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# Program Review Self-Study: Hybrid Programs

Please respond to the following statements in order. They are designed to create a thread of narration. Note: The green highlights coordinate with the prioritized list of program goals table .

# **I. General Information**

A. List the Service and Instructional Area(s)

The Extended Learning Center (ELC), Madera Campus, is considered a department of both the Student Services Division and Instructional Division because the ELC also contains the Writing Center. In fact, at Madera Center, the ELC is the equivalent of the Tutorial Center, Math Center, and Writing Center combined at Reedley College, a “one-stop shop” for students’ tutorial needs.

B. List California Community College Chancellor’s Office Taxonomy of Programs (TOP) Code (found on Blackboard—RC Program Review, Documents, Handbook and Supporting Documents)

Extended Learning Center

Classes for Tutors: Couns 1 (not yet offered at Madera, but a goal) and Couns 2: 4930.13;

Engl 72 and 72A: 802.00; COTR19G 4932.00;

Classes for Tutees: INTDS (Interdisciplinary Studies) 300: 4930.09; INTDS 301 and Engl 272 also show the same TOPS code currently in CurricUNET. Engl 372 was a non-credit version of Engl 272 but through Title V ed. code, we learned we had to discontinue it. In the ELC, INTDS 301 replaced Engl 372.

C. General description of program(s) and/or service(s) offered. Include:

C1. Current staffing (full-time and part-time faculty, staff, student aides, etc.);

Introduction

The Madera Extended Learning Center (ELC) is dedicated to encouraging the intellectual strengths of all students by promoting and delivering excellence in tutorial services to enhance academic success. The ELC provides individual and small-group tutoring for most classes to Madera Center (and other SCCCD) students needing or desiring learning assistance in classes in which they are enrolled. The key objectives of the center’s services are to help students (1) acquire the knowledge and skills needed to be more successful in the class for which they are receiving tutoring, and (2) develop those general study and learning skills that can be universally applied throughout one’s courses. The ultimate goal of the program is to provide students with the knowledge and skills they need to become better independent learners and critical thinkers. Tutor training emphasizes the philosophy of the axiom, "Give a man a fish, and you have fed him once. Teach him *how* to fish and you have fed him for a lifetime." We also try to provide a friendly, open, and diverse collaborative learning community environment that empowers students and fosters overall success.

The Extended Learning Center’s aim is to assist all students enrolled at Madera Center, native and non-native English speakers, developmental, and highly experienced students. We try to help students at whatever level they start, and motivate them to achieve a higher level.

In order to assist all students at diverse levels, the ELC maintains a large collection of study skills reference materials, including handouts, books, sample papers, and some compact disc programs. These materials are available for use by all students. Tutors will sometimes consult or use these materials during the course of their tutoring. The tutorial instructor often provides students individual assistance on the development of appropriate learning strategies for particular tasks.

All services provided by the Extended Learning Center are available to students free of any charge, with the exception of the half unit (or full unit) cost of English 272, the course used for small group writing tutoring. The ELC also uses INTDS 300 for Math/Other Non-Writing Subject Tutoring (groups or drop-ins) and INTDS 301 for Writing Tutoring (groups that can’t do the half unit or drop-ins).

Staffing

The Madera Extended Learning Center is under the direction of the tutorial services instructor-coordinator, who also teaches part of her load in the English department. The ELC Coordinator is currently a part-time faculty position, with a duty schedule of 177 days per year (the same as classroom faculty). At Madera, the tutorial instructor reports to both the Dean of Instruction and the Dean of Student Services, often including the Vice President of Instruction and Student Services as well. The instructor is responsible for the planning, programming, and day-to-day management of all ELC services. She is responsible for the recruitment, hiring, and training of tutors. All tutors, student assistants, and the part-time Assistant Coordinator(s) work under her direction. The part-time Assistant Coordinator provides supervision when the Coordinator is in classes or committee meetings, as well as aiding with keeping the center open as many hours a week as possible. In addition, the current Assistant Coordinator, because of her Counseling degree, is also the Liaison to DSPS, helping to work closely with that program to provide services to meet the unique learning needs of DSPS students. Finally, the current Assistant Coordinator also provides technology and statistical analysis expertise. Tutors for many subjects are also recruited by one of the full-time counselors, who has easy access to grades to identify top students to recruit for particular subject tutoring and who is involved in registration when students are sometimes seeking one more unit or two and might be interested in giving back to the college and developing their interpersonal communication skills.

Clerical/office duties are completed or supervised by the ELC instructor coordinator and assistant coordinator, with support provided by part-time paid and volunteer student aides. It is a continuing challenge to train dependable student aides to handle the complex, detail-oriented clerical duties, especially since student workers are often limited in number of hours they can work because they usually must be full time students to be employed. Add to this the fact that once a worker is well trained, he or she often graduates and moves on. The student workers aid in office operations, reception, and student tracking. There are two primary part-time coordinators that oversee all workers and are responsible for all records as well as payroll. A third adjunct coordinator helps supervise hours on Fridays, but has not learned all the clerical, record-keeping tasks or the electronic tracking system. The ELC has a goal of having at least a part-time Office Assistant, similar to the staffing at Reedley College’s Tutorial Center, who works on a 12-month schedule, and can help be responsible for office operations, reception, student tracking, student employment and payroll, and supervision of student assistants. The goal of having at least a part-time OA was reinforced when we read the recent RC Writing Center’s Program Review. They noticed an improvement in the number of students receiving a P (pass) grade when they made two changes, one of which was changing their hiring practices and job duties regarding the Receptionist. This position is simply termed desk worker/T.A. at the ELC. At RC’s Writing Center, they shifted from using FWS applicants for the receptionist position to one who “is a more active participant in the group tutoring,” from typically basic skills student pool to a more skilled receptionist, able to do more to help “grow the number of tutoring hours completed.” With at least a part-time OA, more coordinator time that is currently spent covering one of the reception desks or training/overseeing desk workers could shift back to the training of tutors or management duties such as budget planning, data analysis, report writing, and collaborating with faculty, other student services and administrators.

Tutoring is provided by a student staff. About 40-50 tutors work each semester. All tutors must be approved to tutor by an instructor in the discipline in which they wish to tutor. (Recommendations are solicited of faculty at the end of each semester, and over the course of each semester as needed.) Tutors must have earned an “A” or “B” grade in the classes in that discipline, and tutors must be in overall good academic standing. They must also possess those communication skills, interpersonal qualities, and work habits appropriate for work as a tutor. Of those 40-50 tutors, less than 20 are usually paid tutors in the ELC; the rest are either students earning units in Couns. 2 or COTR19G, or student tutors are volunteers, working at the ELC for the experience. Students discover the Couns. 2 Tutor Practicum class either through talking with the ELC Coordinator or from the full-time counselor who is the instructor of the class. Often a collaborative effort is needed between the ELC Coordinator and the counselor. For example, student requests will come in for more tutors in a specific subject, such as Health 1 or Psy 2. The small tutorial budget for tutors goes primarily for writing and math tutors, so many discipline-specific tutors are offered a transfer-level elective unit or two for their “pay.” The ELC Coordinator passes the information about specific subject requests to the counselor, who networks with instructors, looks over grades, and watches for students who might need the unit and have the qualifications. Usually, only a handful of the tutors in the ELC are those earning a unit or two in Couns. 2, but the number has climbed as high as ten in a given semester. These students greatly expand the tutorial subjects and hours the ELC can offer, especially in lean budget years.

Each semester, several tutors are upper division students from California State University, Fresno, or Fresno Pacific University. SCCCD regulations permit hiring such persons so long as they are full-time students. More often than not, these tutors will have worked previously for the ELC while attending Madera Center and continue to work once they have transferred. These “veteran” tutors are an essential asset for the experience and expertise they bring to the staff. The ELC’s goal is to seek increases in the tutor budget in order to add pay raises back into the Center and reward experienced tutors. Increases in the tutor budget are also necessary to allow for minimum wage increases such as the one slated to go in effect on January 1, 2016. On occasion, adjunct instructors will donate 2 hours a week and volunteer as tutors; this also gives them a location to meet and work with their own students. While this is helpful, faculty who are tutoring outside of office hours deserve to be paid from Schedule C.

In the ELC, less than half of the tutors each semester are paid for their work. SCCCD regulations require students to be full-time in order to be eligible for student employment. This “full-time status” rule unfortunately prohibits the center from considering any of the college’s many part-time students for paid employment as tutors. It also has the unfortunate consequence of prohibiting the hiring of very experienced tutors who may not need current courses, who may already have a degree and just want the experience and a part-time job. A third negative consequence of this policy is the tighter regulations on financial aid and funding of transfer units. There were times in the past when a student worker would take an unnecessary class just to have the 12 units in order to still be employed; however, ultimately, this impacts how long the student’s financial aid might last. The only time a tutor can be a paid student worker with less than twelve units is when the student qualifies for Federal Work Study and the ELC has an open FWS position. Fortunately, the ELC will typically have several student tutors each semester volunteering time. Volunteers and those working for credit need not be full-time students, but the students in COUNS 2 frequently are full-time. The other drawback to the “full-time status” rule is that students taking 12 or more units often can’t squeeze in more than 10-15 hours a week without affecting their academics. All the tutorial centers as well as other departments on campuses that utilize student workers have to work with this “full-time status” rule until such time as the Ed. Code changes to allow for fewer units or part-time positions are developed that are not restricted to full-time students. It is a primary goal of the ELC to discover how the bookstore and the library can have part-time workers not connected to being full time students, in the hopes of someday being able to have a few positions of this type available to all the tutorial centers in the district. The lack of such positions truly limits the expertise and depth a tutor might offer a center since once they have achieved their bachelor’s degree, they are no longer eligible to be student workers. In the recent economic downturn, with jobs being scarce, valuable skilled tutors are desperate to find or keep some employment while they look for more permanent, full-time work. With our current restrictions on student workers, a retired high school teacher with a bachelor’s degree also could not be employed part-time. A middle alternative might be to allow student workers to have the same number of units as FWS students; that used to be nine years ago, but it changed to six.

Additionally, faculty provide breadth and depth as tutors and can be employed using Schedule C. Faculty tutors have even more education and experience and can substitute as line-of-sight coordinators as well. It is a goal of the ELC to incorporate a small Schedule C budget for faculty tutor hours in the budget planning worksheet, similar to the RC Math Study Center.

The Assistant Coordinator helps provide supervision of the center during summer session. This adjunct is a qualified faculty member who also provides drop-in tutoring in addition to fulfilling his/her supervisory role.

Service Model

Most of the Extended Learning Center’s tutoring is provided to students following a model where students are assigned to tutors with whom they meet on a regularly scheduled basis, usually one to two times a week. These sessions may be one-on-one or on a small-group basis, at the discretion of the tutorial instructor. The majority of the sessions in the ELC are small groups, with one-on-one tutoring provided rarely. All tutoring sessions continue as long as the student requires or desires help, or if the student is enrolled in Engl. 272, until the end of the semester since it is connected to earning a half unit. Research shows that the frequency of attendance for tutoring is directly correlated to success. This “regularly scheduled session” model is intended to get the student to attend a sufficient number of sessions to truly profit from tutoring.

Drop-in tutoring is offered on a limited basis depending on availability and budget. Most tutoring occurs in small groups. Students receiving tutoring in the ELC are enrolled in one of three courses: English 272, *Assistance in College Writing*, a half-unit or one unit course used primarily with small-group tutoring in writing; Interdisciplinary Studies (INTDS) 300, *Academic Learning Center;* or Interdisciplinary Studies (INTDS) 301, *Basic Skills Development*. Both of the INTDS courses are non-credit classes; all three courses generate FTES for the college. Attendance is maintained with TutorTrac*,* a computer-based tracking system specifically designed for tracking the data variables in a tutorial center. Attendance is also documented in handwritten records by the tutors.

The ELC is open 45 - 61 hours per week during the fall and spring semesters, depending on tutor availability and demand. Typically, the hours are Monday through Thursday, 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 2:00 or 4:00 p.m. We strive to open a few minutes before 8 a.m. to log in morning CalWORKs students and help students get materials printed before class because there is no other lab open that early on campus. The ELC strives to serve evening students at least until 6 p.m. and sometimes later, till 9 p.m. The evening hours usually necessitate volunteer time on the part of the coordinator. The ELC has a goal of being able to pay for all coordinator hours needed and not rely on volunteer coordinator hours. This would enable us to consistently offer more definite evening hours, thus allowing for more equitable access to services for part-time students. It would also be more equitable in comparison to coordinator hours provided in the three tutorial centers at Reedley. Summer session services are offered concurrent with the summer session, be it six weeks or longer. Typically hours in the summer are reduced. For example, during Summer 2013 the center was open from 7:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Monday through Thursday.

