

Planning & Program Review (WebForms)

[Home](#)[Account Info](#)

[Plans for Tutoring Center](#) >> 2014 - 2015 Tutoring Center CHC Non-Instructional Program Review 2014-2015

This page is suitable for printing. Just use the print option in your browser or you can [print this page](#).

Name : 2014 - 2015 Tutoring Center CHC Non-Instructional Program Review 2014-2015

Principal Preparer : Jonathan Townsend

Progress Report Preparer : Jonathan Townsend

Version: 12

Group: 2014 - 2015

Type: CHC Non-Instructional Program Review 2014-2015

Last Modified On: 10/22/2014 9:04:28 AM

Last Modified By: Jonathan Townsend

State: Submitted (**Finalized**)

State By: Jonathan Townsend

Instructions

Please respond to the following questions. Please consult the [Integrated Planning and Program Review Handbook](#) for detailed instructions.

1. Description of Program

Assume the reader doesn't know anything about your program. Please describe your program, including the following:

- a. Organization (including staffing and structure)
- b. Mission, or primary purpose
- c. Whom you serve (including demographics and representativeness of population served)
- d. What kind of services you provide - **Rubric Item:** Describe your [Pattern of Service](#) including alternative modes and schedules of delivery (e.g.: online, hybrid, early morning, evening services).

A. Staff and Structure

The Tutoring Center (TC) is part of the Division of Math, English, Reading, and Instructional Support and reports to the dean of the division. The Tutoring Center is composed of two full-time faculty members, two full-time classified professionals, and more than 60 tutors and office assistants. This is a significant shift from three years ago when the center employed one full-time faculty member, four full-time classified professionals, one part-time classified professional and approximately 20 tutors.

Jonathan Townsend currently serves as the coordinator of the Tutoring Center, as well as coordinator for writing, reading, and humanities tutoring. His primary responsibilities are to oversee the day-to-day operations of the Tutoring Center, as well as supervising all English, reading and humanities tutors. Luis Mondragon coordinates math and science tutoring, including the Structured Learning Assistance (SLA) program. Both Jonathan and Luis design and produce all aspects of the Summer Bridge program, including hiring and training of Summer Bridge staff. They also design and oversee workshops for their respective disciplines. Karen Peterson is the Tutorial Coordinator; her primary duties are to oversee Tutoring Center operational processes, to coordinate the Weekly Tutoring program, and to provide logistical support for the Left Lane Program. Judy Cole is the Learning Resources Assistant and is responsible for reception, tutor payroll, and general administrative support.

B. Mission/Primary Purpose

The mission of the Tutoring Center is to be the best community college tutoring center in Southern California by advancing the educational and personal success of the students of CHC through strategic and high quality instructional support programming.

C. Whom You Serve

All students of the San Bernardino Community College District are welcome to utilize the services of the Tutoring Center. However, our primary focus is on students of Crafton Hills College. The Tutoring Center also provides a robust support service (the Left Lane Program) for students that have been identified as at-risk students as defined by the Basic Skills Initiative.

D. What kind of services do you provide?

- Walk-in tutoring
- Weekly tutoring program
- Structured learning assistance (SLA)
- Directed learning activities (DLAs)
- Targeted reading support program for Reading 980
- Workshops
- Summer Bridge
- Left Lane
- CRLA-certified tutor training program

E. How do you provide these services?

Our primary focus is on tutoring students in all subjects. Currently, we offer walk-in tutoring on a drop-in and one-time appointment basis, and recurring tutoring through our weekly tutoring program. All tutoring can facilitate either individuals or groups. Students are able to make appointments with tutors twice per week per course; they may use our walk-in service as often as they wish. We also provide DLAs for writing and reading; these activities are available on the Tutoring Center website. We offer workshops covering English and Math topics. While we are open from 8 am to 8 pm, we do not currently have the staffing structure or funding to provide weekend or online tutoring, which is a growing need as Crafton Hills College expands its offerings of weekend and online courses.

The Tutoring Center produces Summer Bridge for the Left Lane Program. Summer Bridge is an intensive, two-week program that prepares Left Lane students for the Math and English courses they will take during their first semester at Crafton Hills College. In addition, Summer Bridge provides students with skills that will enable them to be more successful. Presentations include time management, test preparation, goal setting, note-taking skills, as well as an introduction to campus life.

The Tutoring Center also provides training for all tutors through a College Reading & Learning Association (CRLA) certified program. All tutors are required to attend a minimum of 10 hours of training, tutor at least 25 hours during the semester, be evaluated, and observe other tutors. We currently offer certifications at Level I and Level II. A third level is pending.

2. External Factors with Significant Impact

What external factors have a significant impact on your program? Please include the following as appropriate:

- a. Budgetary constraints or opportunities
- b. Service area demographics
- c. Requirements of four-year institutions
- d. Requirements of prospective employers
- e. Job market
- f. Developments in the field (both current and future)
- g. Competition from other institutions
- h. Requirements imposed by regulations, policies, standards, and other mandates

The Tutoring Center is impacted significantly by a number of factors. Primarily, our services and our service capacity are directly related to the amount of funding we receive annually. Over the past four years, our budgetary needs for tutoring and support programming (not counting permanent staff salaries) have grown from \$76,000 per year

to over \$260,000 (more than 300% growth), but in that same time frame, our student use has grown by more than 600%. Funding of the Tutoring Center determines the types of services we are able to provide, as well as the degree to which we can provide them.

Another factor that impacts the Tutoring Center is the overwhelming number of students who are unable to read at the college level and require extra reading support in courses outside of reading and basic English. This has directly impacted and altered the way we offer reading support to the campus, and we are planning to do further research in this area.

The number of students coming into Crafton Hills College from the community and placing into basic skills courses is increasing demand for services and has necessitated dramatic changes to our reading program.

A final factor that impacts our program is that we often are unable to provide tutors for specific subjects because of a lack of qualified students. We find that once students have taken high-level math and science courses, they transfer out of CHC. This reduces the pool of eligible candidates that fit our high standard and reduces the number of students we are able to serve in certain higher-level courses.

3. Outcomes Assessment Reporting

Outcomes Assessment Reporting – **Rubric Item:** [Service Area and/or Student Learning Outcomes Process](#). Please use the following tool to report each course or program that was assessed this year, the type of outcome assessed, and the ILO the outcome maps to. In addition, also provide the [Five Column Assessment](#) information in the spaces provided: learning outcomes statement, means of assessment, criteria for success, summary of evidence, and the use of results. If you prefer, the Five Column Assessment information can be attached as a separate document. Additionally, other supporting documents that you wish to include can also be attached to the outcome.

- Program
 - **Statement:** At least 90% of students completing the survey will report that they were “satisfied” with Summer Bridge.
 - Measurement:** A survey was given to the Summer Bridge participants at the end of the program, July 2014.
 - Benchmark:** At least 90% of the students will be satisfied with the service.
 - Evidence:** Assessment was done, data was collected, and data is being process. The staff is waiting on results from IEORP.
 - Implications:** A preliminary review of the surveys (when we skimmed through them before submitting them to IEORP) indicates that the majority of the students were satisfied with the program, but an official report is pending, so no decisions have been made yet. We will discuss the results and any program improvement and planning in an upcoming department meeting when the results arrive.

Is Completed: No
Is Assessed: Yes
Outcome Type: Sao
ILO Type: Unknown

- o **Statement:** At least 90% of students completing the Tutoring Center Survey will report that they were “satisfied” with the center’s general tutoring services.

Measurement: A student survey was given at the end of the fall 2013 semester to the students in the TC. 255 students answered the survey.

Benchmark: At least 90% of the students will be satisfied with the service.

Evidence: Assessment was done and data was collected. 98% of students were satisfied with overall services of the TC.

