

Kaua'i Community College
 Annual Program Review Update (APRU)
 Tutoring Services
 2017-2018 Academic Year

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	Oct. 2018
Target Student Population	All
External Factor(s) that Affected the Program or Unit	None

Part I. Quantitative Indicators

Student and Faculty Information		Program Year				
		13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
1	Annual Unduplicated Student Head Count	1828	1749	1683	1724	1,752
2	Annual FTE Faculty	74	73	73	65	68
2a	Annual FTE Staff	89	91	91	97	97
3	Annual FTE Student	814	757	708	686	675

Demand Indicators		Program Year				
		13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
4	Unduplicated number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions per student FTE	.5	.6	.3	.4	.3
5	Unduplicated students enrolled in Dev/Ed classes who were tutored per number of students enrolled in Dev/Ed classes	.3	.3	.2	.3	.2

Efficiency Indicators		Program Year				
		13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
6	Tutor contact hours per tutor paid hours in one-on-one sessions	.63	.64	.24	.66	.64
7	Duplicated number of students tutored in groups per tutor paid hours	18.3	16.7	20.9	19.5	.61
8	Tutoring budget per student contact hours	\$24	\$54	-		

Effectiveness Indicators		Program Year				
		13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	17-18
9	Students who receive tutoring should pass their tutor course	75	48	78	73	57

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)		Survey Year		
		2014	2016	2018
10	4.h. Tutored or taught other students			
	Mean	1.61	1.53	1.43
	Very Often	5.30%	5.30%	3.50%
	Often	9.30%	5.90%	5.60%
	Sometimes	26.00%	25.30%	21.50%
	Never	59.30%	63.50%	69.30%
11	12.1.d. Frequency of using peer or other tutoring			
	Mean	1.56	1.71	1.08 *
	Often	11.40%	14.30%	17.30% * 5 or more times
	Sometimes	23.40%	29.90%	21.70% * 2-4 times
	Rarely/Never	47.70%	38.50%	12.60% * 1 time
	N/A	17.60%	17.3%	48.40% * Never
12	13.2.d. Satisfaction with peer or other tutoring			
	Mean	2.3	2.33	1.59 *
	Very	25.40%	27.70%	34.90%
	Somewhat	31.40%	31.70%	19.20%
	Not At All	6.30%	5.80%	1.70%
	N/A	36.90%	34.80%	44.20%
13	13.3.d. Importance of peer or other tutoring			
	Mean	2.34	2.41	2.42
	Very	51.20%	55.30%	58.10%
	Somewhat	31.90%	30.20%	25.50%
	Not At All	16.80%	14.50%	16.50%
14	13.1.e. Frequency of using skills labs - writing, math, etc.			
	Mean	1.7	1.83	0.82 *
	Often	13.90%	20.60%	15.20% * 5 or more times
	Sometimes	26.70%	22.00%	13.80% * 2-4 times
	Rarely/Never	37%	33.60%	9.20% * 1 time
	N/A	22.50%	22.80%	61.80% * Never
15	13.2.e. Satisfaction with skill labs - writing, math, etc.			
	Mean	2.25	2.28	1.51 *
	Very	18.40%	24.4%	24.10%
	Somewhat	39.20%	28.80%	17.30%
	Not At All	3.30%	7.30%	2.10%
	N/A	39.10%	39.50%	56.50%

16	13.3.e. Importance of skill labs - writing, math, etc.			
	Mean	2.29	2.31	2.2
	Very	48.00%	48.90%	43.80%
	Somewhat	32.90%	33.00%	32.00%
	Not At All	19.10%	18.10%	24.10%

*Item scale change. Do not compare 2018 means to prior years means.

Part II. Analysis of Quantitative Indicators

~~The Overall Program Health is Healthy.~~

The number of students tutored in one on one sessions (QI 4) decreased from .35 to .26 but was rather consistent with the two previous years. It should be noted that while in-person tutoring session have declined somewhat, the use of the online tutoring service more than doubled and the number of students receiving assistance from embedded tutors as a group or in a support class also increased.

QI 5 speaks to the number of students developmental students who use tutoring services. The number of students enrolled in developmental education classes who used the tutoring center has vacillated in the last three years. It has decreased from .28 the previous year to .21 in the current reporting year. The variation is reflected in the changes in QI 4, with the highest level being last year and this year's level the same as two years ago.

QI 6 remained fairly consistent with the previous reporting year, down only slightly from .64 to .66. Both last year and this reporting year showed a significant increase in efficiency from two years previous at .24. The goal to increase efficiency was met.

Results for QI 7, the number of students tutored in groups, was surprising and inconsistently high compared with previous years. When raw data was examined, it was clear that the number of students that were tutored in groups did greatly increase. In program year 2016-2017, the duplicated number of students tutored in groups was 806 compared with 1,902 in the 2017-2018 academic year. This was a huge, positive increase. There was no obvious reason for this increase.