Professional Development

The Extended Learning Center staff is continually pursuing professional development. The instructor-coordinator has been a member of the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) and the Association of Colleges for Tutoring and Learning Assistance (ACTLA). She has been involved in Cal-PASS and California Association of Teachers of English (CATE). She is currently active on the Curriculum Committee and has been active in Academic Senate. Through those associations, she has kept abreast of trends in tutorial center and writing center practices and pedagogy as well as the changing Title V regulations pertaining to tutorial services. She has also participated in writing new grants for funding tutorial services and participated in the Title V Grant Forums hosted by the college and the district. She is active on the Basic Skills/Student Success Committees and has attended several locally-offered workshops on student learning and development, as well as having some of the tutors and assistant coordinator attend such workshops.

The student desk assistants receive on-the-job training from the instructor-coordinator and the assistant coordinator. A booklet of procedures, processes and rules has been developed and is used as an aid to their training, for use as a reference tool, and is continually being updated to keep up with changing processes.

All new tutors are required to participate in several mandatory training meetings, and all writing tutors are required to complete English 72, *Writing Center Theory and Practice*, and English 72A, *Advanced Writing Center Theory and Practice*. While any tutor can attend the English 72/72A course, the training in it is focused more on helping writing tutors. For both writing tutors and other subject tutors, various instructors are invited each semester to come and speak about how best to help their students become successful in their courses. A tutor training handbook was developed and revised during the years the ELC was funded by the Title V Co-op Grant, but the ELC primarily focused on being a writing center first, so much of the original handbook dealt with tutoring that subject. It has been revised and shortened to apply to more subject tutors in addition to the writing tutors. However, it is still a work in progress. Madera Center has not been able to offer Counseling 1, *Tutor Training*, which would enable the tutors of other subjects outside of writing to have a more structured and regular tutor training curriculum. A goal is to be able to offer this course in the future and to create or adapt the independent study units used by Reedley College’s Tutorial Center, which enable tutors in that center to use their training to lead to possible promotions. Promotion to advanced pay levels requires additional training and experience, thus creating an incentive to pursue this training. Four pay grades are available—presently, $9.00, $10.00, $11.00, and $12.25 per hour. Another option to consider would be Tutorlingo, which is a series of on-demand videos and valuable resources focused on supporting the tutor training process put out in partnership with CRLA (College Reading & Learning Association). These videos could support training or be used for the independent study units, and are currently being considered by the Math Study Center since research shows that tutees benefit from working with tutors who are better trained and prepared for sessions. An institutional purchase would not cost as much as independent purchases, and all tutorial centers connected to Reedley College could make use of these training videos. The institutional cost is approximately $1,500. It is a goal of the ELC to discuss pursuing this option with the other RC tutorial centers.

Program Promotion and Referral

The services of the Extended Learning Center are promoted in a variety of ways. However, while the RC Tutorial Center and Writing Center is advertised in the college catalog and schedule of courses, the Madera ELC currently is not. We would like to change that in the future. The ELC used to have its own area on the Madera website, but in the transition from the North Centers to merging closer to Reedley College, the website link currently focuses on the tutorial services at Reedley. Revisions to the website to rectify this are in progress. A brochure describing the ELC’s services is available and distributed. Posters are placed around campus and in instructor’s boxes, and are regularly changed (this includes discipline specific posters—e.g., “Math Tutors Available” poster in the math classrooms). The instructor-coordinator or a representative is invited to some classes each semester to talk about tutorial services. Students on class-arranged tours from almost all the English classes visit the ELC the first week of the semester, as well as students from some other courses with research paper assignments. Promotional items such as pencils and bookmarks have been created and are distributed. We speak at the CalWORKs Orientations and New Student Orientations. The ELC hosts campus events that coincide with National Punctuation Day, National Day of Writing, and Pi Day, and tutors are encouraged to take groups to the campus reading events. We also have a table at our Spring Extravaganza, where we have the “Wheel of Grammar & Writing” game as well as informational handouts. We try to help students become more engaged in the campus activities that the campus clubs host by advertising them in the ELC. We do this because we know historically, engaged students have higher success rates, which is supported by CCCSE data. We have a PowerPoint presentation that we use with the first week tours, but we like the idea of RC’s Tutorial Center, which has a PowerPoint presentation that runs at periodic intervals in their library lobby. We will add that to our program promotion here and develop one to run on the screens in the A & R area.

Students referred by instructors through the Early Alert process for tutoring or other issues are contacted by the Counseling Department. Those who see their counselor will often be referred for tutoring. In addition, the Madera/Oakhurst CalWORKs program administers its own progress reports and works closely with the ELC when referring students for tutorial support.

Faculty are encouraged to announce the availability of tutoring services (many have included reference to the Tutorial Center in their syllabi), and to personally refer students when appropriate. Some faculty will take extra steps, such as walking students over to the ELC. Others will telephone the tutorial instructor to say that a student is in his/her office who will be coming over to sign up for tutoring. “All staff” email announcements have been used to keep faculty and staff apprised of developments in ELC services.

C2. listing of courses in the program area including transfer/degree applicable, degree applicable/non-transfer, non-degree applicable, and non-credit;

Three tutorial classes and four training courses are offered in conjunction with the Extended Learning Center program.

English 272, *College Writing Assistance* – a half-unit or full unit non-degree applicable course. Students working in small groups who attend and actively participate in writing tutoring for approximately 22 hours a semester receive a Passing grade in this positive attendance course. Besides the FTES for this course, the college may collect non-credit FTES for the two INTDS courses that the ELC uses.

Interdisciplinary Studies 300, *Academic Learning Center* – a non-credit course. All students receiving math or other subject tutoring are enrolled in this class so that the college may collect FTES for their work. All minutes or hours that tutors work with a student must be reported on positive attendance “grade” rosters at the end of the semester.

Interdisciplinary Studies 301, *Basic Skills Development* – a non-credit course. All students who wish to continue small group writing tutoring but can’t repeat English 272 and students who wish to drop-in or work less frequently than two hours a week with a writing tutor are enrolled in this class so that—despite the loss of repeats for English 272—students can still receive the regular tutorial support they desire and that statistics show leads to greater student success. In addition, the college may collect some FTES for their work.

English 72, *Writing Center Theory and Practice* – a 1 unit credit, transfer-level course used for writing tutor training.

English 72A, *Advanced Writing Center Theory and Practice* – a 1 unit credit, transfer- level course used for writing tutor training.

Counseling 2, *Tutor Practicum* – a laboratory course that permits tutors to earn one to two units of transfer level credit for their tutoring work rather than pay.

COTR19G, *Cooperative Work Experience, General* – a credit, transfer-level course. In the ELC, this course is an option for units for either tutoring or clerical work experience.

C3. list of degrees and certificates;

The ENGL 72/72A courses apply to the English degree. The Couns 2 and COTR19G apply as elective transfer level units.

As reported in the last RC Writing Center Program Review, while the College does not offer a certificate in tutoring, the College Reading and Learning Association offers an International Tutor Training Program Certification (ITTPC). Reedley College’s current course outlines and curriculum in ENGL 72 and 72A closely align with the program requirements. If Reedley’s training program is certified, Reedley College’s Writing Center and the ELC could issue level one and level two CRLA certificates to our learning assistants/tutors. The students could carry these certificates to other CRLA certificated programs at universities who offer level 3 training programs. Currently, 12 CSUs, including CSU Fresno, and 52 California community colleges, including Fresno City College, are ITTPC certified tutor training programs. Certification of the training program increases its professionalism and increases opportunities for learning assistants to carry their training on to the university level if they transfer.

C4. brief facilities overview;

The Extended Learning Center is located in the Admissions building, room AM 154. Through a Title V Co-op grant, the ELC was established in October 2004 and opened its doors in Fall 2005. This Extended Learning Center represented a significant accomplishment for the Madera Center. For the first time, tutors had training and an instructor-coordinator and resources in a room that was more than just an empty classroom tutors used for tutoring. The room is a converted classroom, but as much as possible, the ELC is designed to be used as a tutorial center.

The facility is approximately 1140 square feet in size. In addition to the main room, there is one room down the hall (AM 137 that can seat approximately 25-29), which is used for overflow, and which is “connected” by camera as well as proximity within the same main building. The instructor-coordinator has an office away from the ELC because she is also an instructor of English classes (AV1 262). In the main ELC room, near the entry door are two desks; one is a large modular work station and the other is a smaller desk area. Both of these serve as reception desks. These work stations accommodate the instructor-coordinator, assistant coordinator, and desk staff. There is a phone on the instructor-coordinator’s desk but not the second reception desk. A goal is to someday find the funds to have a second phone added as it can be difficult to get from one side to the other to answer the phone. Also, a second phone would mean the clerical duties of taking all the phone messages could at least be shared and not primarily handled by the instructor-coordinator. Adding a second phone would require some rewiring. Two study cubicles in the room increase privacy and reduce noise. Thirty-six seats are available (25 at the six large tables in the main room and twelve available with computers); however, due to table size, distractions, and noise, the room’s effective capacity is less than that. There are approximately nine large tables in AM 137, which also serves as a classroom occasionally; it is still not 100% dedicated to being a second location for tutoring. The tables would need to be smaller tables on wheels, with chairs on wheels, to enable easier re-configuration for different size tutoring groups and larger tutorial workshops. We also need to include a small work desk for a coordinator or desk worker. Currently, 137 is more often used either for larger math and chem tutoring groups, or for studying or one-on-one tutoring when the main ELC is too noisy. Headsets would help students concentrate when studying amid tutoring.

Access to the Extended Learning Center is through the Admissions hallway or through a direct-access entrance on the north side of the Admissions building. The availability of this direct-access entrance permits the ELC to offer open hours that may differ from those of the administration. For example, on weekdays the Admissions office closes at 5:00 p.m., while the ELC can remain open until 6:00 or 9:00 p.m. Being located next door to Admissions and the DSPS services, as well as being located near counseling services and the library, helps the ELC stay closely connected to the other student services. It also enables the tutors to help students find and use those other student services.

Wireless access to the college’s Internet system is available in the ELC to all students and staff. However, there is a lack of charging stations, which should be addressed in the future.

The ELC serves primarily as the principal location for tutoring, but it is used by other programs and by students for other reasons. Since general study space in the library is limited, many students find their way into the center simply to study. Student-organized study groups also commonly use the ELC as a meeting location. Adjunct faculty members have used the center to meet with their students, either individually or in small groups.

Occasionally, on particularly busy days, we will have insufficient table space to accommodate all students. This requires us to attempt finding space elsewhere in the building or in the closest classrooms outside the building. Recently located tables outdoors within view of the ELC are starting to be utilized for some occasional tutoring groups, weather permitting, and this helps relieve the congestion a little in our maxed facility. Administration is aware of the crowded conditions, and there has been some consideration of relocating the ELC, but any current move would not provide us with much more square footage than the two rooms we occupy now, and it would locate our services further away from the center of campus and away from related student services. We realize we won’t be able to expand our services much more until another building is put up on campus and/or major renovation could be done to the current building. However, the benefits we currently have in being centrally located and alongside other student services outweigh the benefits of gaining a few square feet on the edge of campus.

C5. equipment requirements including ongoing maintenance requirements and costs;

The ELC has twelve computer stations available for tutor and tutee use. The computer stations have sufficient width to sometimes allow tutor and tutee to sit side-by-side in front of the computer and have sufficient table space to lay out class materials. Two of the computers are on manually-operated tables that DSPS donated; these tables can be elevated or lowered to accommodate students using wheelchairs. While the primary purpose of this small computer lab is to provide tutors and their students access to computers for use in tutorial sessions, students from the general student body are welcome to use the computers for class purposes when not needed for tutoring. Many times during peak hours all the stations are in use, and we send students to the larger labs on campus, but they report back that those are full too. Adding even 3 stations to the second tutoring location would help.

The center has three staff computers (one each for instructor-coordinator, assistant coordinator, and student assistants), and two black and white printers, and one color printer. One printer/scanner that was purchased with the original Title V grant is now outdated, so the driver software doesn’t work well with current Office programs. However, it still makes copies and is heavily used for that. Both of the black and white printers serve as the printers for the student-use computers. One of these is older and temperamental, but the “workhorse” printer for the ELC is new, purchased at the end of last year in cooperation with the CalWORKs program because of all the TutorTrac report printing that we do for their program. The color printer also makes copies and still has scanning capabilities. Color printing is primarily used for fliers advertising campus or ELC events, but students can get a small number of items printed in color (e.g., a science slide or a picture for an Art 2 paper or a cover page for a project). The majority of the printing done by students is on the black and white printers. The ELC does not have the print card equipment that the Madera Center library has. We require students to donate paper in exchange for printing. Not only does this donation seem to make the students a little more conscientious about being conservative with paper when printing, but it also seems to help with the collaborative atmosphere of the center.