Implications: 85% of students come to the tutoring center for walk-in tutoring; it is a priority for the TC staff to have enough walk-in tutors to meet this demand. 58% if the students learn about the TC services from their instructors; after discussing the results in a department meeting, the TC staff determined to maintain/increase communication with instructors to maintain/increase the number of student referrals. The department recognized that instructors are a significant referral and publicity source for the TC’s services, so we want to work to communicate better with faculty about our services. This was one reason that our objective 3.1 was written in our 4-year plan.

Is Completed: Yes
Is Assessed: Yes
Outcome Type: Sao
ILO Type: Unknown

- o **Statement:** At least 90% of students completing the Tutoring Center Survey will report that they were “satisfied” with the center’s SLA service.

Measurement: A student survey was given at the end of the fall 2013 to the students in the SLA classes.

Benchmark: At least 90% of the students will be satisfied with the service.

Evidence: Assessment was done, data was collected, and data is being process. The staff is waiting on results.

Implications: A preliminary review of the surveys indicates that the majority of the students were satisfied with the program, but official data results have not yet been received from IEORP. We will discuss the results in a department meeting when the results arrive.

Is Completed: No
Is Assessed: Yes
Outcome Type: Sao
ILO Type: Unknown

- o **Statement:** At least 90% of students completing the Tutoring Center Survey will report that they were “satisfied” with the Weekly Tutoring service.

Measurement: A student survey was given at the end of the spring 2014 semester to the students using the service. 13 students answered the survey.

Benchmark: At least 90% of the students will report that the service helped them improve their class grade.

Evidence: Assessment was done and data was collected. 92 % responded that their class grade improved because of weekly tutoring.

Implications: The department met during a department meeting and discussed the results together. First, the small sample size was identified and we realized that we need to use different methods in the future to secure more robust and reliable data. Although we met our success measure, we need more data next time. We also identified from other questions in the survey that the program needs more tutors to meet the demand of service requests. We further identified that tutors need additional training to improve and expand the program. This was integrated into the next iteration of tutor training, which happened in fall 2014.

Is Completed: Yes

Is Assessed: Yes

Outcome Type: Sao

ILO Type: Unknown

- o **Statement:** At least 90% of the tutors will find the Tutor Training Program helpful.

Measurement: A survey was given to the tutors at the end of the Spring 2014 semester.

Benchmark: At least 90% of the tutors will find the Tutor Training Program helpful.

Evidence: Assessment was done and data was collected. More than 90 % of the tutors found the specific subject training somewhat helpful or very helpful. About 80% found the CRLA training somewhat helpful or very helpful.

Implications: We did not meet our success measure for this outcome. Subject-specific training was adequate, and we determined that much of the CRLA training was working and was helpful, but some things needed changing. The coordinators who are responsible for designing tutor training met and discussed these results, and we decided to make the following changes to the program: We incorporated our professional tutors into the tutor training planning and implementation process to add fresh perspective and different trainers. We wrote different training curriculum to add greater variety and incorporated some new methods of training to make the training more helpful to tutors. Two examples of this: we have DSPS conduct at least one training per semester on disability, and we are using role-playing more often in trainings.

Is Completed: Yes

Is Assessed: Yes

Outcome Type: Sao

ILO Type: Unknown

4. Progress on SLOs

4. Progress on SAOs – **Rubric Item:** [Service Area and/or Student Learning Outcomes Process](#).

- a. Please summarize the progress your unit has made on SAO measures you have applied since your last program review.

- b. Please describe any improvements made by your unit as a result of the outcomes assessment process.
- c. What is your plan for continuously completing the assessment cycle?
- d. If your program has SLOs, please discuss here.

A.

Since the last program review, the Tutoring Center staff met and decided to deploy surveys in different service areas to assess SAO 1.1 and analyze if the Tutoring Center is providing high-quality academic support services. The results from the surveys showed that the vast majority of the students that participated in the survey are satisfied with the center's services.

The Tutoring Center wanted to assess SAO 1.2 in order to gauge the impact of the tutoring services on course success, retention, and persistence. However, the Tutoring Center wasn't able to assess the SAO 1.2. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning is in the process of generating a report that will include the impact of the Tutoring Center on course success, retention, and persistence among other things. The Tutoring Center wants to work with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning to create a similar report every 2 years in order to identify data trends that may suggest a need for changes in our support services.

The Structured Learning Assistance program (SLA) was assessed as part of SAO 2.1 during the semesters of Fall 2012, Spring 2013, and Fall 2013. The data from Fall 2013 showed that the students find the program very helpful. However, no data has been generated regarding the impact on course success, retention, and persistence. The Tutoring Center plans to work with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning to generate a report based on how the SLA program impacts course success, retention, and persistence.

The Tutoring Center's website now contains assessment reports to meet SAO 3.1. This information can be found on the Tutoring Center's [Data and Assessment web page](#). The Tutoring Center will continue to post reports and any data pertaining to the assessment of services on this page.

During the spring 2014, the Tutoring Center created SAO 4.1: At least 90% of the tutors will find the tutor training program helpful. This SAO was assessed during the spring of 2014. The results showed that more than 90% of the tutors found the training very helpful or somewhat helpful. The TC staff wants to keep making improvements to the tutor training program and make sure it becomes a model program for other tutoring centers and learning institutions.

Answers to parts b, c and d:

- Due to the past assessment of the Summer Bridge Program, improvements/modifications were made to the program this year:
 - i. In addition to the morning (9am-12:30pm) and afternoon (1pm-3:30pm) sessions, an evening session (6pm-9:30pm) was added to accommodate students that worked

between the hours of 8am-5pm.

- ii. The sessions were modified to provide students with review material for both math and English instead of just one subject as was done the previous year.
- iii. A more robust campus tour was given to students.
- iv. Study skills presentations were modified to improve content and be more engaging.

- Because of the demand and feedback that we received about our weekly tutoring program, the following improvements were made to the program:

- i. More tutors were hired to meet increased demand and expand the program.
- ii. Weekly tutor training was improved/modified/increased.

- During the last two years, changes have been made to the tutor training program:

- i. Regular tutor training sessions occur every Friday (2pm-4pm) after the Tutoring Center closes.
- ii. The Tutor Lead position was created. This position is given to experienced tutors that have shown exceptional tutoring and leadership skills. Tutor leads provide tutoring support and guidance to the other tutors. The title of Tutor Lead is an internal departmental title only; tutor leads officially hold the district title of Tutor II or Tutor III.
- iii. The tutor training program now includes Level 1 and Level 2 CRLA certifications. The Tutoring Center is working on adding Level 3 certification to be deployed in the near future.

- Because of the assessment of SAO 4.1, the Tutoring Center's staff is creating a tutor training manual and is currently revising and modifying training modules to improve the overall training program.

- The Tutoring Center has improved (and continues to improve) the department's website content and navigation to provide students with useful resources and good user experience.

- The Tutoring Center has no SLOs.

The Tutoring Center has created the following SAOs for 2014-2015:

2014-2015 SAOs

Reading

1.1 By the end of the term, students will improve on their initial pre-assessment rating.

Measurement tool: activity pre-assessments/session 10 reflection activity

Success measure: improvement in 4 skills

1.2 Students and faculty will be satisfied overall with the reading service provided.

Measurement tool: satisfaction survey deployed at end of term.

Success measure: 95% of respondents will be either satisfied or very satisfied with the service.

Weekly Tutoring

2.1 Students will be satisfied overall with the service.

Measurement tool: satisfaction survey deployed at end of term.

Success measure: 95% of respondents will be either satisfied or very satisfied with the service.

Tutor Training

3.1 Tutors participating in lead tutor training will find training helpful or very helpful in regards to learning leadership and supervision skills.