QI 9 examines all developmental classes, Math 103, and English 100. The pass rate decreased significantly this year compared to the previous two years. However, the pass rate of students who received tutoring at .57 is almost at par with the pass rate for students who did not receive tutoring in the same courses at .58. It is possible that the students who obtained tutoring for these classes were students who may have done poorly and tutoring helped them succeed to the level of those who did not seek tutoring.

Efforts will continue to attract students to the Academic Support Center by using outreach and promotional materials.

In the 2017-2018 academic year 15 peer tutors were employed, 12 were embedded in at least one STEM class in at least one of the semesters, with most being imbedded both semesters and some being embedded in more than one class in a semester. There were also 7 professional tutors who were embedded in math and English classes.

In addition to peer tutors and professional tutors, math and English instructors volunteered to hold office hours in the center. Each math instructor holds at least one scheduled hour per week in the center, but in reality spend much more with students. These tutoring sessions held by math faculty often turn into group sessions. Most English faculty, with the exception of one in the fall semester and two in the spring semester, also held hours in the center. Their sessions are almost always one-on-one sessions. Faculty who volunteer in the tutoring center do not keep records so the number of hours actually spent in the tutoring center and the number of hours they are engaged with students is unknown.

The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) was administered this year. See table above. ~~Overall, the results of this most recent survey were positive and indicated some notable upward trends. Due to some changes in the scale, some items (like number 11 which examines the frequency of use) cannot be examined and compared. The number of students who reported that they used peer or other tutoring "Often" went up from 14.3% in the 2016 survey to 17.3% in the 2018 survey. This is the highest in at least the last four CCSSE surveys. The number of students who said they "Rarely/Never" used peer or other tutoring decreased from 38.5% in the 2016 survey to 12.6% in this year's survey, another positive. In addition—~~The number of students who indicated that they were "Very" satisfied with tutoring increased from 27.7% in the last survey to 34.9% in the most recent survey. It is difficult to interpret the skills lab data (QI 14, 15, 16) because Kauai Community College does not have separate math and writing labs, so it is not possible to determine if these results pertain to the tutoring center or to study groups held in other areas of the campus by various departments.

Embedded tutor evaluation by teaching faculty: Each semester teaching faculty who have had an embedded tutor are asked to evaluate their embedded tutor. The evaluation form contains eight questions with a rating from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Embedded Tutor Evaluation sent out during fall and spring semesters. Responses below are reported in percentages.

Total responses: 20

	1 Strongly Disagree	2	3	4	5 Strongly Agree
Tutor attends classes as agreed/is punctual				20	80
Tutor Demonstrates					

mastery of course content			20	10	70
Tutor is engaged in the class				30	70
Tutor takes direction from the instructor					100
Tutor is not a distraction					100
Tutor relates well to students				20	80
Tutor addresses students' questions in a way that encourages students to think for themselves				20	80
Tutor addresses students' questions in a way that encourages students to think for themselves				20	80

Brainfuse Usage for the 2017-2018 Academic Year. Brainfuse online tutoring service was utilized by KCC students for a total of 342 hours. This is an increase from the last two years and a significant increase from last year at 223 hours. This increase was mostly due to the number of writing sessions and the number of writing lab and task submissions (writing). These increases may, in large part, be due to encouragement and incentives offered by English faculty to use online tutoring as another way to gain input from outside sources. Since Brainfuse does not differentiate between writing lab and task submissions, it cannot be determined how many of the 339 were for writing assignments for English classes and how many were for writing assignments for other classes. The number of math live sessions increased only slightly this year by 3 sessions. The number of live sessions in this reporting year for math were 143 and 79 for

writing. The remaining sessions were for other subjects including Accounting, Anatomy & Physiology, Biology, and Chemistry with the most of those sessions being in Accounting at 45 sessions.

	# of live sessions	# of college writing sessions	# of writing lab and task submissions	# of math live sessions	# of hours used
2015-2016 AY	307	22	385	209	321
2016-2017 AY	195	45	298	140	223
2017-2018 AY	298	79	339	143	342

Tutor Evaluations. Students were asked to evaluate their peer tutors for a period of about two weeks in the fall and spring semesters. Forms are filled out after tutoring sessions and placed anonymously into a receptacle. In the fall of 2017, sixty-seven evaluations were collected, with 61 evaluations collected in the spring of 2018. Once again, student evaluations of tutoring sessions were overwhelmingly positive. Combined result are reported below.