A 21-inch TV with DVD-VCR player is available in room AM 137 (the Overflow ELC) and is used mostly in conjunction with tutor training; that room also has sound with its smart panel projection, so any training videos are watched there. However, most tutor training sessions take place in the ELC because the majority of the resources for tutors to use are housed there. The ELC is equipped with an automatic projector screen that uses wireless capabilities to review PowerPoints, but it has no sound capability. This equipment is mainly used for tours of promoting the Tutorial Center and tutor training purposes. Unfortunately, due to placement of projector screen, distractions, and noise, the room’s effectiveness of using equipment is limited.

The ELC uses table top printers as copiers. There is not enough room to house an actual copier, though one is needed. Limited copying of forms, etc. is done with these table top printers; bigger copying jobs are taken to the copier in the Instructional area in AV1 101.

All of this equipment is in need of regular replacement, and must be kept as current as that which is being used in instruction if the center is to be able to properly support instructional activities. Just this past summer, the ELC received newer computers and monitors for the twelve student stations. There is a need for at least two or three laptop computers for use in the Overflow ELC, which has only one computer station, but which is often used by math tutors, whose tutees have questions pertaining to their MyMathLab assignments. While more and more tutoring sessions involve the use of computers, within the main ELC, there is no more room for additional computer stations. This may be why many students (or their tutors) are starting to bring their personal laptop computers to their sessions. Also, since we have virtually no online tutorial services, and since Oakhurst has little, if any, tutorial services at all, one goal is to try to expand to include some online tutorial services, which would require the purchase of additional portable laptops for tutor use, equipped with headsets with microphones. Additional headsets would help some students work with programs with sound (or block out some of the tutoring noise). The ELC has been in discussions with the ESL instructor for advice on the best types of headsets, and we are hopeful that basic skills funds might be used to purchase a few industrial strength headsets. Some of the other equipment is aging, the consequence of the college not being able to keep to its technology replacement plan due to budget constraints.

C6. supply requirements, if any.

After the transitional years and merging more closely with Reedley College, the ELC now has a definite line item in its budget for supplies, and we thank the Budget Committee and new budget worksheet process for that. Prior to this, once the Title V Co-op grant ran out, the budget for office supplies for the ELC was virtually non-existent, so the ELC relied primarily on help from categorical programs whose students use tutorial services heavily, such as Basic Skills funds, or the CalWORKs and TRIO programs.

The center’s ability to acquire, on an occasional basis, useful references is now virtually impossible. For new editions of textbooks, the ELC relies on instructors to get a desk copy for it at the same time as one is obtained for reserve in the library. There isn’t room in the current budget for new tutor training DVDs or reference books such as the newest editions of the MLA and APA Handbooks. We have tried to apply for mini-grants for some items, but a larger supply budget that would include some texts and reference books is a goal.

The ELC’s biggest supply expense is ink for the lab printer. Recently one of the ELC’s printers was upgraded and ink costs tripled. Not only do we now have to purchase a more expensive toner cartridge, we also have to purchase imaging units and fusers (maintenance kits). It is difficult to keep up with the increasing costs for toner, so we will continue to seek an increase in the supply budget. Although we do purchase some cases of paper for our own use, paper costs are not a huge expense because we require students to donate paper to use the printers; we find this makes them a little more responsible in conserving paper, yet still allows for tutors to print resources to aid in their sessions and drafts of papers for use within the writing tutoring sessions

D. Mission, Strategic Plan, and Educational Master Plan

D1. Describe how your program supports the College Mission Statement. Give a few specific examples.

“Reedley College, including its centers and sites, provides an accessible educational environment ensuring high-quality innovative learning opportunities supported by services for student success. We offer associate degree programs, career technical education, transfer-level and basic skills courses. We instill a passion for learning that will meet the academic, workforce, and personal goals of our diverse population.” In addition to this mission statement, Reedley College recently developed the slogan, “We motivate and inspire students to succeed.”

The Extended Learning Center supports the college’s mission statement and slogan in several respects. The concept of accessibility means, among other things, the availability of academic support services, such as tutoring, for those students who may encounter difficulty in the pursuit of their educational goals. Basis skills enhancement is a fundamental component of the tutoring service. Tutors are role models of students who have succeeded in their course work, and they are academic peer coaches who motivate their tutees to overcome their difficulties or lack of confidence. Finally, the core mission of the tutorial service is to support the instructional mission of the college (as described in the mission statement’s first sentence) by providing services that will increase the likelihood of student success

D2. Describe how your program supports the College Strategic Plan. Give a few specific examples.

The ELC provides tutorial support services, and most closely aligns with the broad goals 1, 2, and 3, which are titled: Goal 1: Student Success, Goal 2: Student Access, and Goal 3: Teaching and Learning Effectiveness.Specifically, our services fall under“2.3 Provide broad-based instructional support services relevant to the diverse needs of the students.” Some of the specific elements of the Strategic Plan that our program supports are noted below.

1.2 In addition, the Writing Center component of the ELC is part of the literature and composition program and supports the composition program by providing assistance for students in the basic skills and transfer level classes.

1.3 The Extended Learning Center uses a collaborative, peer-based tutoring model. This student-centered practice encourages students to engage with each other as well as the material. Additionally, the learning assistants/tutors benefit from the work experience and the transfer-level training courses. Students considering teaching as a career choice and majoring in liberal studies in particular benefit from the work experience as tutors.

1.4 The tutors (also sometimes called learning assistants) are trained to identify, understand, and work with multiple learning styles. They are also given training to work with ESL students, basic skills students, students with disabilities, adult students, returning veterans. They are made aware of the many services available to students on campus and frequently help connect students with those services. Because the tutors are the students’ peers, students are often more comfortable expressing their difficulties and needs, which makes the ELC very effective at identifying and assisting student’s unique needs.

2.3 The ELC’s primary goal is assist students with their writing and other challenging coursework in their academic classes. However, ELC tutors also help beginning students learn how to use vital tools like campus e-mail accounts, Blackboard, WebAdvisor, and online orientations.

2.4 The ELC also supports elements of 2.4 by “providing services and activities that maximize the opportunity for educational and personal growth.” The tutoring services provided by the center are designed to address a student’s immediate class content problems *and* to address those underlying academic skills issues that need development. For student tutors, the experience of tutoring will expand their mastery of their subject, give them the opportunity to improve and acquire new academic skills, and help them develop more effective communication skills. For the student clerical aides, the experience of working in the fast-paced environment of a busy tutorial center gives them the opportunity to acquire new workplace “soft skills” as well as develop their clerical and communication skills.

3.3 ELC tutors are encouraged to participate in regional tutorial, basic skills, and writing center conferences when economically feasible. When possible, at least a few of the tutors and the coordinators attend. We have learned that the RC Writing Center has participants write up conference summaries and share them with applicable department colleagues; the ELC may consider that extra step in the future since it would add another level of professional development for the tutors. In re-reading the RC Writing Center’s program review, we noted that their coordinator maintains membership in the International Writing Center Association (IWCA) and has included this cost in their goals and budget. The ELC, since it delivers all types of tutoring, is considering following this example but also requesting membership for CRLA, the College Reading and Learning Association.

3.4 The ELC participates in Program Review and SLO assessments. The tutor training courses require tutors to develop specific learning objectives in the tutorial sessions and then assess student learning outcomes and to report those assessments. In the future, tutors may become more involved in the development of the specific assessment tools and analyzing the resulting data.

4.3 Students considering teaching as a career choice and majoring in liberal studies in particular benefit from the work experience as tutors. Student clerical aides have the opportunity to acquire workplace skills also.

6.2 The ELC coordinators participate in the TWM (Tutorial, Reading and Math) workgroup, also sometimes called the TLC (Tutorial and Learning Centers), which polycoms with RC’s Tutorial Center, Writing Center, Math Lab, and RC’s new Communications Center. These groups work together to support and promote each other’s services.

D3. Describe how your program supports the College Educational Master Plan. Give a few specific examples.

Tutorial services are not addressed in the recommendations contained within the Reedley College Educational Master Plan. However, tutorial services are described in detail within the plan narrative. Notably, tutorial services are specifically included in the paragraph describing “strengths of the college.” The plan states, “The College has developed a variety of services to support students including tutoring centers that focus on writing and math. These tutoring centers were regarded as extremely critical to the success and support of students at Reedley College.” In addition, the ELC supports recommendation 4: “As part of this process, the College should also consider expanding and promoting staff development for, and the offering of, nontraditional methods for delivering classes and services (i.e., via internet and related technological systems and services).” The ELC supports all classes offered in all formats. For example, the tutors and desk workers are trained to assist students in navigating online courses. The tutors of reading, math, chemistry, and writing assist students in navigating MyReadingLab, MyMathLab, MyChemLab, and the Criterion program which is used with a few of the basic writing skills courses. The ELC is trying to advertise the recently purchased Smarthinking online tutoring service, and has linked it to its three tutorial courses via BlackBoard. Furthermore, the ELC keeps a resource list of websites aiding students and tutors in various disciplines and has put shortcuts to a few of the more popular sites on their computers.

E. In the table below, list only the recommendations deemed substantiated by the Program Review Committee from the previous Program Review and the implementation status of each. Include in the status column any barriers encountered. Add or delete rows as needed.

**Please note:** This is the ELC’s first separate Program Review. The last cycle, it was included within the Reedley College Writing Center’s program review information, which was an appendix to the Composition Sequence Program Review. However, not all of the goals from that appendix applied to all three writing centers, so only those that also applied to Madera’s ELC are copied below. In addition, since the ELC offers tutoring for all disciplines and not just writing tutoring, the past applicable goals from RC’s Tutorial Center’s draft cycle 3 Program Review are also copied below. These goals were more global, so they are listed first. The numbers start again when switching to the writing center goals. Finally, since this is the first time that the Madera ELC has completed its own program review, for background purposes data from prior to Spring ’08 is sometimes included. Because of the extended deadline to complete our program report, which occurred after the Institutional Researcher had already sent us the five-year data sets, we sometimes include data and information up to and after Fall ’13.

**Previous Program Recommendations**

| **Recommendation** | | **Status** | | **Outcome** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Tutorial Center funding be increased so as to ensure that the center can:  (a) accommodate increasing demand for services, | | Tutor staff funding increased in the two years following program review. Matriculation funding was lost, but was replaced with equal XX0 dollars. Perkins money was increased; and new, annual allocations were received from the committee administering the Basic Skills Initiative.  In 2011-12 funding was no longer sufficient to accommodate demand for tutoring. Total funding for 2011-12 was essentially the same as the previous year. During the Fall 2011 term 21% more tutoring hours were provided than in the previous fall term. The center ceased adding more tutor work hours on March 1, 2012. New requests for tutoring were only accommodated to the extent that the student could join an existing tutoring session. Demand continued to rise despite a decline in college enrollment.  Funding for 2012-13 was, again, the same as the previous year. Demand for tutoring continues to increase. | | Recommendation not implemented. | |
| (b) regularly hire adjunct faculty to keep the center open two evening each week, | | Unable to implement due to lack of funding. | | Recommendation not implemented. | |
| (c) purchase necessary supplies and reference materials, | | Budget cut by 48% in 2012-13 | | Recommendation not implemented. | |
| (d) “purchase” the same number of tutor work hours when the district increases student worker (tutor) pay rates. | No action required as there have been no student pay rate increases until July 2014. It will increase again Jan. 2016. | | Not applicable till July 2014. | |
| 2. The Tutorial Center and the college continue the development of online tutoring by collaborating with Fresno City College and North Centers and by providing necessary funds for the employment of tutors, supervisory staff, and equipment and software. | | Planning has been suspended pending improved budget conditions. | | Recommendation not implemented. | |
| 3. The college maintain the integrity of the Tutorial Center facility for use by the Tutorial Center program. | | The addition of Beyond the Classroom (BTC) activities impacted the tutorial center’s ability to satisfactorily accommodate group tutoring sessions as the large conference room is being used during the busiest times of the day. | | The situation in the current year is manageable; however, consideration needs to be given to the intermediate and long-term facility needs of tutorial and BTC services given the likelihood that both services will continue to expand. | |
| 1. Expanding writing center computer lab into a media-ready lab (to support students taking online courses, especially those using virtual classrooms). | | Not complete | | No longer viable due to budget constraints. | |
| 2. Further supporting learning assistant-training by sending learning assistants to national conferences. | | Ongoing | | Conference attendance was suspended during budget crisis. Funds were found to send tutors to Northern California Writing Center Conference in 2013. | |
| 3. Expanding into a Writing and Reading Center. | | Not complete | | No longer viable due to budget cuts. Tutors receiving training in tutoring reading. Reading faculty is invited to be guest speakers during the tutor training. | |
| 4. Writing and offering course modules to support writing and reading classes. | | Complete; Ongoing. | | Modules were created and piloted, but proved to be cumbersome and a lot of tutor time was utilized. Future modules are possible, but would need to be developed with resources in mind. | |
| 5. Employing faculty tutors. | | Not complete | | Not viable due to budget cuts. | |
| 6. Embedding peer tutors in writing and reading classes. | | Complete; ongoing | | Peer tutors are embedded in writing courses using BSI funds. | |
| 7. Conducting evaluations of expanded services. | | Ongoing | | We evaluate group, walk-in and embedded tutoring through surveys and/or institutional research each semester. | |

F. If applicable, in the table below, list the recommendations from the previous accreditation report and the status of each. Include in the status column any barriers encountered.