Measurement tool: online survey/focus group

Success measure: 100%

3.2 Tutors participating in tutor training will find training helpful or very helpful.

Measurement tool: online survey

Success measure: 100%

3.3 Tutors will complete the next appropriate level of CRLA certification—either level 1 or level 2.

Measurement tool: data sheet/CRLA completion criteria

Success measure: 100%

Summer Bridge

4.1 Summer Bridge participants found the program to be valuable or very valuable in helping prepare them for starting classes.

Measurement tool: survey deployed in Summer Bridge

Success measure: 95%

SLA

5.1 Students who have attended 50% or more of the SLA sessions feel that Sla helped them improve their math class grade by at least one letter grade.

Measurement tool: survey deployed in SLA classes

Success measure: 90%

5. Quantitative and Qualitative Results

Please provide...

- a. **Rubric Item:** At least two quantitative or qualitative measures you have chosen to gauge your [program's effectiveness](#) e.g.: transfers, degrees, certificates, satisfaction, student contacts, students serviced, Perkin's data, etc.
- b. **Rubric Item:** A summary of the results of these measures. Please be sure to set a target and provide the reasoning for the [target](#) that has been set.
- c. What did you learn from your evaluation of these measures, and what improvements have you implemented or do you plan to implement as a result of your analysis of these measures?

a)

We have chosen 1) satisfaction and 2) student use as the measures we use to gauge effectiveness. For measure 1, we use student surveys (qualitative). For measure 2, we use SARS use reports.

b)

Structured Learning Assistance (SLA) Evaluations: The Tutoring Center administered an evaluation (survey) to rate the students' satisfaction with the SLA workshops (see attachment). In the last evaluation we learned that 98% of respondents rated their SLA tutor as very or somewhat effective at conducting sessions. 97% of respondents affirmed or somewhat affirmed the SLA sessions helped them with test preparation. 96% of respondents stated their SLA sessions helped them understand the course material most or some of the time. 81% of respondents rated whether SLA sessions helped them earn a higher grade as definitely yes or probably yes.

Summer Bridge Evaluations: Every year, the Tutoring Center administers an evaluation to rate the students' satisfaction with the summer bridge program (see attachment). In the last evaluation, we learned that 90% or more of the respondents Agreed or Strongly Agreed with the following statements about Summer Bridge:

- o My math skills improved because of the Summer Bridge Program.
- o My English skills improved because of the Summer Bridge Program.
- o The Bridge facilitator was knowledgeable about the subject matter.
- o The Bridge facilitator's presentation style and techniques were effective.
- o I feel more prepared for the start of classes because of the Summer Bridge Program.
- o I found the math handouts and materials helpful.
- o I found the English handouts and materials helpful.
- o I would recommend the Summer Bridge Program to others.

We also learned that 80% or more of the respondents assigned a rating of 5 or 4 [utilizing a five-point scale where 5 = Extremely Valuable and 1 = Not at all valuable] to the following questions about Summer Bridge sessions and activities:

- o How easy was it to understand material provided in the program?
- o How valuable was the time management session?
- o How valuable was the Reading in College session?
- o How valuable was the In-the-Classroom session?
- o How valuable was the Prepping for Tests session?
- o How valuable were the Tutoring Center/Study Groups session?
- o How valuable was the Campus Tour?

These results indicate that the students find the program very helpful and of high quality.

Student Surveys: During the spring semester of 2014 the Tutoring Center administered a student survey to rate the students' satisfaction with the TC. About 83% of the students reported waiting 20 min or less to see a tutor when doing walk-in tutoring. 70% reported to have waited less than 10 minutes. About 16% reported waiting for more than 25 minutes to see a tutor. This information tells us that the waiting time for most students is appropriate. However, we want to improve and make sure that the 16% that waited more than 25 minutes see a tutor sooner by encouraging them to make appointments. As a result of this data, the Tutoring Center hired more tutors for the fall of 2014 to meet

increased demand and ensure that the waiting time to see a tutor is reasonable. Almost 60% of the students that answered the survey found out about the Tutoring Center and its services from their instructors. The TC staff wants to make sure that communication between instructors and TC staff continues and increases so that instructors keep referring students to the TC. 83% of the respondents felt that the Tutoring Center had an effect on their overall course grades. This helped the TC corroborate that the services that are offered have a positive effect on student grades.

Tutor surveys: During the spring of 2014, the TC staff gave the tutors a survey to assess the tutor training program. More than 90% of the tutors found the subject training somewhat helpful or very helpful. About 80% found the CRLA training somewhat helpful or very helpful. 68% of the tutors said that they improved their tutoring practice a great deal during a year; the rest (32%) reported that their tutoring practice improved somewhat over a year. 87 % of the tutors attributed their improvement to the tutor training program.

SARS Reports: At the end of each semester the TC runs SARS reports to assess the number of students that are served. The [linked table](#) summarizes some of the reports that were obtained since the fall of 2010.

These reports have helped the Tutoring Center's staff make informed and strategic decisions about how many tutors are hired to meet service demand. These reports have also made it clear that there has been a significant increase in the demand of services and the number of students that are using the Tutoring Center's services.

6. Performance on Data Items

Please discuss your program's performance on each component of the applicable evaluation rubric (The rubric is available in Blackboard, the OIERP Web Site, and in the PPR Handbook). If you have already discussed your programs performance on one or more these components then refer to that response here, rather than repeating it.

a. Non-Instructional Program Effectiveness Evaluation Rubric

- i) **Rubric Item:** Describe a significant [innovation or enhancement](#), and the data collected and analyzed that has helped to determine the efficacy of the innovation.
- ii) **Rubric Item:** Describe at least 2 external and/or internal [partnerships](#) that substantially impact the quality of services to students or clients.

i)

The Left Lane Program is a one-year targeted student intervention program designed to shorten the length of time to completion. It is targeted at first-year students who place into a course below college level in English, reading, or math. The program is designed to leverage existing college resources to have maximum effect on student completion,

retention, and persistence with minimal extra costs to the college. The TC plays a large role in the production, design, and evaluation of this program.

This program's data is outlined in the summary of findings section of [a report housed on the OIERP website](#). The data suggests that the Left Lane Program is a significant and meaningful contributor to student success and should be continued. Data collection and analysis for this program will be ongoing.

Summer Bridge is a programmatic component of the Left Lane Program. It is run for two weeks in the summer. It is designed to review and preview English and math content, offer an robust orientation to the campus, and review study skills. The data collected from Summer Bridge has two parts:

- 1) Student satisfaction survey for both [English](#) and [Math](#) tracks deployed to all Summer Bridge participants.
- 2) Focus groups with Left Lane Program students held during week 6 of the fall term. Overall, the data collected from these focus groups indicated that students felt that Summer Bridge was very helpful and helped prepare students for their classes, reduced anxiety about the start of college, and helped familiarize them with the campus in a significant way that directly affected their performance in their courses. Additionally, students wanted both math and English review in Bridge. These data were discussed at Tutoring Center department meetings and at Summer Bridge planning meetings. Changes were made to the program as appropriate.

Tutor training was redesigned to follow the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) guidelines for tutor training programs. The TC's training program was certified by CRLA to offer level 1 and level 2 training certifications. The TC's Friday hours of operation were significantly adjusted to accommodate regular and ongoing tutor training throughout the term. Part of the innovation was a move to a modularized approach to tutor training and the development of a new training program that included several training modules not previously deployed.

