4 in QI 4	Raw score /FTE	3 years, next CPR 2021
Maintain the number of students in developmental classes who are tutored.	KCC goals 1&2 and 2017-2021 Strategic Goals 1,4,6, and 7.	.21 in QI 5	Increase to .25 or greater.	Raw score/number of students enrolled in developmental classes receiving tutoring	3 years, next CPR 2021

5. Resource Implications

Resource Request(s) for next year (from CPR Plan for your program or unit, or one(s) developed in Part V above if CPR was completed prior to 2018).

I am NOT requiring resources for my program/unit.

5. Resource Implications

Resource Request(s) for next year (from CPR Plan for your program or unit, or one(s) developed in Part V above if CPR was completed prior to 2018).

List in the table below resource requests greater than or equal to \$3,000.

Program Goal	Click or tap here to enter text.
Resource Requested*	Click or tap here to enter text.
Cost and Vendor	Click or tap here to enter text.
Annual Recurring Cost	Click or tap here to enter text.
Useful Life of Resource	Click or tap here to enter text.
Person(s) Responsible and Collaborators	Click or tap here to enter text.
Timeline	Click or tap here to enter text.

***An approved ITAC Request Form must be attached for all technology requests**

Appendix A – Student Tutor Evaluations Academic Year 2018-2019

Student Evaluations of Tutors 2018-2019 Academic Year

Figure 1

	Yes	No	Somewhat	NA	Total
Did the tutor arrive on time for the appointment, if applicable?	79			6	85
Did the tutor seem supportive?	85				85
Was the tutor knowledgeable in the specific subject area?	84		1		85
Did the tutor respond positively to your questions and concerns?	84		1		85
Did the tutor provide adequate explanations?	82		3		85
Was the tutor attentive?	85				85
Would you recommend this tutor to another student?	85				85
Do you feel better prepared after tutoring than you did before?	83		2		85

Appendix B-Tutor.com Usage

Tutor.com Usage Spring 2019

Figure 2

	Live Sessions	Drop off Essay	Math Sessions	Total Hours	Accounts
January	8	2	3	2.5	33
February	59	41	13	36.6	34
March	28	21	1	19.26	13
April	32	16	7	17.74	6
May	28	17	0	14	0
Total	147	97	24	90	86

Appendix C-Health Call Rubric

Tutoring Health Call Rubric 2018-2019 AY

Figure 3

Area	Benchmark	Scoring
Demand		
Unduplicated number of Students tutored in One-on-one sessions per Student FTE (QI 4)	2 = More than 0.4; 1 = 0.3 to 0.4; 0 = Less than 0.3	2 = Healthy 1 = Cautionary 0 = Unhealthy
Unduplicated students Enrolled in Dev/Ed Classes who were tutored Per number of students Enrolled in Dev/Ed Classes (QI 5)	2 = More than 0.3; 1=0.2; 0 = Less than 0.2	
Efficiency		
Tutor contact hours per Tutor paid hours in one-On-one sessions (QI 6)	2 = More than 0.6; 1 = 0.5 to 0.6; 0 = Less than 0.5	2 = Healthy 1 = Cautionary 0 = Unhealthy
Duplicated number of Students tutored in groups Per tutor paid hours (QI 7)	2 = More than 0.6; 1 = 0.5 to 0.6; 0 = Less than 0.5	
Effectiveness		
Student Satisfaction Survey Response = 'YES'	2 = 90%; 1 = 80 to 90%; 0 = Less than 80%	2 = Healthy 1 = Cautionary 0 = Unhealthy
	Student Satisfaction % answered 'YES' in Student Evaluation	99%