Previous ACCJC or Other Accreditation Recommendations

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Recommendation** | **Status** | **Outcome** |
| Not applicable |  |  |

# **II. Quantitative Analysis**

These data provide an initial and important framework for review of programs and the program as a whole.

Please note that these data should be integrated with the qualitative analysis and SLO assessment to help support your Summary Statements & Goals

Insert suitable tables provided and formatted by the Institutional Researcher in your report. Additional graphs and charts are acceptable. Please be sure to label tables and charts and reference them by number in the narrative.

A. How many students served by program/services area in the past year? How does this compare with past years?

**The following tables reflect enrollment for those students who were enrolled in ALL Courses**

**ENROLLMENT TRENDS HEADCOUNT (Unduplicated)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| REEDLEY  COLLEGE | **6458** | **6490** | **6991** | **6982** | **7032** | **6909** | **6702** | **6601** | **6218** | **5561** |
| MADERA  CENTER | **2870** | **2895** | **3129** | **3057** | **2830** | **2962** | **2779** | **2901** | **2899** | **2534** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 1 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**  **ENROLLMENT TRENDS The following tables reflect enrollment for those students who were enrolled in ENGL-372, ENGL-272, INTDS-300, OR INTDS-301 CLASSES and SECTIONS as outlined by ELC.**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | ENROLLMENT TRENDS HEADCOUNT (Unduplicated) | | | | | | | | | | | |  | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP | | MADERA CENTER ELC | **272** | **390** | **317** | **256** | **410** | **376** | **380** | **357** | **409** | **370** |   **Table 2 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Please note:** We found it easier reading of data for interpretation when we lined up Reedley College, Madera Center and ELC data in groups of three per data set. However, we also kept the traditional format of the tables sent by the Institutional Researcher, as per the directions and for readers who prefer that format. All charts are here in both formats, first the traditional and then the trio line up. | | | | | | | | | | | | | **HEADCOUNT (Unduplicated Merged Data from Reedley College, Madera Center and ELC)** | | | | | | | | | | | | |  | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** | | **REEDLEY COLLEGE** | **6458** | **6490** | **6991** | **6982** | **7032** | **6909** | **6702** | **6601** | **6218** | **5561** | | **MADERA CENTER** | **2870** | **2895** | **3129** | **3057** | **2830** | **2962** | **2779** | **2901** | **2899** | **2534** | | **MADERA CENTER ELC** | **272** | **390** | **317** | **256** | **410** | **376** | **380** | **357** | **409** | **370** | | **Table 3** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **(Unduplicated Merged Data from Madera Center and ELC)** | | | | | | | | | | | |  | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** | | **MADERA CENTER** | **2870** | **2895** | **3129** | **3057** | **2830** | **2962** | **2779** | **2901** | **2899** | **2534** | | **MADERA CENTER ELC** | **272** | **390** | **317** | **256** | **410** | **376** | **380** | **357** | **409** | **370** | | **Percentage** | **9%** | **13%** | **10%** | **8%** | **14%** | **13%** | **14%** | **12%** | **14%** | **15%** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table 4**

**Table 5**

**Overall College and Tutorial Enrollment (TABLE # Unduplicated Headcount)**

Tutorial courses generate steady enrollment figures at the Madera Center, and on the whole, the Madera Center ELC has seen an increase of student body enrollment, except for spring 2010. Overall there has been average increase of 5% throughout the semesters. The numbers differed substantially between Spring 2010 and Fall 2010, which coincide with a slight dip in Madera Center enrollment. This reduction in ELC enrollment to a proportional low of 8.4% was probably a result of two specific factors: (1) The Title 5 Co-op grant ended Fall '09 and the changing budget caused conservative planning, reduced hours we were open, and a reduction of tutoring hours overall; and (2) in Spring 2010, English 372 was deleted per ed. code guidelines. Looking more closely at the most recent semesters, one can see that the number of students served has stayed relatively the same, despite the downward trend of campus enrollment due to reduced course offerings and tighter financial aid restrictions. However, if one looks at the data proportionally, the students served in the ELC in Fall 2011 were 13.7% of Madera enrollment; in Spring 2012, it was 12.3%; in Fall 2012, it was 14.1%; and in Spring 2013, it was 14.6%. This means that we are actually serving a greater proportion of enrolled students, even though the number served went down between Fall 2012 and Spring 2013.

**AGE CATEGORY**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| REEDLEY COLLEGE | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| 19 or Less | **32%** | **30%** | **34%** | **28%** | **34%** | **29%** | **35%** | **30%** | **35%** | **30%** |
| 20-24 | **35%** | **37%** | **35%** | **39%** | **36%** | **40%** | **38%** | **41%** | **40%** | **45%** |
| 25-29 | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **12%** | **10%** | **11%** | **10%** | **11%** |
| 30-34 | **6%** | **6%** | **6%** | **7%** | **6%** | **6%** | **5%** | **6%** | **6%** | **6%** |
| 35-39 | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **3%** | **4%** | **3%** | **3%** |
| 40-49 | **6%** | **6%** | **5%** | **6%** | **5%** | **5%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** |
| 50+ | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **3%** | **2%** |
| Not Reported | **1%** | **0%** | **0%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **0%** |

**Table 6 -Data Source: SCCCD Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MADERA CENTER | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| 19 or Less | **29%** | **24%** | **29%** | **26%** | **28%** | **23%** | **27%** | **23%** | **26%** | **22%** |
| 20-24 | **34%** | **36%** | **35%** | **39%** | **38%** | **40%** | **39%** | **41%** | **38%** | **42%** |
| 25-29 | **13%** | **15%** | **13%** | **13%** | **14%** | **14%** | **14%** | **14%** | **14%** | **14%** |
| 30-34 | **8%** | **9%** | **8%** | **8%** | **7%** | **8%** | **8%** | **8%** | **8%** | **8%** |
| 35-39 | **5%** | **6%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** |
| 40-49 | **8%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **5%** | **6%** | **5%** | **6%** | **6%** | **5%** |
| 50+ | **3%** | **3%** | **3%** | **3%** | **3%** | **4%** | **3%** | **3%** | **3%** | **3%** |

**Table 7 - Data Source: SCCCD Institutional Research**

**AGE CATEGORY ELC**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Madera Center ELC | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| 19 or Less | **25.74%** | **18.21%** | **21.45%** | **16.02%** | **26.83%** | **20.21%** | **29.47%** | **21.01%** | **23.72%** | **21.08%** |
| 20-24 | **25.00%** | **27.95%** | **28.39%** | **32.03%** | **31.46%** | **36.70%** | **33.16%** | **35.01%** | **32.27%** | **34.59%** |
| 25-29 | **12.87%** | **14.87%** | **12.62%** | **13.67%** | **14.39%** | **14.63%** | **11.05%** | **15.13%** | **13.45%** | **16.22%** |
| 30-34 | **7.72%** | **11.03%** | **11.36%** | **11.72%** | **6.83%** | **9.31%** | **7.37%** | **7.84%** | **9.78%** | **9.19%** |
| 35-39 | **7.72%** | **6.41%** | **9.15%** | **8.20%** | **8.54%** | **6.91%** | **7.89%** | **6.72%** | **8.56%** | **5.95%** |
| 40-49 | **16.91%** | **15.90%** | **12.62%** | **13.67%** | **6.83%** | **7.98%** | **7.63%** | **10.64%** | **7.58%** | **7.30%** |
| 50+ | **4.04%** | **5.64%** | **4.42%** | **4.69%** | **5.12%** | **4.26%** | **3.42%** | **3.64%** | **4.65%** | **5.68%** |

**Table 8 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **AGE CATEGORY (Merged Data from Reedley College, Madera Center and ELC)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **Reedley College**  **19 or Less** | **32%** | **30%** | **34%** | **28%** | **34%** | **29%** | **35%** | **30%** | **35%** | **30%** |
| **Madera Center**  **19 or Less** | **29%** | **24%** | **29%** | **26%** | **28%** | **23%** | **27%** | **23%** | **26%** | **22%** |
| **Madera Center ELC**  **19 or Less** | **26%** | **18%** | **21%** | **16%** | **27%** | **20%** | **29%** | **21%** | **24%** | **21%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reedley College**  **20-24** | **35%** | **37%** | **35%** | **39%** | **36%** | **40%** | **38%** | **41%** | **40%** | **45%** |
| **Madera Center**  **20-24** | **34%** | **36%** | **35%** | **39%** | **38%** | **40%** | **39%** | **41%** | **38%** | **42%** |
| **Madera Center ELC**  **20-24** | **25%** | **28%** | **28%** | **32%** | **31%** | **37%** | **33%** | **35%** | **32%** | **35%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reedley College**  **25-29** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **12%** | **10%** | **11%** | **10%** | **11%** |
| **Madera Center**  **25-29** | **13%** | **15%** | **13%** | **13%** | **14%** | **14%** | **14%** | **14%** | **14%** | **14%** |
| **Madera Center ELC**  **25-29** | **13%** | **15%** | **13%** | **14%** | **14%** | **15%** | **11%** | **15%** | **13%** | **16%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reedley College**  **30-34** | **6%** | **6%** | **6%** | **7%** | **6%** | **6%** | **5%** | **6%** | **6%** | **6%** |
| **Madera Center**  **30-34** | **8%** | **9%** | **8%** | **8%** | **7%** | **8%** | **8%** | **8%** | **8%** | **8%** |
| **Madera Center ELC**  **30-34** | **8%** | **11%** | **11%** | **12%** | **7%** | **9%** | **7%** | **8%** | **10%** | **9%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reedley College**  **35-39** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **3%** | **4%** | **3%** | **3%** |
| **Madera Center**  **35-39** | **5%** | **6%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** |
| **Madera Center ELC**  **35-39** | **8%** | **6%** | **9%** | **8%** | **9%** | **7%** | **8%** | **7%** | **9%** | **6%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reedley College**  **40-49** | **6%** | **6%** | **5%** | **6%** | **5%** | **5%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** |
| **Madera Center**  **40-49** | **8%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **5%** | **6%** | **5%** | **6%** | **6%** | **5%** |
| **Madera Center ELC**  **40-49** | **17%** | **16%** | **13%** | **14%** | **7%** | **8%** | **8%** | **11%** | **8%** | **7%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Reedley College**  **50+** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **3%** | **2%** |
| **Madera Center**  **50+** | **3%** | **3%** | **3%** | **3%** | **3%** | **4%** | **3%** | **3%** | **3%** | **3%** |
| **Madera Center ELC**  **50+** | **4%** | **6%** | **4%** | **5%** | **5%** | **4%** | **3%** | **4%** | **5%** | **6%** |
| **Not Reported** | **1%** | **0%** | **0%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **0%** |

**TABLE 9**

**Overall College and Age Enrollment**

The Madera Center ELC data in comparison to the Reedley College and Madera Center student body data indicates that the older student population utilizes tutorial services more than the younger student population, specifically the age groups 25 – 49. Typically, beginning in the 25 to 29 age group, a few percentage increases are noted which then increases each 4 year interval until the 45-49 group. It also should be noted that the first four semesters, fall 2008 to spring 2009, there was a significant percentage of students in the 45 to 49 group who utilized the tutorial services, which then decreased to a less than 5% percentage difference. The decrease corresponds to the economic downturn and reduced course offerings.