There were a few different data pieces that were used to evaluate the new program's efficacy. First was the overall student use survey for the TC, in which 98% of students were satisfied with the TC's services. This indicates a highly satisfactory tutor force. Second was the tutor survey (deployed to the tutors who went through the training program). More than 90% of tutors found the training helpful. While this indicates that the tutor training program is effective, we want to see 100% of tutors find the training helpful, and are continually making data-driven changes to the training to enhance it.

ii)

The TC has several partnerships:

1. We partner with multiple campus departments including Counseling and Admissions & Records to produce the Left Lane Program.
2. We have partnered with the Fire Academy to offer writing support for fire cadets
3. We partner with DSPS to produce our tutor training program and to provide

above-and-beyond tutoring services to students with disabilities and to students in Extended Opportunities Programs and Services.

4. We have partnered with science instructors to create workshops designed for specific classes and concepts.
5. Partnerships with English faculty have allowed us to design a presentation/service to English and writing courses in which we demonstrate the peer review process and prepare the students for peer review in their own course.
6. We also partner with the Math department to produce our SLA program.
7. The TC works with STEM to facilitate some of our science tutoring.
8. Additionally, we partner with all the instructional faculty to identify and refer qualified students to apply to work as tutors.

Each of these partnerships substantially affects the quality of the services provided by the Tutoring Center.

7. Evaluation

7. Based upon and not repeating the descriptions you provided in Question 1 and the responses provided in Questions 2-6, please provide an analysis of what is going well and why and what is not going well and why, in the following areas.

- Representativeness of population served
- Alternative modes and schedules of delivery (e.g.: online, hybrid, early morning, evening services)
- Partnerships (internal and external)
- Innovation and Implementation of best practices
- Efficiency in operations
- Efficiency in resource use
- Staffing
- Participation in shared governance (e.g., do unit members feel they participate effectively in planning and decision-making?)
- Professional development and training
- Group dynamics (e.g., how well do unit members work together?)
- Compliance with applicable mandates

Representativeness of population served

We have seen tremendous success in the growth of various areas being served. In particular, we have seen increased language and science support, with courses being supported more extensively than in the past (ASL, Japanese, Arabic, chemistry, geology/geography). The biggest challenge in this area is that it is sometimes difficult to find qualified student tutors in certain subjects in which the need is great for a smaller population of students (statistics, calculus 3, microbiology, chemistry and organic chemistry). Many of these courses are taken by students in their final semester at

Crafton, so qualified student tutors for these disciplines are harder to find.

Alternative modes and schedules of delivery

We have limited evening tutoring services and limited early morning tutoring, and those are working well, but comparably few students utilize the services at those hours. Essentially, we need to improve a lot in this area. We do not currently offer online tutoring to serve distance and online students, nor do we have extensive evening hours. We also need to add weekend services as well, which we have never offered before. We are trying to put as many resources on the department's website as possible so that students can access some kind of support on evenings and weekends, but we intend to grow this area in the next four years. In order to do this we need increased staffing, and in particular we need staff for the center that are allowed to work evenings and weekends. Short-term hourly staff are not allowed to work on weekends, and our current staff are not enough to staff the center for extended evening hours and weekends. In addition, more tutors would be necessary to offer more service hours.

Partnerships (internal and external)

Our department has done a good job of building internal partnerships with many different areas on campus (see question 6ii). As we have grown the kinds of support services we offer and the size of our service footprint on campus, partnerships have been both necessary and vital for growth. Our intradepartmental communication has helped facilitate this as has the streamlining of internal processes. This has allowed us to communicate more effectively with other departments.

Innovation and implementation of best practices

- Creation and use of unit outcome assessment calendar: We have calendarized our assessment process. We have a yearly planning retreat at the end of spring, and a planning department meeting at the beginning of each term to discuss assessed outcomes and close the loop on the process.
- Regular one-on-one meetings between coordinators and staff: One-on-ones are a best practice in management, and are used effectively at organizations like Apple. They have helped with communication, department problem-solving, and staff focus, morale, and purpose.
- Implementation of augmented tutor training program: we have redesigned our tutor training program to be more efficient, more helpful for the tutors, and we have added one level of the nationally-recognized College Reading and Learning Association certification. A third level is pending.
- Implementation of tutor leadership program: we have regular leadership training for our professional tutors to equip them with training in supervising skills, program design and assessment, and tutor training design and implementation skills. Adding this leadership program has enriched the skill of our professional tutors and enhanced the skill level of the entire tutor workforce.
- Redesign of reading support: the reading support redesign process began with the faculty need and the course objectives of Reading 980. The sessions are modularized support sessions (sometimes called DLAs) that can be used by faculty in a variety of ways.
- Departmental emphasis on ongoing professional development: over the past three years, we have augmented training for all our tutors. Every department member has been asked to create a personal professional development plan, and TC coordinators

have regular one-on-one meetings with full and part-time staff to discuss issues and be available for mentoring.

- Guided discussions through relevant books for staff—our tutor leaders and our staff and reception student workers have recently started reading and discussing books related to relevant best practices in their respective areas.

Although we have data linking TC programming to student success, we need to do a better job at this and do more research on the link between TC services and student success. Some of our 4-year plan objectives are designed to accomplish this. We never completed one objective about this from our last cycle, and we need to continue the work to determine the impact of tutoring on course success, retention, and persistence. We also need to determine the campus's needs in reading. There have been years and years of evidence suggesting that students are not prepared to deal with the college-level texts that are required of them in their courses, but we have not conducted research across the curriculum to find out what specific reading skills need improvement.

With the tablet initiative gaining initiative on campus and with ever-changing technology, we need to begin to identify ways we can offer services more efficiently and innovatively using the technology that students are already bringing into the center and using at home and in their classes. To do this well, we need to first do some research on best practices in this area.

Even though our student use has ballooned in recent years, we are still not communicating as effectively to the campus as we could be. We know that some students and even faculty (even department chairs) do not even know where the Tutoring Center is located, let alone what services we offer. The Tutoring Center needs to present itself more clearly, and we need to use best practices in marketing and communication to more clearly communicate our services, mission, and purpose to the campus community.

Efficiency in operations

Having a centralized location for tutoring services has been very successful in several ways. It helps facilitate easy access of multiple services all in one location, and students tend to access multiple services in one visit. We have been very successful in attracting students to tutoring services, as our student traffic has increased by approximately 600% in the last three years (see link in question 5b). Our centralized location allows for one tutor with multiple subject skills to tutor multiple disciplines in one location, making the tutor and her time more valuable. Emphasizing group tutoring sessions has opened the capacity for more tutoring to happen. Streamlining internal operations processes like tutor hiring, evaluations, and tutor training has helped as well. In particular, we began closing the center at 2 pm every Friday to facilitate a weekly training time between 2 and 4 pm. This has helped us streamline tutor and staff training and departmental communication.

The attrition of our permanent staff from 6.5 three years ago to 4 today has had a negative impact on our operational efficiency. As student use has increased by about 600% and more support programs have been added or augmented, our staff has shrunk, resulting in fewer people doing considerably more work. There is a need for more support staff, tutors, and faculty in the center to keep up with the tremendous growth of

demand for tutorial services and to maintain the high quality of services offered, to say nothing of working to expand needed services into areas of instruction that have historically and consistently asked for more service help (like reading support in courses and disciplines from across the campus).

The production of the Left Lane Program has also been an increasing challenge for the Tutoring Center in regards to operational efficiency. While LLP services and students have helped increase the overall service footprint of the TC, keeping up with the increasing workload has been difficult for the department. In particular, as the college grows the size of LLP each year, our staff has decreased, and the role we have played in producing LLP has increased. After Raju Hegde left the institution, TC staff took over the coordination of the program, but it has become clear that operational efficiency is compromised by not having a manager or coordinator of LLP outside of the TC. Additionally, Karen Peterson has been providing logistical support for the LLP, but our current compliment of support staff is not enough to do the work needed in the TC and continue to provide the LLP logistical support that is needed.