Total Evaluations Received: 128

	YES	NO	SOMEWHAT	N/A
Did the tutor arrive on time for the appointment, if applicable?	114	0	0	14
Did the tutor seem supportive?	128	0	0	0
Was the tutor knowledgeable in the specific subject area?	126	0	2	0
Did the tutor respond positively to your questions and concerns?	128	0	0	0
Did the tutor provide adequate explanations?	126	0	2	0
Was the tutor attentive?	128	0	0	0
Would you recommend this tutor to another student?	128	0	0	0
Do you feel better prepared after tutoring than you did before?	124	0	4	0

Part III. Assessment Data (EP 5.202)

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	Passed at a rate one percentage point lower than students who were not tutored.	Increased training for tutors and faculty input.	Spring 2019

Part IV. Results of Prior Year Action Plans (UHCCP 5.202)

Action Plan	Anticipated Outcome	Actual Outcome
Improve and enhance daily operations	With the addition of a permanent assistant, daily operations will be more consistent and run more smoothly	Daily operations are more consistent and running more smoothly as informally assessed by tutoring coordinator.
Increase number of unduplicated students using the learning center as measured in QI 4 to the 2014-2015 level.	Increase in unduplicated students using tutoring.	Rate fell slightly
Increase Efficiency as measured in QI 6 to the 2014-2015 level	Increase in efficiency	Efficiency fell slightly but remained close to last year's level and increased from 2015-2016 level.

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
To increase student access to tutoring services and facilities and service to improve learning and student engagement.	Y	Indicator score .4	To meet or exceed academic year 15-16	Indicator score .3	Unduplicated number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions.

Although the unduplicated number of student, college level and developmental declined, the number of students tutored in groups greatly increased. It appears that students are following the suggestion from their instructor and tutoring center staff to work in groups more often, or at least try to work in groups as a strategy.

The goals for next year's action plan: 1) to increase usage as measured in the QI 4 which measures unduplicated usage. 2) to increase the number developmental students who use tutoring services as measured in QI 5 to.3.

Goal	Strategic Goal/Priority (List number)	Benchmark	Desired Outcome	Unit of Measure	Year(s) Implemented
Increase the number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions.	KCC goals 1&2 and 2017-2021 Strategic Goals 1,4,6, and 7.	.26 in QI 4	Increase to than 3.5 or greater.	Raw score/FTE	3 years, next CPR 2021
Increase the number of students in developmental classes.	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.	3 years, CPR 2021

Part VI. Resource Request(s)

A full time assistant is needed to further improve consistency of services and operations. The amount of data input takes a considerable amount of time and leaves little time for an assistant to become familiar with the normal operations of the tutoring center or to be of direct help to students. During the times when the coordinator is out or attending to other matters away from the tutoring center, having an individual who knows the ins and outs of the center is invaluable to effectively and efficiently, and consistently service students. It would also increase tutor efficiency since tutors would not have to be used as receptionist as frequently.

Program Goal	To increase student access to tutoring services and facilities to improve learning and student engagement. Aligns with KCC Goals 1&2
---------------------	--

Resource Requested*	Full-time assistant position (APT) to work a total of 37 weeks per academic year
Cost and Vendor	\$6,500 additional
Annual Recurring Cost	\$6,500/year additional
Useful Life of Resource	Permanent
Person(s) Responsible and Collaborators	Academic Support Center Coordinator and STEM faculty.
Timeline	Fall 2019

The tutoring coordinator was asked to request resources for a STEM center which would require a renovation to the Academic Support Center/Library. The addition of a STEM center would allow for the lessening of the stigma associated with going to the tutoring center. The proposed space is the area that was designated for the cafe. This is ideal since it opens out to an outdoor sitting area where students can socialize and study in groups. It allows easy access to the library and the Science and Math Lab where the models for the anatomy classes are kept. In addition this location is ideal because it is in the flow of traffic from the NSCI building to the parking lot. The hope is that the STEM center will be an open, welcoming place for students to gather, study, enjoy a snack or coffee break, and seek assistance as needed.

Program Goal	To increase student access to tutoring services and facilities to improve learning and student engagement. Aligns with KCC Goals 1 & 2.
---------------------	---

Resource Requested*	Renovation for the ASC to create a STEM Center.
Cost and Vendor	\$100,000 approximate cost. Vender undetermined
Annual Recurring Cost	\$700 -\$900 per year for additional tutor staffing.
Useful Life of Resource	Ongoing
Person(s) Responsible and Collaborators	Academic Support Center Coordinator. Stem faculty
Timeline	Fall 2019

Tutoring Health Call
Rubric 2017-2018 AY

Area	Benchmark	Scoring
DEMAND		
<i>Monitoring the capacity and need for the unit.</i>		
Unduplicated number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions per student FTE (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 (5)	2 = More than 0.3; 1 = 0.2 to 0.3; 0 = Less than 0.2	
EFFICIENCY		
<i>Monitoring how time is budgeted and spent in the unit.</i>		
Tutor contact hours per tutor paid hours in one-on-one sessions (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 (7)	2= More than 0.6; 1 = 0.5 to 0.6; 0 = Less than 0.5	
EFFECTIVENESS		
<i>Monitoring the quality of products produced by the unit.</i>		
		2 = Healthy

Student Satisfaction (9A)
Survey Response = 'YES'

2= 90% or more; 1 = 80 to
90%; 0 = Less than 80%

1 = Cautionary
0 = Unhealthy

Overall Health Call

5-6 = Healthy