The fact that the older student population utilizes tutorial services more than the younger student population is typical of the data seen in other tutorial centers because older students can be returning for new career training, they are more frequently students who also have to work, and they can be more experienced students. The older student population often either feel they have less time to waste and are more serious about being successful in their courses, or they feel less confident about their skills because they have been out of schools and seek supportive services to ensure success.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| GENDER CATEGORY (Merged Data from Reedley College, Madera Center and Madera Center ELC) | | | | | | | | | | |
| REEDLEY COLLEGE | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| Female | **58%** | **58%** | **58%** | **58%** | **56%** | **56%** | **55%** | **55%** | **54%** | **54%** |
| Male | **41%** | **42%** | **42%** | **42%** | **44%** | **43%** | **44%** | **44%** | **45%** | **45%** |
| Unreported | **1%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** |

**TABLE 10 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MADERA CENTER | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| Female | **67%** | **66%** | **64%** | **65%** | **64%** | **63%** | **65%** | **66%** | **66%** | **65%** |
| Male | **33%** | **34%** | **36%** | **35%** | **35%** | **36%** | **35%** | **33%** | **33%** | **34%** |
| Unreported | **0%** | **1%** | **0%** | **0%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TABLE 11 -Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | MADERA CENTER ELC | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP | | Female | **73.16%** | **71.54%** | **72.24%** | **70.70%** | **66.10%** | **64.63%** | **66.32%** | **74.79%** | **69.44%** | **70.27%** | | Male | **26.47%** | **28.21%** | **27.76%** | **29.30%** | **33.17%** | **34.04%** | **33.16%** | **23.81%** | **29.34%** | **28.65%** | | Unreported | **0.37%** | **0.26%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.73%** | **1.33%** | **0.53%** | **1.40%** | **1.22%** | **1.08%** |   **TABLE 12 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **GENDER CATERGORY (Merged Data from Reedley College, Madera Center and ELC)** | | | | | | | | | | | |  | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** | | **Reedley College**  **Female** | **58%** | **58%** | **58%** | **58%** | **56%** | **56%** | **55%** | **55%** | **54%** | **54%** | | **Madera Center**  **Female** | **67%** | **66%** | **64%** | **65%** | **64%** | **63%** | **65%** | **66%** | **66%** | **65%** | | **Madera Center ELC**  **Female** | **73%** | **72%** | **72%** | **71%** | **66%** | **65%** | **66%** | **75%** | **69%** | **70%** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Reedley College** | **41%** | **42%** | **42%** | **42%** | **44%** | **43%** | **44%** | **44%** | **45%** | **45%** | | **Madera Center**  **Male** | **33%** | **34%** | **36%** | **35%** | **35%** | **36%** | **35%** | **33%** | **33%** | **34%** | | **Madera Center ELC**  **Male** | **26%** | **28%** | **28%** | **29%** | **33%** | **34%** | **33%** | **24%** | **29%** | **29%** | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | **Reedley College**  **Unreported** | **1%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | | **Madera Center**  **Unreported** | **0%** | **1%** | **0%** | **0%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | | **Madera Center ELC**  **Unreported** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** |   **TABLE 13** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Overall College and Gender Enrollment**

Generally, the Reedley College and the Madera Center student body population have a higher number of female students in comparison to males. Correspondingly, the tutorial services are utilized by more females than males. Comparing data across all semesters there has been an average increase of 5% in male usage of the ELC tutorial services. The biggest difference between male and female students served happened between Fall 2011 and Spring 2012; it went from a 1-2% difference between campus female/male population and ELC to a 9% difference. This difference could have influenced by several variables and more analysis would be required to draw any clear conclusions. The ratio of male and female students served in the ELC most clearly mirrors the Madera student body population in Fall 2010, Spring 2011, and Fall 2011.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ETHNICITY CATEGORY | | | | | | | | | | |
| REEDLEY COLLEGE | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| African-American/  Non-Hispanic | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **3%** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** |
| American Indian/Alaskan | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **6%** | **5%** | **6%** |
| Hispanic | **59%** | **60%** | **60%** | **60%** | **64%** | **63%** | **64%** | **64%** | **67%** | **68%** |
| Race/Ethnicity Unknown | **9%** | **11%** | **10%** | **9%** | **6%** | **6%** | **5%** | **5%** | **3%** | **3%** |
| White/ non-Hispanic | **23%** | **22%** | **22%** | **23%** | **22%** | **22%** | **22%** | **22%** | **21%** | **20%** |

**TABLE 14 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MADERA CENTER | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| African-American/  Non-Hispanic | **3%** | **3%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** |
| American Indian/Alaskan | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | **5%** | **6%** | **6%** | **8%** | **8%** | **8%** | **7%** | **8%** | **7%** | **8%** |
| Hispanic | **55%** | **54%** | **52%** | **51%** | **56%** | **55%** | **59%** | **60%** | **60%** | **61%** |
| Race/Ethnicity Unknown | **13%** | **13%** | **13%** | **11%** | **8%** | **7%** | **6%** | **4%** | **3%** | **3%** |
| White/ non-Hispanic | **22%** | **22%** | **24%** | **25%** | **23%** | **25%** | **23%** | **23%** | **24%** | **23%** |

**TABLE 15 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MADERA CENTER ELC | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| African-American/  Non-Hispanic | **7.35%** | **6.67%** | **5.68%** | **7.42%** | **5.12%** | **5.32%** | **5.00%** | **7.28%** | **6.11%** | **4.86%** |
| American Indian/Alaskan | **1.47%** | **1.79%** | **0.63%** | **1.17%** | **0.98%** | **1.06%** | **0.79%** | **0.28%** | **0.73%** | **1.08%** |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | **2.57%** | **5.90%** | **6.62%** | **5.47%** | **7.07%** | **5.85%** | **4.47%** | **6.16%** | **6.85%** | **7.84%** |
| Hispanic | **60.29%** | **56.92%** | **53.00%** | **57.42%** | **60.49%** | **58.78%** | **65.79%** | **64.71%** | **63.57%** | **64.59%** |
| Race/Ethnicity Unknown | **11.03%** | **11.03%** | **11.36%** | **9.38%** | **5.61%** | **7.45%** | **4.47%** | **4.48%** | **2.69%** | **2.70%** |
| White/ non-Hispanic | **17.28%** | **17.69%** | **22.71%** | **19.14%** | **20.73%** | **21.54%** | **19.47%** | **17.09%** | **20.05%** | **18.92%** |

**TABLE 16 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **ETHNICITY CATEGORY (Merged Data from Reedley College, Madera Center and ELC)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **ETHINCITY (TABLE ?)** | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **RC - African-American/Non-Hispanic** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **3%** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** |
| **MC - African-American/Non-Hispanic** | **3%** | **3%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** |
| **ELC- African-American/Non-Hispanic** | **7%** | **7%** | **6%** | **7%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **7%** | **6%** | **5%** |
|  | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **RC - American Indian/Alaskan** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** |
| **MC -American Indian/Alaskan** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** |
| **ELC -American Indian/Alaskan** | **1%** | **2%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **0%** | **1%** | **1%** |
|  | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **RC Asian/Pacific Islander** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **6%** | **5%** | **6%** |
| **MC -Asian/Pacific Islander** | **5%** | **6%** | **6%** | **8%** | **8%** | **8%** | **7%** | **8%** | **7%** | **8%** |
| **ELC-Asian/Pacific Islander** | **3%** | **6%** | **7%** | **5%** | **7%** | **6%** | **4%** | **6%** | **7%** | **8%** |
|  | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **RC Hispanic** | **59%** | **60%** | **60%** | **60%** | **64%** | **63%** | **64%** | **64%** | **67%** | **68%** |
| **MC -Hispanic** | **55%** | **54%** | **52%** | **51%** | **56%** | **55%** | **59%** | **60%** | **60%** | **61%** |
| **ELC-Hispanic** | **60%** | **57%** | **53%** | **57%** | **60%** | **59%** | **66%** | **65%** | **64%** | **65%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **RC Race/Ethnicity Unknown** | **9%** | **11%** | **10%** | **9%** | **6%** | **6%** | **5%** | **5%** | **3%** | **3%** |
| **MC -Race/Ethnicity Unknown** | **13%** | **13%** | **13%** | **11%** | **8%** | **7%** | **6%** | **4%** | **3%** | **3%** |
| **ELC-Race/Ethnicity Unknown** | **11%** | **11%** | **11%** | **9%** | **6%** | **7%** | **4%** | **4%** | **3%** | **3%** |
|  | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **RC White/ non-Hispanic** | **23%** | **22%** | **22%** | **23%** | **22%** | **22%** | **22%** | **22%** | **21%** | **20%** |
| **MC -White/ non-Hispanic** | **22%** | **22%** | **24%** | **25%** | **23%** | **25%** | **23%** | **23%** | **24%** | **23%** |
| **ELC-White/ non-Hispanic** | **17%** | **18%** | **23%** | **19%** | **21%** | **22%** | **19%** | **17%** | **20%** | **19%** |

**TABLE 17**

**Overall College and Ethnicity Enrollment**

Although Hispanic is the dominant ethnic group at both Reedley College and Madera Center, Reedley College enrolls a higher percentage of Hispanics students each semester than Madera Center. Reedley College ranges from 59 to 68 percent while Madera Center ranges from 51 to 61. The Madera Center ELC ranges from 53 to 66 percent. The ELC ethnicity mirrors the enrollment in the diversity of the Madera Center campus, with only slightly higher numbers for

CHispanic and African-American than the campus norm.

**UNIT LOAD**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| REEDLEY COLLEGE | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| FULL TIME | **51%** | **47%** | **51%** | **49%** | **51%** | **48%** | **50%** | **48%** | **50%** | **51%** |
| PART TIME | **49%** | **53%** | **49%** | **51%** | **49%** | **52%** | **50%** | **52%** | **50%** | **49%** |

**TABLE 18 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MADERA CENTER | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| FULL TIME | **38%** | **38%** | **38%** | **38%** | **40%** | **38%** | **39%** | **38%** | **36%** | **36%** |
| PART TIME | **62%** | **62%** | **62%** | **62%** | **60%** | **62%** | **61%** | **62%** | **64%** | **64%** |

**TABLE 19 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MADERA CENTER ELC | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| FULL TIME | **100.00%** | **50.77%** | **48.90%** | **52.73%** | **50.49%** | **51.60%** | **54.21%** | **51.82%** | **48.90%** | **55.41%** |
| PART TIME | **0.00%** | **49.23%** | **51.10%** | **47.27%** | **49.51%** | **48.40%** | **45.79%** | **48.18%** | **51.10%** | **44.59%** |

**TABLE 20 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **UNIT CATEGORY (Merged Data from Reedley College, Madera Center and ELC)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **RC- FULL TIME** | **51%** | **47%** | **51%** | **49%** | **51%** | **48%** | **50%** | **48%** | **50%** | **51%** |
| **MC-FULL TIME** | **38%** | **38%** | **38%** | **38%** | **40%** | **38%** | **39%** | **38%** | **36%** | **36%** |
| **ELC -FULL TIME** | **100%** | **51%** | **49%** | **53%** | **50%** | **52%** | **54%** | **52%** | **49%** | **55%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **RC -PART TIME** | **49%** | **53%** | **49%** | **51%** | **49%** | **52%** | **50%** | **52%** | **50%** | **49%** |
| **MC- PART TIME** | **62%** | **62%** | **62%** | **62%** | **60%** | **62%** | **61%** | **62%** | **64%** | **64%** |
| **ELC-PART TIME** | **0%** | **49%** | **51%** | **47%** | **50%** | **48%** | **46%** | **48%** | **51%** | **45%** |

**TABLE 21**

The Fall 2008 data in the above table appears to be an anomaly. After research, our in-house data reflected more accurate numbers, which were 54% full time and 46 % part time. Full-time students are more likely to request and receive tutoring. This may be explained in part by access – the absence of a consistent schedule of evening hours; but it is more likely explained by the general tendency of part-time students to have less time to be involved with extra services on campus or the fact that there are fewer numbers of evening tutors available. Our commitment to serving evening students with volunteer coordinator hours and only a couple of tutors has enabled us to serve a higher percentage of part-time students than our counterparts at Reedley; however, Madera has a higher percentage of part time students overall than Reedley does, so we could still improve in this area. Funding should be increased so that evening coordinator hours could be paid and the number of evening tutors could be increased, and Saturday tutoring hours could be added to support the new Saturday courses.

We examined the growth of tutorial hours per semester, as represented in the following chart for spring semesters. The charts indicate a fairly steady increase, with dips when courses were cut substantially. The number of hours students spend working with their tutors correlates with an increase in success as seen by the Mark Analysis information following the next chart.