Efficiency in resource use

The costs for tutoring have greatly increased because the demand for tutoring services has increased. While our student use has increased by about 600% over the last three years, our tutoring budget has not increased that much. One reason is that we are able to be more strategic with the deployment of tutors, using group sessions where possible. Another is that we are able to use tutors who can tutor multiple subjects, effectively increasing efficiency.

Even though we are receiving funds from various sources other than the general fund (BSI, the San Manuel grant, one-time district funds for programs), this money is not institutionalized and cannot be relied on from year to year. Our tutoring budget need has grown from \$76,000 three years ago (see 2011 program review document) to approximately \$260,000 this year (not including costs for permanent staff salaries). This growth is substantial and demonstrates both the dramatic rise in demand for services and the center's efficiency in deploying these funds, since the student use growth rate is 600% and the budget growth rate is only 300%.

A significant and growing challenge for us is a lack of sufficient space for tutoring. We need more space, but also certain kinds of spaces in order to provide the kinds of services that are needed for the student populations that are using and will use the center. Much of our reading support program requires students to read out loud to the tutor in order to identify and work on challenging words and skills in reading. This kind of activity cannot realistically be done in a small tutor room with other students present and listening. We need more designated open study/group study space as well as spaces that allow for quiet study or one-on-one tutoring that is private. We currently lack an adequate amount of this kind of space and have had to decline service to some students because of this. In addition, we have had to decline service requests from faculty because of a lack of adequate space. We have had many requests from faculty to bring their entire class to the TC to do some kind of support activity but we have had to decline those requests because of a lack of space to accommodate whole classes at one time.

During busy times, every seat and study room is full, and we sometimes have tutors tutoring out in the hall, sometimes even sitting on the floor with their students because there are no more tables or chairs available. We often have students come in to the Tutoring Center during the busiest times and look around for a seat. Finding none, many turn around and walk out. This means we are losing many students to a lack of adequate space. We also have no way of calculating how many students are affected in this way, but we see it happen all the time.

Staffing

Significant staffing changes have occurred in the last three years. One was the freezing of the English and math paraprofessional positions and the addition of Luis Mondragon as math/science faculty coordinator and Jonathan Townsend as English/reading/ humanities faculty coordinator. This substantial staffing shift has allowed for the development of subject-specific tutor training, workshops, augmented support programming, the beginning of contextualized support services, and increased communication and collaboration with campus faculty. However, the department does not know if or when these positions will be made permanent, so the departmental staffing structure is ambiguous, and this can negatively affect planning and morale. Another change was the reclassification of Karen Peterson to Tutorial Coordinator. This new position allows for much better streamlining of internal departmental processes.

The attrition of our permanent staff from 6.5 FTE staff three years ago to 4 FTE staff today has had a negative impact on our operational effectiveness. Producing the programming for the Left Lane Program and Summer Bridge and maintaining the logistical support for these programs has been challenging for the department with our current staffing compliment. In addition, since our student tutor workforce has grown through necessity, the work required to maintain and supervise that workforce has grown as well while our permanent staff is only 60% of what it was.

One staffing change we have implemented that is working very well is the expanded use of short-term hourly professional tutors. We have hired these professional tutors in multiple subjects including math, language, science, writing, and reading, and they serve as resources for the student tutors working during their shift. This addition of another level of expertise effectively provides for shift supervisors, allowing shifts of tutors to learn more effectively together about tutoring. It also has increased the morale and the focus of the tutor workforce, making all the tutors more effective. This staffing shift is one the department has found remarkably helpful and intends to continue.

Janet Burnham and Betty Weischadle (our two reading instructional assessment technicians) have retired during the 2013-2014 year. While we have hired professional tutors via short-term hourly assignments to keep the service going this year, the lack of a full-time reading staff member has been very difficult for all departmental staff and the students that are served by the reading support service. Jonathan Townsend has been coordinating the reading service, but his duties coordinating writing and humanities support services, in addition to his duties coordinating the department, the Left Lane Program, and Summer Bridge, are simply too much work for one full-time position, and the quality of work will suffer if this situation continues. We are also not able to meet the need or demand for all the reading tutoring. We have already had to turn away requests for expanded reading tutoring for other courses and expanded one-on-one reading

tutoring due to lack of Tutoring Center staffing. We have received requests from faculty in Political Science, philosophy, history, mathematics, and English for various levels of reading support for their courses, but we are currently unable to meet these needs.

Participation in shared governance

Tutoring Center staff sit on a variety of campus and district committees. Karen Peterson sits on SSEEMM, Professional Development, and (until recently) the district budget committee. Luis Mondragon sits on Professional Development, SSEEMM, and Basic Skills Initiative (BSI). He also teaches and participates in the math department. Jonathan Townsend sits on SSEEM, IEAOC, and BSI. Judy Cole has not served on any committees in the past three years.

Department members generally feel positively about their participation in campus governance outside of the department, but there is room for improvement, particularly in the area of classified staff having an equal voice in campus governance. One big area of concern for all the department members regarding campus planning and decision-making is that there have been several college conversations and planning sessions about our unit but without anyone from our unit invited or present. In particular, this has occurred in regards to creation of a LLP 3-year plan as well as two things related to Tutoring Center space on campus: 1) conversations about moving toward a decentralized, multi-success center model, and 2) design of success center space in the LADM remodel plan. No one from the Tutoring Center was present, consulted, nor invited to participate in these conversations which may have drastic impact on TC services and staff.

Planning and decision-making processes within the department have been greatly improved in the last three years. Decisions are shared appropriately. Faculty, staff and even students are regularly consulted to offer input on planning.

Professional development and training

In the past three years, we have augmented training for our short-term hourly staff and for our tutors. Every department member has been asked to create a personal professional development plan, and TC coordinators have regular one-on-one meetings with full and part-time staff to discuss issues and be available for mentoring.

One challenge in this area is that it is difficult to attend conferences for training due to the limited college funds in this area, most conferences we would attend would require significant out of pocket expense, which means that even with professional development funds helping pay for expenses, we simply cannot afford to go to the conferences we would like to.

Group dynamics

Overall things are going very well in this area. In general, the staff in our department get along well and like each other. The biggest challenge in this area is that we have had departmental attrition (from 6.5 to 4 FTE staff) and this has caused some of our staff to have more work than can reasonably be completed in forty hours per week. More staff would help the group function better.

One example of how the group has worked together well is evidenced by this document. The process of producing this document began in May 2014, during our departmental

planning retreat. During that retreat, all permanent staff were present and all short-term hourly staff were invited as well. Almost all attended, close to 15 people. At the retreat we discussed programs that we had run that year and evaluated some data from assessment as it was available. We then began the process of working through the program review process. We did a lot of work that day, and everyone participated. The short-term hourly staff participated with particular enthusiasm, as this was the first time they were invited to be a part of this process.

In fall the department began to meet every two weeks for department meetings, and every Friday morning to discuss program review and planning and update each other on the work we had all been doing. Most of the writing was done by Jonathan Townsend, Luis Mondragon, and Karen Peterson, with short-term hourly staff helping with the writing as they were able to, since they are only on campus for a limited amount of time each week. The developing 4-year plan was created with permanent and short-term staff present, then reviewed by all permanent and short-term staff in the department. Opportunity was given for student tutors to provide input as well. The document in its final form was truly a collaborative effort over a period of many months, and I am immensely proud of the job that our department's staff have done in producing it.

Compliance with applicable mandates

One area where we are not in compliance with mandates is that we regularly exceed the posted maximum capacity for our facility. This is due to overwhelming demand for tutoring services. While this kind of problem is a good one to have, we nonetheless need to secure adequate facilities for the tutoring demand so we can be in compliance with this mandate.