TABLE 22

**The MARK ANALYSIS and ACHIEVEMENT tables that follow reflect student accomplishment across their coursework (not just the ENGL and INTDS courses).**

**MARK ANALYSIS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| REEDLEY COLLEGE | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| A | **21%** | **22%** | **21%** | **23%** | **23%** | **23%** | **23%** | **23%** | **22%** | **21%** |
| B | **18%** | **18%** | **19%** | **18%** | **19%** | **19%** | **19%** | **20%** | **21%** | **21%** |
| C | **16%** | **16%** | **16%** | **15%** | **16%** | **16%** | **17%** | **16%** | **17%** | **17%** |
| D | **6%** | **6%** | **7%** | **6%** | **7%** | **6%** | **7%** | **6%** | **7%** | **6%** |
| F | **15%** | **15%** | **16%** | **16%** | **15%** | **15%** | **14%** | **15%** | **14%** | **14%** |
| NP | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **1%** | **2%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** |
| P | **5%** | **5%** | **5%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **4%** | **3%** | **3%** |
| W | **12%** | **10%** | **11%** | **9%** | **10%** | **9%** | **9%** | **9%** | **9%** | **8%** |
| X | **6%** | **6%** | **4%** | **6%** | **5%** | **6%** | **6%** | **6%** | **6%** | **7%** |
| Totals | **20028** | **19838** | **21378** | **21053** | **21338** | **30495** | **20091** | **20026** | **19442** | **17389** |

**TABLE 23 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MADERA CENTER** | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **A** | **28%** | **27%** | **27%** | **26%** | **24%** | **25%** | **23%** | **25%** | **24%** | **22%** |
| **B** | **18%** | **19%** | **20%** | **18%** | **20%** | **19%** | **21%** | **22%** | **19%** | **21%** |
| **C** | **15%** | **15%** | **16%** | **16%** | **17%** | **16%** | **17%** | **17%** | **16%** | **17%** |
| **D** | **6%** | **6%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** |
| **F** | **15%** | **15%** | **15%** | **15%** | **15%** | **14%** | **15%** | **14%** | **14%** | **13%** |
| **IP** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **0%** | **1%** | **0%** |
| **NP** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **1%** | **0%** | **0%** | **1%** |
| **P** | **3%** | **3%** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **4%** | **2%** | **2%** | **2%** | **3%** |
| **W** | **9%** | **8%** | **8%** | **9%** | **9%** | **9%** | **8%** | **8%** | **10%** | **8%** |
| **X** | **4%** | **5%** | **4%** | **5%** | **6%** | **6%** | **6%** | **6%** | **7%** | **7%** |
| **Totals** | **7622** | **7698** | **8250** | **7803** | **7523** | **7523** | **7017** | **7230** | **7334** | **6306** |

**TABLE 24 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MADERA CENTER ELC** | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **A** | **18.60%** | **18.85%** | **21.31%** | **22.12%** | **18.18%** | **20.64%** | **19.64%** | **20.64%** | **19.88%** | **18.43%** |
| **B** | **15.54%** | **15.66%** | **16.69%** | **14.94%** | **17.54%** | **15.88%** | **17.37%** | **18.37%** | **16.75%** | **19.02%** |
| **C** | **13.53%** | **13.07%** | **12.00%** | **14.12%** | **15.58%** | **13.80%** | **12.74%** | **13.10%** | **14.46%** | **14.76%** |
| **D** | **5.07%** | **4.69%** | **5.33%** | **4.00%** | **5.09%** | **4.99%** | **5.90%** | **4.78%** | **4.68%** | **5.12%** |
| **F** | **9.34%** | **8.54%** | **9.80%** | **8.33%** | **7.90%** | **6.84%** | **9.71%** | **7.90%** | **7.54%** | **7.97%** |
| **I** | **0.08%** | **0.22%** | **0.07%** | **0.16%** | **0.21%** | **0.00%** | **0.11%** | **0.12%** | **0.52%** | **0.27%** |
| **IP** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.24%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** |
| **NP** | **5.07%** | **4.19%** | **1.92%** | **2.69%** | **2.65%** | **1.80%** | **1.60%** | **0.98%** | **0.83%** | **1.08%** |
| **P** | **7.25%** | **7.61%** | **6.46%** | **7.27%** | **5.67%** | **7.13%** | **6.45%** | **6.74%** | **5.67%** | **5.93%** |
| **RD** | **0.08%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.05%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.00%** | **0.05%** | **0.00%** |
| **W** | **7.97%** | **5.57%** | **3.84%** | **5.80%** | **5.30%** | **5.68%** | **3.59%** | **4.29%** | **5.57%** | **4.04%** |
|  | **17.47%** | **21.61%** | **22.59%** | **20.33%** | **21.83%** | **23.25%** | **22.89%** | **23.09%** | **24.04%** | **23.38%** |
| **Total Grades** | **1025** | **1422** | **1090** | **976** | **1475** | **1324** | **1398** | **1256** | **1460** | **1422** |

**TABLE 25 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**



**TABLE 26 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

Overall, students enrolled in ELC tutoring withdraw less from their courses in comparison to Madera Center and Reedley College numbers. This same population in addition earns “P” grades at an almost double rate in comparison to the Madera Center campus norm. The higher number of "P" grades can be partially explained by the fact that the English 272 tutorial course is included in the "P" grade total, but it doesn't fully explain the almost double rate. In addition, students enrolled in the ELC earn fewer D’s and F’s than the campus norms for Madera Center and Reedley College.

**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT INDICATORS**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **REEDLEY COLLEGE** | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **GPA** | **2.22** | **2.25** | **2.21** | **2.23** | **2.24** | **2.25** | **2.26** | **2.27** | **2.29** | **2.29** |
| **SUCCESS** | **62.7** | **64.4** | **63** | **64.5** | **65.5** | **66.2** | **67** | **66.8** | **67.2** | **68** |
| **RETENTION** | **87.5** | **89.4** | **88.5** | **90** | **90** | **89.9** | **90.8** | **90.3** | **90.7** | **90.9** |
| **ATTRITION** | **12.5** | **10.6** | **11.5** | **10** | **10** | **10.1** | **9.2** | **9.7** | **9.3** | **9.1** |

**TABLE 27 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **MADERA CENTER** | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **GPA** | **2.34** | **2.37** | **2.32** | **2.33** | **2.28** | **2.36** | **2.33** | **2.35** | **2.36** | **2.35** |
| **SUCCESS** | **66.7** | **67.5** | **68** | **66.5** | **66.5** | **67.9** | **66.7** | **68.7** | **66.2** | **68.5** |
| **RETENTION** | **90.7** | **91.2** | **91.7** | **90.5** | **90.8** | **90.6** | **91.1** | **91.9** | **89.4** | **91** |
| **ATTRITION** | **9.3** | **8.8** | **8.3** | **9.5** | **9.2** | **9.4** | **8.9** | **8.1** | **10.6** | **9** |

**TABLE 28 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Madera Center ELC** | **GPA** | **SUCCESS** | **RETENTION** | **ATTRITION** |
| **08FA** | **2.37** | **66.60%** | **90.33%** | **9.67%** |
| **09SP** | **2.45** | **70.39%** | **93.03%** | **6.97%** |
| **09FA** | **2.41** | **72.94%** | **95.05%** | **4.95%** |
| **10SP** | **2.47** | **73.59%** | **92.70%** | **7.30%** |
| **10FA** | **2.44** | **72.93%** | **93.22%** | **6.78%** |
| **11SP** | **2.55** | **74.85%** | **92.60%** | **7.40%** |
| **11FA** | **2.45** | **72.89%** | **95.35%** | **4.65%** |
| **12SP** | **2.51** | **76.51%** | **94.43%** | **5.57%** |
| **12FA** | **2.53** | **74.78%** | **92.67%** | **7.33%** |
| **13SP** | **2.46** | **75.88%** | **94.73%** | **5.27%** |

**TABLE 29 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

Analysis of grades specific to courses tutored is a future goal, but relies on the campus investing in more Institutional Researcher hours.

The chart below again lines up all the columns for GPA, success, retention, and attrition in a similar format for easier comparison.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT INDICATORS (Merged Data from Reedley College, Madera Center and ELC)** | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **08FA** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** |
| **GPA** | **2.22** | **2.25** | **2.21** | **2.23** | **2.24** | **2.25** | **2.26** | **2.27** | **2.29** | **2.29** |
| **GPA** | **2.34** | **2.37** | **2.32** | **2.33** | **2.28** | **2.36** | **2.33** | **2.35** | **2.36** | **2.35** |
| **GPA** | **2.37** | **2.45** | **2.41** | **2.47** | **2.44** | **2.55** | **2.45** | **2.51** | **2.53** | **2.46** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SUCCESS** | **62.7** | **64.4** | **63** | **64.5** | **65.5** | **66.2** | **67** | **66.8** | **67.2** | **68** |
| **SUCCESS** | **66.7** | **67.5** | **68** | **66.5** | **66.5** | **67.9** | **66.7** | **68.7** | **66.2** | **68.5** |
| **SUCCESS** | **67%** | **70%** | **73%** | **74%** | **73%** | **75%** | **73%** | **77%** | **75%** | **76%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **RETENTION** | **87.5** | **89.4** | **88.5** | **90** | **90** | **89.9** | **90.8** | **90.3** | **90.7** | **90.9** |
| **RETENTION** | **90.7** | **91.2** | **91.7** | **90.5** | **90.8** | **90.6** | **91.1** | **91.9** | **89.4** | **91** |
| **RETENTION** | **90%** | **93%** | **95%** | **93%** | **93%** | **93%** | **95%** | **94%** | **93%** | **95%** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **ATTRITION** | **12.5** | **10.6** | **11.5** | **10** | **10** | **10.1** | **9.2** | **9.7** | **9.3** | **9.1** |
| **ATTRITION** | **9.3** | **8.8** | **8.3** | **9.5** | **9.2** | **9.4** | **8.9** | **8.1** | **10.6** | **9** |
| **ATTRITION** | **10%** | **7%** | **5%** | **7%** | **7%** | **7%** | **5%** | **6%** | **7%** | **5%** |

**TABLE 30 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

The above chart shows that students receiving tutoring had grade point averages, success rates, and retention rates higher than that of the Madera Center or Reedley College total population. Attrition rates for students enrolled in tutorial courses were lower than the Madera Center's attrition rates as a whole, with the exception of the Fall '08 semester, which was only slightly higher. In short, these numbers clearly indicate that tutoring helps students be more successful. Although the ELC sees many types of students, there are two types that stand out: the student who could be successful on his own but lacks confidence and role models and the student who is struggling to master the content and needs the academic support of tutoring. Based on the numbers above, we can say the ELC enables both types of students to be more successful in their classes.

To try to better determine the effectiveness of tutorial support more clearly or in more depth than the above information, analysis of grades specific to courses tutored is in progress on a sampling of a couple semesters. Completion of this analysis is a future goal, but institutional researcher hours are needed.

**FTE/FTES**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| REEDLEY COLLEGE | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| Contract  (Fac. Workload) | **96.53** | **81.21** | **92.55** | **82.93** | **94.17** | **85.82** | **91.05** | **90.86** | **89.56** | **87.09** |
| Part Time  (Fac. Workload) | **67.84** | **76.98** | **75.64** | **66.46** | **68.05** | **60.5** | **62.83** | **57.27** | **57.75** | **36.38** |
| Extra Pay  (FT Fac. Workload) | **15.86** | **24.57** | **16.26** | **23.65** | **13.79** | **21.11** | **16.42** | **18.15** | **17.3** | **17.55** |
| FTEF | **180.23** | **182.76** | **184.45** | **173.04** | **176.01** | **167.43** | **170.30** | **166.28** | **164.61** | **141.02** |
| FTES | **2437.84** | **2332.33** | **2636.23** | **2509.52** | **2651.22** | **2473.74** | **2403.25** | **2344.59** | **2352.36** | **2063.62** |
| FTES per FTEF | **13.53** | **12.76** | **14.29** | **14.50** | **15.06** | **14.77** | **14.11** | **14.10** | **14.29** | **14.63** |
| WSCH per FTEF | **405.79** | **382.85** | **428.77** | **435.08** | **451.89** | **443.24** | **423.36** | **423.01** | **428.72** | **439.0** |
| FT:PT LHE Ratio | **1.42:1** | **1.05:1** | **1.22:1** | **1.25:1** | **1.38:1** | **1.42:1** | **1.45:1** | **1.59:1** | **1.55:1** | **2.39:1** |

**TABLE 31 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MADERA CENTER | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| Contract  (Fac. Workload) | **26.77** | **25.21** | **26.15** | **24.77** | **25.55** | **25.44** | **26.27** | **27.38** | **25.51** | **24.03** |
| Part Time  (Fac. Workload) | **26.26** | **26.19** | **26.87** | **21.32** | **17.07** | **22.6** | **20.6** | **21.51** | **24.21** | **16.54** |
| Extra Pay  (FT Fac. Workload) | **5.18** | **6.24** | **5.99** | **4.78** | **5.71** | **4.43** | **5.63** | **4.87** | **5.68** | **4.93** |
| FTEF | **58.21** | **57.64** | **59.01** | **50.87** | **48.33** | **52.47** | **52.50** | **53.76** | **55.40** | **45.50** |
| FTES | **834.10** | **856.73** | **918.66** | **863.84** | **815.33** | **828.82** | **810.03** | **840.54** | **855.30** | **686.34** |
| FTES per FTEF | **14.33** | **14.86** | **15.57** | **16.98** | **16.87** | **15.80** | **15.43** | **15.64** | **15.44** | **15.08** |
| WSCH per FTEF | **429.87** | **445.90** | **467.04** | **509.44** | **506.10** | **473.88** | **462.87** | **469.05** | **463.16** | **452.5** |
| FT:PT LHE Ratio | **1.02:1** | **0.96:1** | **0.97:1** | **1.16:1** | **1.50:1** | **1.13:1** | **1.28:1** | **1.27:1** | **1.05:1** | **1.45:1** |