Implementation of outcomes was the single greatest criticism of the college during the recent accreditation team site-visit. We regularly create and use outcomes in our department. We have calendarized our assessment process into our yearly calendar. We have a yearly planning retreat at the end of spring, and a planning department meeting at the beginning of each term to discuss assessed outcomes and close the loop on the process. Our [SAOs for 2014-2015](#) were listed in question 4 and can be found on our website.

While we have done a good job of using outcomes and going through the five-column model, we can improve in communicating this to the campus. In particular, one of our goals from the last cycle was to list assessment data and outcomes on our website, which we have recently begun to do. We now have a system in place for continuing this, and will continue to put more internal assessment data on our site.

Addendum

The Tutoring Center has, historically, overseen all LRC and CHC courses, but review of those courses is absent from this program review. The reason is that three years ago, Robert Brown, working as Developmental Studies Specialist and the Tutoring Center Coordinator, managed these courses. He was the instructor of record for many of the LRC courses and scheduled the CHC courses; in short, he acted as department chair. When Robert Brown moved to the STEM grant, Raju Hegde took over the responsibility

for overseeing the LRC and CHC courses. Only a few days ago from when this was written were those responsibilities handed to Jonathan Townsend formally with board approval. In short, the oversight of those courses was our department's responsibility for only the first of the past three years; in years 2 and 3 these courses were not our responsibility. Because of this, they are not addressed in this program review. We intend to address them in the next cycle.

8. Vision and Mission

a. Tell us your vision: Where would you like your program to be four years from now? Dream big while considering any upcoming changes (e.g.: new buildings, labs, growth, changes in the discipline etc.).

b. **Rubric Item** ([Alignment](#)): In what ways does your mission and vision align with and contribute to the college's [mission](#) and [vision](#), as specified in the CHC Educational Master Plan?

8a)

- In four years, we want to be the premiere tutoring program in Southern California, offering comprehensive academic support programming to the campus while being the most desired place for a CHC student to work, on or off-campus. The services we offer will be easy to access, will help students succeed, and will be high quality. We will be a singular location on campus that encourages and demonstrates lifelong learning for students, faculty, and staff: a place where everyone learns together.
- First, we want to secure the necessary staffing and space to provide for 1) the current demand for support services, and 2) the continued growth that we expect to see over the next four years. Our current space is inadequate for our current needs, let alone for continued growth, so we would like to have a centralized location on campus with at least 3x the square footage of our current location. We would also like to have an attached classroom that we can use as tutoring overflow and to work with whole classes at one time.
- In four years we will have greatly expanded our reading support programming. We will offer contextualized reading support for students in all disciplines. This will include a variety of reading support programs and will be designed and led by a faculty member with reading background and expertise. A reading paraprofessional will assist the implementation of these programs.
- We will offer robust evening, weekend, and online tutoring services to support the demand of the changing CHC student population and its needs.
- As the Left Lane Program is institutionalized and expanded over the next four years, we will continue to participate by offering academic support services to LLP students. We intend to continue participating in Summer Bridge as well.

- We will develop a robust and sustainable volunteer tutor force to supplement our paid tutor workforce. This tutor force will consist of volunteers from area universities, and a robust training program will accompany its deployment. We want to be able to offer all of our tutors significant professional development and experience by the time they leave our tutoring center. This will help our relationships with the community and leverage a larger talent pool than we have at Crafton Hills.

8b)

The TC's activities, programs, and goals align with the colleges in significant ways, and we have demonstrated that through the services we provide and the programming we run.

The TC offers several high-quality support programs that are used extensively and are designed to meet the instructional support needs of students (CHC Goal 1.1 and 1.2). Our programming is based on best practices of academic support. Our tutor training program, for example, is certified by the College Reading and Learning Association which ensures that nationally-recognized best practices in tutoring support are used (CHC Goal 3.1). Over the past three years, the TC's planning processes have become more aligned with the spirit of CHC Goals 6.1 and 6.2. We have over 2 demonstrated years of operating virtually all aspects of the department through evidence-based and collaborative decision-making. We have more recently been working to make our processes more transparent. We work hard to use tutors and staff in optimal ways, and we have demonstrated that we have managed change proactively (CHC Goals 7.1 and 7.2). Finally, we work hard to use our personnel and financial resources strategically (CHC Goals 8.1 and 8.3).

The TC's programming significantly helps support transfer preparation (CHC Vision) and is designed to help support the success of students in a quality instructional support environment (CHC Mission).

9. Progress on Prior Goals

Briefly summarize the progress your unit has made in meeting the goals and objectives identified in your last Four-Year Action Plan.

- **1 - Goal - Academic Support Services**

The Tutoring Center will provide **high-quality** academic support services that assist students in their academic improvement. These support services include individual tutoring, group tutoring, student workshops, and academic support materials (e.g., DLA's, study guides, etc.)

Priority Rank: 1

Objectives:

◦ **1.1 - Objective - Student Surveys**

SAO 1.1 - At least 90% of students completing the Tutoring Center Student Survey will report that they were "satisfied" with the center's services.

RATIONALE:

To reach the goal of providing high-quality academic support services, we need a way to measure for "quality".

Priority Rank: 1

Original Start Date: 12/12/2011 **Original End Date:** 05/20/2011

Revised Start Date: 12/12/2011 **Revised End Date:** 05/20/2011

Responsible Person: Tutoring Center Staff

Strategic Direction: None

Impact Type: -- Pick One --

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

Actions/Activities:

▪ **1.1.a1 - Revise student surveys**

Revise student surveys so that they ask relevant questions specific to the services being assessed. This needs to be completed before the start of the spring semester.

Start Date: 12/12/2011 **End Date:** 01/13/2012

Responsible Person: Tutoring Center Staff

Status Code: Work is Completed

Progress Description:

This was completed, and satisfaction surveys are continually edited as needed before they are deployed.

Measurements/Documentation of Progress:

▪ **1.1.a2 - Work with ORP**

Work with Office of Research & Planning (ORP) to determine the appropriate number of surveys needed to provide significant data, the best time during the term to disseminate the surveys, and the most effective ways to disseminate the surveys that would elicit greater response.

Start Date: 12/12/2011 **End Date:** 01/13/2012

Responsible Person: Tutoring Center Staff

Status Code: Work is Completed and Ongoing

Progress Description:

We have regularly been working with IEORP to create surveys. This happens on an ongoing basis.

Measurements/Documentation of Progress:

- **1.1.a3 - Disseminate Surveys**

The student surveys will be given to students to complete at multiple times during the spring 2012 semester.

Start Date: 01/17/2012 **End Date:** 05/18/2012

Responsible Person: Tutoring Center Staff

Status Code: Work is Completed

Progress Description:

This work was done, but not by spring 2012. It was completed and ongoing student satisfaction surveys were deployed in 2013 and 2014.

Measurements/Documentation of Progress:

- **1.2 - Objective - Tutoring Center Impact**

SAO 1.2 – Determine the impact of tutoring on course success, retention, and persistence as appropriate.

RATIONALE:

Part of determining the center’s effectiveness must include its ability to impact the grades of the students we serve.

Priority Rank: 3

Original Start Date: 12/19/2011 **Original End Date:** 05/25/2012

Revised Start Date: 12/19/2011 **Revised End Date:** 05/25/2012

Responsible Person: Tutoring Center Staff

Strategic Direction: None

Impact Type: -- Pick One --

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

Actions/Activities:

- **1.2.a1 - Identify "10+" Students**

Create a method for pulling data from SARS database that displays statistics for students utilizing center services for 10 hours or more per semester.

Start Date: 12/19/2011 **End Date:** 12/22/2011

Responsible Person:

Tutoring Center Coordinator and Learning Resource Assistants

Status Code: Work is Completed

Progress Description:

We have created a method for pulling the needed data from SARS.