**TABLE 32 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

**The following table reflects the students in Engl-272, 372, INTDS-300, 301 and the faculty load assigned with those sections only.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| MADERA CENTER  ELC | 08FA | 09SP | 09FA | 10SP | 10FA | 11SP | 11FA | 12SP | 12FA | 13SP |
| Contract  (Fac. Workload) | **0.1** | **0.1** |  |  | **0.1** |  |  | **0.03** |  | **0.13** |
| Part Time  (Fac. Workload) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Extra Pay  (FT Fac. Workload) |  |  | **0.1** | **0.1** |  | **0.1** | **0.2** | **0.17** | **0.3** | **0.2** |
| FTEF | **0.10** | **0.10** | **0.10** | **0.10** | **0.10** | **0.10** | **0.20** | **0.20** | **0.30** | **0.33** |
| FTES | **8.39** | **10.84** | **8.6** | **8.97** | **8.71** | **11.58** | **11.83** | **11.62** | **11.77** | 11.7 |
| FTES per FTEF | **83.90** | **108.40** | **86.00** | **89.70** | **87.10** | **115.80** | **59.15** | **58.10** | **39.23** | **35.45** |
| WSCH per FTEF | **2517.0** | **3252.0** | **2580.0** | **2691.0** | **2613.0** | **3474.0** | **1774.5** | **1743.0** | **1177.0** | **1063.6** |
| FT:PT LHE Ratio | **1.5** | **1.5** | **1.5** | **1.5** | **1.5** | **1.5** | **3** | **3** | **4.5** | **5** |

**TABLE 33 - Data Source: Office of Institutional Research**

Madera campus has a slightly higher efficiency rating (WSCH per FTEF) than Reedley campus, and the high numbers in the ELC probably contribute to that. However, Madera also has a slightly higher FTES per FTEF than Reedley campus, meaning that more sections are taught by adjuncts who don't usually have office hours. This justifies a higher need for support services like tutoring. In the ELC chart, there appear s to be some missing data, since part-time faculty have worked some hours in the ELC over the years. In addition, the current coordinator's load was originally calculated to put all ELC work on overload during the Title V Co-op Grant, and it stayed that way until around Fall '10 or Fall'11. During the transition years and the re-alignment of Madera Center closer to Reedley College, the coordinator's load was reconfigured and ELC work was made part of her overall load. This explains the downward trend of the FTES per FTEF numbers for the ELC.

B. Identify and describe the processes and procedures that the program/services area uses to access and measure outcomes. List the best ways to measure the quality and success of your program. If a student or staff questionnaire has been developed, validated by institutional researcher, and administered, please report results. Use the following as suggestions:

* Satisfaction (students, staff, and community)
* Success
* Participation
* Retention
* Demographics (age, gender, ethnicity)
* Additional data (assess program/services to the standards for the area)

Similar to the Reedley College Writing Center and Tutorial Center, the ELC uses satisfaction, success, participation and retention to assess and measure outcomes.

The ELC uses a similar End of the Semester Survey as the primary tool for assessment for small group tutoring. The survey was developed with the help of the Institutional Researcher. The survey checks for student satisfaction with the service and what topics tutors are helping students with the most. We use similar surveys for both the small group writing students (who may be enrolled in English 272 or they may use INTDS 301 if they are repeating students) and with INTDS 300 students, who are primarily small groups getting tutoring in math or other subjects. We also have a quick survey question that we ask all walk-in students to complete at the end of their session, whether they be INTDS 301 or 300 walk-ins. Both the student and the tutor rate how well the objectives of the session were met. This question is intended to help both set a clear objective for the session, but we have found through tutor training discussions that it does not always accomplish this task. The ratings seem to usually indicate how satisfied with the session each participant is. We should investigate whether a different type of assessment would yield more useful data.

The English 72/72A courses will examine the past SLO work of the Reedley College Writing Center this semester and next to see whether we wish to try to focus more on measuring collaboration or asking open ended questions as a "best practice" used by the tutor. Further, we would also like to encourage the tutors or learning assistants to become more involved in determining SLOs and analyzing the results, similar to what RC's Writing Center will be doing. We believe the tutors will take the record keeping and diagnostic and post survey work more seriously if they are helping with the end product. We will also examine the past SLO work of the Reedley College Tutorial Center and BTC programs because, like the Tutorial Center, the ELC believes that the acquisition of better learning skills is of particular significance because of the influence this usually has on student success beyond their experience with tutoring. The RC Tutorial Center has done some SLO work on measuring how well tutors are able to help students with developing new study strategies. Analysis of their results should prove beneficial to the ELC tutors as well.

The ELC is currently analyzing the data to see the specific percentage differences in student success based on receiving 10 hours, in between 10 - 20 hours, or over 20 hours of tutoring within small groups. The chart below is the data for one semester of analysis.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fall 13** | | | |
| **INTDS 300** |  |  |  |
| **Hours** | **GPA** | **Retention** | **Successful Completion** |
| less than 10.5 | 2.22 | 91.00% | 66.20% |
| in between 10.5 and 20.5 | 2.46 | 95.05% | 81.19% |
| greater than 20.5 | 2.88 | 95.87% | 85.95% |
| **INTDS 301** |  |  |  |
| less than 10.5 | 2.53 | 95.88% | 77.06% |
| in between 10.5 and 20.5 | 2.71 | 93.22% | 80.51% |
| greater than 20.5 | 2.65 | 96.34% | 79.27% |
| **ENGL 272** |  |  |  |
| less than 10.5 | 2 | 89.63% | 56.10% |
| in between 10.5 and 20.5 | 2.5 | 92.68% | 75.61% |
| greater than 20.5 | 2.56 | 97.35% | 83.63% |

**TABLE 34**

The above table is a one-semester comparison of student's tutorial hours, Fall 2013, in relation to their relative success rates. No matter which of the three types of tutorial classes the students were enrolled in, GPA, retention, and successful completion increased with higher hours of tutoring, with one exception: students enrolled in INTDS 301 and receiving over 20 hours of tutoring did not follow this pattern. However, we don't know if this is a trend or an anomaly without examining other semesters of data. One aim of the ELC to continue this comparison across several semesters as time permits to assist in evaluating the ELC progress.

Our main assessment tool for the three types of tutoring courses has been student surveys. While the ELC will continue to monitor the student surveys, we are finding, just as RC's Writing Center and Tutorial Center has found, that the students don’t know how to assess or are unwilling to be critical of the program. The most useful information has come from instructor and tutor comments that occur sporadically or informally. The ELC will be devising surveys to collect more instructor and tutor data. That way we will have more specifics on what the concerns are of the instructors (and tutors) and can use that information to improve the program.

C. If your program offers online services, use the collected data to evaluate your online services in comparison to your face-to-face services.

Not Applicable currently. However, Madera Center is working on updating its website to include information specific to our campus' services, and we have a goal to add some online services to try to reach out to Oakhurst students who have virtually no tutorial support offered. Limited online services of trying to respond to essays submitted by part-time working students within a 48-hour timeframe, similar to what RC's Writing Center offers, are also being considered. To add any online tutorial services, however, would require the purchase of additional portable laptops for tutor use, equipped with headsets with microphones.

D. Provide a short analysis of the process and procedures identified in B above.

The past process and procedures for all assessments was that the surveys were administered by tutors, compiled by the Assistant Coordinator or a trained student aide, and assessed by the ELC coordinator and Assistant Coordinator. However, in working on this program review, several tutors became involved in looking at the data from the institutional researcher's website and past program review drafts of other centers. The tutors now want to become more involved in establishing the assessments and surveys to be used in the future. New procedures are being slowly developed in the tutor training class. This practice is in keeping with the philosophy that the ELC is a student-centered environment.

E. Analyze how the program’s historical funding patterns have impacted the program.

All of the college's tutorial center budget numbers were examined and re-coded over the course of this cycle, including those for the ELC. At Madera, it has always been a struggle to learn clear budget numbers at the beginning of each fiscal year. Whether this was due to not having enough accounting staff on site is unknown. The hope is that with the transitional years behind us, there will be clearer communication about specific budget numbers in time for clear planning before semesters start.

The table below shows the resulting budget that the ELC used. These numbers came from the budget worksheets. Some other funds come from categorical sources, but these can vary each semester.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **2009-2010 Budget** | **2010-2011 Budget** | **2011-2012 Budget** | **2012-2013 Budget** | **2013-2014 Budget** | **2014-2015 Budget** |
| Student Workers (Tutors & Desk Aides) | $27,882 | $41,575 | $34,060 | $16,519 | $25,474 | $35,000 |
| Supplies (Instr. & Non-Instr.) | $1,718 | $1,252 | 0 | 0 | $1,500 | $2,500 |

**TABLE 35**

As one can see, there was a significant reduction to the ELC budget in the 2012-2013 year, the first year of the transition from being the North Centers to being more closely aligned with Reedley College. The ELC accommodated this by cutting hours after the semester had started, particularly no longer offering tutoring on Fridays and cutting down on number of paid tutors. A larger number of FWS positions and volunteers were used that year, resulting in extensive training being needed. Experienced tutors were lost and morale declined. Supplies were sought from the categorical programs that make high use of ELC services during the two budget years without a clear supply budget. Having a clear supply budget the last two years has helped immensely, and we thank the Budget Committee and the new budget worksheet process. As the budget became a little better the next year, Fridays were added back in and one or two more tutors were hired. Evening hours still rely on volunteer time on the part of coordinators, but the ELC has always felt a strong desire to provide some access to tutorial services for all students. It is one way in which we strive to provide equitable service to both full and part time students.

A couple of semesters basic skills funds were used to pay for some tutorial hours, but more recently, Madera's Basic Skills allocation has gone toward coordinator hours. These additional coordinator hours are sorely needed to cover times the main coordinator is teaching classes or in committee meetings as well as to cover the range of hours that volunteers and Couns. 2 tutors can work as well as the range of hours that students request tutoring. During some peak business hours, two coordinators can be needed to handle the volume of traffic, worker call-ins, and student and tutor questions. A part-time office assistant is sorely needed and would be more cost effective than adding numerous coordinator hours.

Despite being a smaller campus, the Madera ELC tutors close to the same number of tutees as the larger RC Tutorial Center does, with approximately one-third the number of paid tutors. One academic year of students tutored totals are summarized in the chart below as a representative sample.



**TABLE 36**

To serve this growing number of tutees, Reedley College's Tutorial Center has three main budget codes to fund its approx. 60 student workers. The ELC has had up to eight budget codes as well as the training, supervising, and tracking of different types of volunteer student workers. The following ELC chart is included so one can see the complexity of trying to use multiple categorical funding sources to fund the increasing demand for tutorial support. This chart also shows how many volunteers or students working for units are needed in order to serve the number of students and provide the number of tutorial hours the ELC has been providing. Although the volunteers bring subject-specific expertise and often earn units for their hours, we find that paid tutors are more likely to be more committed to their job. A goal is to seek budget increases until the ELC has a majority of paid tutors and not a majority of volunteer tutors or tutors working for units.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tutors and Desk Staff in the ELC from Fall 07 to Present** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **07SP** | **07FA** | **08SP** | **08FA** | **08FA end** | **09SP** | **09FA** | **10SP** | **10FA** | **11SP** | **11FA** | **12SP** | **12FA** | **13SP** | **13FA** | **14SP** | **14FA** |
| **Grant or XX0** | **6** | **10** | **12** | **12** | **16** | **17** | **8** | **8** | **9** | **8** | **7** | **7** | **7-9** | **6-7** | **6-7** | **7** | **11** |
| **Basic Skills** | **3** | **2** | **2** | **2** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **FWS; FWS/CW** | **3** | **8** | **2** | **4** | **2** |  | **8** | **5** | **2** | **5** | **3** | **5.5** | **6-7** | **8** | **6** | **6.5** | **6** |
|  | **3** |  | **2** | **2** |  | **3** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **FHO-TT/DSS** |  |  | **4** |  | **2** | **2** |  | **4** | **2** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **2-3** | **4** | **4** | **4** | **4** |
| **Metro** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **1** |  |  |  |
| **C6** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **1** |
| **SSS/STEM** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **1** | **1** | **4** | **3** | **3** | **1-2** |  |  |  |  |
| **Perkins** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total paid workers** | **12-13** | **18** | **18** | **18** | **20** | **22** | **16** | **18** | **14** | **18** | **14** | **16.5** | **19-22** | **20-21** | **17-18** | **18.5** | **22** |
| **Number of all Workers w/Vol. & Couns 2/Cotr 19G** | **25** | **29** | **30** | **39** | **39** | **37** | **28** | **48** | **41** | **33** | **49** | **49** | **36** | **45** | **48** | **46** | **40** |
| **Basic Skills funds were switched to fund some coordinator hours after Fall '08; some Perkins funds were used to supplement the budget in 2013-14 budget year but no specific workers were assigned to the Perkins budget number** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **highlight means workers on a split budget, so not additional student workers, but purchased additional tutor hours** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **a. note: Title 5 Co-op Grant ended Sept 09; more tutors paid via other funding sources and/or recruited more Couns 2/COTR19G tutors** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **b. first "transition" year; budget greatly reduced and number of vol. tutors more actively recruited, and at least one more grant/categorical funding added for limited time (Metro grant); 2 workers moved to FWS and 2 workers quit** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **c. second year after the transition and a decline in morale; led to lowest number of student workers;** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**TABLE 37**

**Budget Summary**

**(to be completed by Dean/Manager)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2008-2009** | **2009-2010** | **2010-2011** | **2011-2012** | **2012-2013** | **Total Division Budget**  For the 5th year  **2012-2013** | **Percent of Division 2012-2013** |
| **Salaries** | 252,267.00 | 270,138.63 | 278,975.50 | 224,208.60 | 224,208.60 | 224,208.60 |  |
| **Benefits** | 55,627.34 | 55,542.02 | 55,718.75 | 35,907.12 | 35,907.12 | 35,907.12 |  |
| **Instructional Supplies** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XX0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LT0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perkins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grant Funded | 35,285.27 | 30,635.76 | 30,635.76 | 41,921.03 | 41,921.03 | 41,921.03 |  |
| **Non-Instructional Supplies** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XX0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LT0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perkins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grant Funded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Operating Expenses** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XX0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LT0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perkins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grant Funded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Equipment** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| XX0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LT0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perkins |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grant Funded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 307,894.35 | 325,680.65 | 334,694.25 | 260,115.72 | 260,115.72 | 260,115.72 |  |

# **III. Student Learning Outcomes**

A. An accreditation standard requires that the institution makes public expected learning outcomes. In what ways are the courses/program/degree/certificate outcomes made public?