Measurements/Documentation of Progress:

- **1.2.a2 - Run Course Success Reports**
 - Submit to ORP the list of ID numbers representing students who utilized services 10 hours or more for the semester.
 - Request ORP to run reports comparing course success data with general population.

Start Date: 01/13/2012 **End Date:** 02/03/2012

Responsible Person:

Learning Resource Assistants and ORP

Status Code:

Work is Planned but not yet firmly scheduled

Progress Description:

We will begin making research requests this fall. We recognize that this objective is vital to providing high quality service that helps students succeed, so this objective will be carried over to the next cycle until completed. Results will be posted on the department's assessment page.

Measurements/Documentation of Progress:

- **2 - Goal - Student Intervention Programs**

The Tutoring Center will provide high-quality student intervention programs that support students enrolled in developmental level and basic skills courses.

RATIONALE:

The student intervention programs require specialized planning, training, and implementation. The programs target specific student populations with histories of academic struggles, and should be evaluated completely each semester.

Priority Rank: 2

Objectives:

- **2.1 - Objective - Evaluation of Intervention Programs**

SAO 2.1 – The Tutoring Center’s student intervention programs will be evaluated each semester based on course success, retention data, and persistence data, as well as additional measures appropriate for each program.

Priority Rank: 2

Original Start Date: 12/19/2011 **Original End Date:**
01/13/2012

Revised Start Date: 12/19/2011 **Revised End Date:**
01/13/2012

Responsible Person: Tutoring Center Staff

Strategic Direction: None

Impact Type: -- Pick One --

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

Actions/Activities:

- **2.1.a1 - Revise Assessment Tools**

Create/revise assessment tools for all intervention programs prior to their implementation. This should happen at the end of the semester prior to the program's implementation for the next term.

Start Date: 12/19/2011 **End Date:** 01/13/2012

Responsible Person:

Instructional Assessment Technicians

Status Code: Work is Completed and Ongoing

Progress Description:

The department has implemented specific times when we choose which programs to assess, create SAOs for those programs, define success measures, and discuss collected data to determine potential changes to programming. We do this at a planning retreat at the end of spring term each year as well as a longer planning department meeting at the beginning of each term. Any other discussion of assessment happens at our regularly scheduled department meetings twice a month.

Measurements/Documentation of Progress:

http://www.craftonhills.edu/Current_Students/Tutoring_Center/Data_and_Assessment

- **2.1.a2 - Communicate Assessment Plans**

Discuss assessment plans with the Division Dean (Raju Hegde) as well as the faculty within the departments associated with those programs. This should happen at the start of each term in which the programs will run.

Start Date: 01/17/2012 **End Date:** 05/23/2014

Responsible Person:

Coordinator & Instructional Assessment Technicians

Status Code: Work is Completed and Ongoing

Progress Description:

This occurs through posting of SAOs on the departmental website and through the attendance of TC staff at English and math department meetings, in addition to the regular meetings with Left Lane Program staff from other departments.

Measurements/Documentation of Progress:

[link to departmental SAOs](#)

- **3 - Goal - Completion of Assessment Cycles**

The Tutoring Center will regularly assess its effectiveness by establishing consistent and transparent assessment processes.

RATIONALE:

The Tutoring Center has never been truly consistent in program evaluation and reporting. The center's website allows for simple and clear dissemination of reports to the campus.

Priority Rank: 3

Objectives:

- **3.1 - Objective - End of Term Reports**

The following reports will be posted each term:

- Total Number of Student Contacts (disaggregated by discipline)
- Report on Student Surveys (including number completed and descriptive statistics on student satisfaction)
- Student Intervention Program Summative Reports (see SAO 2.1)

Priority Rank: 4

Original Start Date: 12/19/2011 **Original End Date:**
01/13/2012

Revised Start Date: 12/19/2011 **Revised End Date:**
01/13/2012

Responsible Person: Coordinator, Learning Resource Assistants

Strategic Direction: None

Impact Type: -- Pick One --

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

Status Code: Work is Underway

Progress Description:

This work is underway but has not yet been completed. We will begin posting this end-of-term report on [the departmental website](#) at the end of this term in December 2014. We have already posted retroactive reports for previous terms using our SARS data.

10. Four-Year Action Plan (Goals, Objectives, Resources, and Actions)

Rubric Item: Reflect on your responses to all the previous questions. Complete the Four-Year Action Plan, entering the specific program goals ([goal rubric](#)) and objectives ([objective rubric](#)) you have formulated to maintain or enhance your strengths, or to address identified weaknesses. Assign an overall priority to each goal and each objective. In addition, enter any actions and/or resources required to achieve each objective. (Click here to see a definition of [goals](#), [objectives](#), [actions](#), and how they [work together](#).)

- **1 - Goal - Align Tutoring Center academic support services to meet the current campus need.**

Priority Rank: 1

Objectives:

- **1.1 - Objective - Provide appropriate staff for the services that we currently offer.**

Priority Rank: 1

Start Date: 10/27/2014 **End Date:** 07/01/2016

Responsible Person: TC Coordinator, Dean, VP, Pres

Strategic Direction: 1. Student Access and Success

Impact Type: Institutional

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

Resource Requests:

- **1.1.r1 - Faculty Coordinator Positions**
Description

Make the two current faculty coordinator positions in the Tutoring Center permanent.

Rationale

Even though these positions already exist, they are temporary, and the uncertainty associated with temporary positions undermines strategic planning. The department does not know if or when these positions will be made permanent, so the departmental staffing structure is ambiguous, which is counterproductive for the department and the campus. This interim staffing structure has

proven to be remarkably effective in growing student use (by 600%), adding tutoring services, and enhancing communication with the faculty of the divisions we serve. The cost analysis below is blank because this change does not cost more money; rather, it is a structural change.

Resource Type: Ongoing

Expenditure Category: Personnel

First Year Cost/Savings: \$191,299.06/\$0.00

Second Year Cost/Savings: \$197,016.98/\$0.00

Third Year Cost/Savings: \$202,773.98/\$0.00

- **1.1.r2 - Eve/Weekend LRC Assistant Hire**
Description

Hire one additional LRC Assistant (1FT) that can help us expand hours of TC operation to evening and weekend hours to better serve students.

Rationale

With the growth of our evening and weekend college fast approaching on the horizon, we need to offer appropriate academic support services to those students to be in compliance with the law. We already have a staffing need during the day, and hiring one more FT LRC Assistant would both assist with the current staffing need and allow us to expand services to extended evening and weekend hours, and to help provide support for distance learning and online tutoring, which was identified by our recent accreditation site report as something the college needs to enhance.

Resource Type: Ongoing

Expenditure Category: Personnel

First Year Cost/Savings: \$59,446.18/\$0.00

Second Year Cost/Savings: \$61,568.00/\$0.00

Third Year Cost/Savings: \$63,804.50/\$0.00

Actions/Activities:

- **1.1.a1 - Reading Paraprofessional Hire**

Hire one reading paraprofessional (1FT) staff member to assist Tutoring Center faculty implement campus-wide reading support services.

Start Date: 01/12/2015 **End Date:** 03/23/2015

Responsible Person: TC Coordinator, Dean, VP

- **1.2 - Objective - Provide appropriate facilities for the services that we currently offer.**

Priority Rank: 3

Start Date: 10/27/2014 **End Date:** 08/17/2015

Responsible Person: TC Coordinator, Dean, VP, Pres

Strategic Direction: 1. Student Access and Success

Impact Type: Institutional

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

- o **1.3 - Objective - Determine the impact of tutoring on course success, retention, and persistence as appropriate.**

Priority Rank: 8

Start Date: 10/27/2014 **End Date:** 06/04/2018

Responsible Person: TC Coordinator, Tutorial Coordinator, IEORP

Strategic Direction: 8. Effective Resource Use and Development

Impact Type: Institutional

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

Actions/Activities:

- **1.3.a1 - Run Course Success Reports**

- Submit to ORP the list of ID numbers representing students who utilized services 10 hours or more for the semester.
- Request ORP to run reports comparing course success data with general population.

Start Date: 10/27/2014 **End Date:** 06/01/2015

Responsible Person:

TC Coordinator, Tutorial Coordinator, IEORP

- o **1.4 - Objective - Work with other departments and committees to clarify the TC's role in the Left Lane Program.**

Priority Rank: 5

Start Date: 10/27/2014 **End Date:** 07/01/2016

Responsible Person:

TC Coordinator, Dean, VP, Pres, SSEEMM Committee, BSI Committee

Strategic Direction: 1. Student Access and Success

Impact Type: Institutional

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

- o **1.5 - Objective - Determine and meet the reading support needs of the campus.**

Priority Rank: 6

Start Date: 11/03/2014 **End Date:** 06/29/2018

Responsible Person: TC Coordinator, TC staff, IEORP

Strategic Direction: 1. Student Access and Success

Impact Type: Institutional

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

Actions/Activities:

- **1.5.a1 - Determine Campus-wide Reading Needs**

Determine the current campus need for reading support across the curriculum.

Start Date: 10/27/2014 **End Date:** 12/18/2015

Responsible Person: TC Coordinator, TC staff, IEORP

- **1.5.a2 - Create Campus Reading Support Plan**

Create a plan to offer an array of appropriate and contextualized reading academic support services for the campus.

Start Date: 01/12/2015 **End Date:** 12/14/2015

Responsible Person: TC Coordinator

- **1.5.a3 - Reading Faculty Hire**

Hire one faculty member (1FT) to oversee and develop campus-wide reading support services.

Responsible Person:

TC Coordinator, Dean, VP, Pres, Academic Senate

- **1.5.a4 - Reading Paraprofessional Hire**

Hire one reading paraprofessional (1FT) staff member to assist the reading faculty member implement reading support services.

Responsible Person: TC Coordinator, Dean, VP

- **2 - Goal - Expand comprehensive academic support services to meet the growing campus need.**

Priority Rank: 2

Objectives:

- **2.1 - Objective - Provide appropriate staff for the services that we will offer over the next four years.**

Priority Rank: 2

Start Date: 10/27/2014 **End Date:** 08/10/2015

Responsible Person: TC Coordinator, Dean, VP, Pres

Strategic Direction: 1. Student Access and Success

Impact Type: Institutional

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

Resource Requests:

- **2.1.r1 - Reading Faculty Hire**

Description

Hire one faculty member (1FT) to oversee and develop campus-wide reading support services.

Rationale

A faculty member is requested to serve in the Tutoring Center as a reading content expert. This position is needed in the Tutoring Center to oversee the growth of reading support services across the disciplines. For many years, Crafton faculty from almost every discipline have consistently complained that their students are underprepared and underequipped to adequately navigate college-level texts necessary for their course instruction. While offering Reading 980 is one measure to address this issue, it is clearly inadequate to meaningfully and comprehensively address the overall reading skill deficiency of the student body. The Tutoring Center has written a 4-year plan to help address this problem by augmenting reading support services across the curriculum, and a faculty member is needed to lead this effort to design college-wide support services as well as any curriculum that may be needed.

If this position is not secured this year, reading support services will be limited to what we currently offer, which is limited group tutoring for only Reading 980 students. We have already had to turn away requests for expanded reading tutoring for other courses and expanded one-on-one reading tutoring due to lack of Tutoring Center staffing. We have received requests from faculty in Political Science, philosophy, history, mathematics, and English for various levels of reading support for their courses. Additionally, delaying filling this position will delay the creation of a coherent campus reading plan that includes basic skills, reading apprenticeship, and perhaps most strategically, campus-wide contextualized reading support that has been needed for decades. We simply cannot afford not to fill this position immediately. This position will also be vital to continuing to be able to effectively produce and expand the Left Lane Program. Without it, the Tutoring Center will not be able to continue to produce the Left Lane Program components that are needed. The attrition of the Tutoring Center's staff from 6.5 three years ago to 4 today has had a negative impact on our operational efficiency and ongoing effectiveness. As student use has increased by about 600% and more support programs have been added or augmented, our staff has shrunk, resulting in fewer people doing considerably more work.

Resource Type: Ongoing

Expenditure Category: Personnel

First Year Cost/Savings: \$117,838.28/\$0.00

Second Year Cost/Savings: \$120,707.01/\$0.00

Third Year Cost/Savings: \$123,573.31/\$0.00

▪ **2.1.r2 - Reading Paraprofessional Hire**
Description

Hire one reading paraprofessional (1FT) staff member to assist Tutoring Center faculty implement campus-wide reading support services.

Rationale

With the growth of the TC and increased demand for reading support services, we need a reading paraprofessional to help implement growing reading support programming. This position is not new; it was put on administrative freeze until later this year. This is a position we have lost to retirement (1.5 FTE) attrition and we need it back, but we are only requesting 1FTE instead of 1.5.

Resource Type: Ongoing

Expenditure Category: Personnel

First Year Cost/Savings: \$80,119.44/\$51,733.14

Second Year Cost/Savings: \$83,273.50/\$51,733.14

Third Year Cost/Savings: \$86,599.56/\$51,733.14

Actions/Activities:

▪ **2.1.a1 - Eve/Weekend LRC Assistant Hire**

Hire one additional LRC Assistant (1FT) that can help us expand hours of TC operation to evening and weekend hours to better serve students.

Start Date: 10/27/2014 **End Date:** 08/10/2015

Responsible Person: TC Coordinator, Dean, VP

- **2.2 - Objective - Increase service to include increased evening hours, weekend service, and online/distance tutoring.**

Priority Rank: 9

Start Date: 08/10/2015 **End Date:** 06/29/2018

Responsible Person: TC Coordinators, TC staff

Strategic Direction: 1. Student Access and Success

Impact Type: Institutional

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

- **2.3 - Objective - Secure a centralized location on campus that offers the appropriate amount of space to meet future**

demand and that has an attached or adjacent classroom to work with whole classes at one time.

Priority Rank: 4

Start Date: 10/27/2014 **End Date:** 08/10/2015

Responsible Person: TC Coordinator, Dean, VP, Pres

Strategic Direction: 1. Student Access and Success

Impact Type: Institutional

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

- **2.4 - Objective - Create a robust and sustainable volunteer tutor force.**

Priority Rank: 7

Start Date: 01/12/2015 **End Date:** 06/29/2018

Responsible Person: TC Coordinators, TC staff

Strategic Direction: 8. Effective Resource Use and Development

Impact Type: Institutional

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

- **2.5 - Objective - Research innovative uses of technology in tutoring and academic support contexts.**

Priority Rank: 11

Start Date: 01/05/2015 **End Date:** 12/18/2015

Responsible Person: TC Coordinators

Strategic Direction: 3. Best Practices for Teaching and Learning

Impact Type: Department

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

- **3 - Goal - Raise campus awareness of the Tutoring Center, its mission, and its services.**

Priority Rank: 3

Objectives:

- **3.1 - Objective - Present a coherent, comprehensive, and consistent vision, mission, and brand to the campus from all areas of the Tutoring Center.**

Priority Rank: 10

Start Date: 01/05/2015 **End Date:** 06/29/2018

Responsible Person: TC Coordinators, TC staff

Strategic Direction: 1. Student Access and Success

Impact Type: Institutional

Institutional Learning Outcome: Not Applicable

11. Comments

There are no comments for this plan.

12. Supporting Documents

- [LRC 3-year Action Plan Worksheets 2009-2010.pdf](#)
- [Tutoring Center Data Measures.pdf](#)

SBCCD © Copyright 2016