☐Catalog ☐Brochure ☐Website

☐Articulation/Transfer Agreements ☓Other:

B. Include the hyperlink(s) for the course and program/degree/certificate to GELO mapping grid as it is stored in your Blackboard SLO Assessment folder here.

<http://scccd.blackboard.com/webapps/blackboard/content/listContent.jsp?course_id=_23199_1&content_id=_1029230_>

C. Give a brief overview of the course assessments completed during the last five years, highlighting any results and action plans that have been particularly helpful in improving student learning and your program. Provide all Course SLO Assessment Report Forms for your program in appendix A.

Counseling 1 – Not offered at Madera, but a goal so the other subject tutors besides writing tutors have an actual training course, not just 3 - 5 training sessions.

English 72/72A – The assessments have shown students demonstrating a high-level of proficiency. This was expected. This is a tutor training class, so the typical enrollee is highly-motivated, capable, and determined to excel. Few students enroll in this class, so drawing any significant conclusions from the data is difficult. Currently, we are interested in the SLO assessment done by the Tutorial Center at Reedley College, which tries to determine how well tutors integrate the tutoring of study skills into their sessions. We believe our tutors could also improve in instructing their students in this area. One of our assessment tools was an evaluation of each tutor during a session to be completed by the coordinators; this method proved cumbersome and subjective, so we will be exploring alternatives to this method.

Counseling 2 – The assessments have been informally collected, and they have shown students demonstrating a high-level of proficiency. This was also expected. This is a practicum for tutors, so the typical enrollee is highly-motivated, capable, and determined to excel. Few students enroll in this class. Given the small pool of enrollees, one cannot draw any statistically significant conclusions from the data.

Interdisciplinary Studies 300 – This is a non-credit class for students receiving tutoring, used in the ELC for tutoring received for math and other subjects besides writing. We use a quick survey assessment question that we ask all walk-in students to complete at the end of their session, whether they be INTDS 301 or 300 walk-ins. Both the student and the tutor rate how well the objectives of the session were met. This question is intended to help both set a clear objective for the session, but we have found through tutor training discussions that it does not always accomplish this task, nor are all tutors even approaching the question the same way. As a result, the ratings seem to usually indicate how satisfied with the session each participant is. Also, tutors feel the assessment is skewed by having to answer the question in front of the tutor, even if tutors assure the student that he or she can be completely honest. We have not separated it from the specific tutorial session because we were hoping to pinpoint when several students were having trouble meeting their objective with the same tutor. Since the current assessment question isn't working the way we had hoped, we should investigate whether a different type of assessment would yield more useful data. We also ask regularly attending INTDS 300 students to complete the End of the Semester survey. The results are overall positive, indicating students feel more confident about their skills and future success, but seem overly optimistic and uncritical. We are trying to address this in our tutor training sessions.

Interdisciplinary Studies 301 - This is a non-credit class used in the ELC for writing drop-ins or students who cannot take Engl. 272 again for working in small groups. The SLO assessment used generally--the quick survey per session--is described above under INTDS 300. However, a special assessment was done one semester for INTDS 301 students, which is discussed below.

Our Writing Center is also a full tutorial center, the ELC. Therefore, we have drop-in tutoring of all types, and we try to track writing/reading/study skills drop-ins under INTDS 301 and math/science/other subject drop-ins and regular group tutoring under INTDS 300. We assess all drop-ins with the same quick survey of a response to achieving the objective for the session. We want to keep this general but quick survey the same for all drop-in sessions, but we needed a separate tool to assess more specifically the INTDS 301 SLOs. Therefore, we developed a short mini-survey of three questions to give to a random sample of INTDS 301 drop-ins. First, we discuss the results of the quick survey done with all drop-in sessions, and then we discuss the mini-survey of three questions.

Our analysis of the data of the quick survey done per drop-in session concluded that the ELC/Writing Center INTDS 301 course is proving to be successful with 77% of students reporting that they felt the tutorial session had been “very helpful/successful” in achieving their objective for the session. Tutors also reported on how successful they felt the session was in meeting their objective (because the tutor could set a more realistic or different objective than the student or because the tutor, having some training, could be better equipped to evaluate how successful the session was). Their reports are also positive (77% reporting either “very helpful/successful or helpful/successful). In discussing this quick survey per session during training meetings, it became clear that tutors were interpreting the question differently and so were their tutees. One goal of asking the survey question is to remind tutors to set a learning objective for the session with their tutee; we will keep the quick survey question on our forms and try to improve training so there is a more uniform understanding of what the survey is asking. We also developed a mini-survey of three questions to give to a random sampling of INTDS 301 students and had them respond anonymously.

We did a mini-survey of three questions with a random sampling of students who received walk-in or semi-regular writing, reading, or study skills tutorial help, and as an assessment of several parts of the SLOs, this was a satisfactory assessment tool. This extra assessment was done of the INTDS 301 course one semester. For INTDS 301, essentially, the student learning objectives are

students will be able to

**Use alternative learning strategies to successfully complete course objectives,** such as

* use effective time management strategies,
* improve on application of various learning strategies to their subject by using constructive feedback from peer support, and OR later revise this to say something like improve their own editing skills by receiving constructive feedback?
* develop improved fluency of handling basic reading, writing, mathematics, and study stills through supervised practice and modeling.

For this extra SLO assessment, we measured success of how well writing consultants and tutors of other subjects are meeting the needs of students by doing a random sampling mini survey looking at three parts of the SLOs: (1) student felt tutoring improved his/her basic writing, reading or study skills; (2) during tutoring, the student felt he/she received constructive feedback on assignment(s); and (3) the student felt more successful in coursework after tutoring. We predicted that at least 70% of students surveyed will report they “somewhat agree” or “strongly agree” with achieving one or all of these SLOs.

After doing this mini-survey of three questions with a random sampling of students who received walk-in or semi-regular writing, reading, or study skills tutorial help, we determined that, as an assessment of several parts of the SLOs, this was a satisfactory assessment tool. The results indicate that we met or exceeded our predicted level of success on each SLO measured: 73% responded with a 4 or 5 that their writing, reading, study skills improved as a result of tutoring; 80% responded with a 4 or 5 that they received constructive feedback during their tutorial sessions; and 80% responded that they felt more successful in their coursework after tutoring. Charts detailing the results follow on the next page. We would like to expand the number of those taking this mini-survey in our next assessment cycle to see if that yields more substantial or varied data for analysis.

This cycle of assessments revealed the need to revise the SLOs for the INTDS 301 course to be clearer and more accurate in wording. This will be accomplished through the Curriculum process during a future semester. The ELC is still wrestling with finding a way to articulate some more specific objectives to measure, yet still provide a form useful to all types of tutoring performed in our center.

Our ELC does tutoring of both writing and math and other subjects within the same center, unlike the separate Writing, Math, and Tutorial Centers at the main college campus. We have a high number of volunteer tutors who change each semester and who have had to work with minimal training on processes. We need to begin offering Couns. 1 to improve the training of math and non-writing tutors. During peak hours, we have two different rooms we use for tutoring, and computer access for tracking data is very limited in one of those rooms. Therefore our forms for tracking sessions have to be broadly worded to be multi-purpose, user-friendly, and not necessarily only electronic. In addition, we deal with a high volume of students and visits, with approximately 200 students on each roster each semester for our two main kinds of drop-in tutoring, another 100 approximately in our half-unit group tutoring class. In one semester sampling, there were over 440 responses to the quick one question assessment for just writing drop-in sessions. As a result, the volume may not enable us to assess much more than what we are currently able to do with our quick one-question survey.

To summarize, we would like to find a way to develop more specific objectives or track more detailed data connected to the student learning outcomes for INTDS 301, but we continue to wrestle with this area.

**TABLE 38**

**TABLE 39**

**TABLE 40**

English 272 - This is the half-unit (or full unit) course used for small group writing/reading tutoring. It currently is also assessed with the End of the Semester survey.

Overall, the subjective survey results were positive, but may not be the best assessment tool for a full picture, so the ELC will explore using a different assessment tool in addition to the surveys.

D. Give an overview of the program/degree/certificate assessments completed during the last five years, highlighting any results and action plans that have been particularly helpful in improving student learning and your program. Provide all Instructional Program/Degree/Certificate SLO Assessment Report Forms for your program in appendix B.

The various assessments the ELC currently uses are primarily subjective surveys that ask broad questions focused more on student satisfaction. Wording has changed over the semesters to try to help students and tutors understand more clearly what learning objectives we are trying to measure. We should explore alternative assessment tools that might yield more accurate data. In addition, because we tried to measure an objective for each walk-in visit from both the tutor and tutee perspective, we have a large volume of data to analyze. We still feel it is important for clear learning objectives to be set per session, and the asking of the question is hoped to help accomplish this. As a result, the volume may not enable us to assess much more than what we are currently able to do with our surveys.

We would like to find a way to develop more specific objectives or track more detailed data connected to the student learning outcomes for all three of our tutorial courses, but we continue to wrestle with this area.

The relatively new assessment survey for our Engl 72 and 72A courses revealed that it is difficult for the returning tutors who also attend the training to not include what they have learned several semesters after the course is completed. It is also difficult to separate out Couns 2 tutor trainee results from the global tutor evaluation and assessment methods we use. Because it is important to have the experienced tutors sharing what they've learned with the newer trainees, we gave the assessment to all attending the training, not just currently enrolled students. We will have to address this in the future, even though it will make the resulting data pool even smaller. In addition, this survey showed that one of the SLOs in English 72 should be reworded to be clearer. This will be accomplished through the curriculum process.

E. Based on your assessments, have you identified additional resources needed to support the improvement of student learning or remedy any gaps you have found within your program (ie. staff development/training, equipment, technology, guest speaker, etc.)? Be sure to include these in your goals with appropriate page number references.

A common thread through the assessments is the critical role that tutor training plays in the ultimate success of the center’s services. The core training required of all new tutors is believed to be achieving its purpose, but this initial training needs to be supported by ongoing in-service training for all tutor staff. This has been a focus of recent developments in the training plan. Work will need to continue in this direction. The challenge is largely one of time. The task of training is the responsibility of the tutorial instructor. With the rise in the number of students served and of hours of tutoring provided, finding more time to devote to training activities is difficult. Being able to offer a section of Couns. 1 could help address more training needs, but may not be the complete solution to the problem. A common request of the tutors is to have more guest speakers of instructors and other service providers to help train them in more specifics. For example, current plans are to request that a DSPS counselor come once again to train tutors on how they could better serve DSPS students. In addition, we have several new English adjunct faculty this semester, and tutors in the Engl. 72/72A courses are requesting that those new adjuncts be approached to speak to the tutors.

# **IV. Qualitative Analysis**

Please note that these data should be integrated with the qualitative analysis, and SLO assessment to help support your Summary Statements and Goals

A. Describe future trends unique to your area that are likely to influence your program. How will students be affected by these trends?

* Political (local ordinances, state or federal legislation, Title 5, Ed Code)
* Economic (Labor Market Data, District Fact Book, Advisory Committees)
* Sociological (migrant population, single parents, aging population trends)
* Technological (access, security, ethics)
* Educational (High School Graduation Rates, competition from other public and private postsecondary institutions, online education)

Political: Student Success Task Force and its resulting changes and focus on student equity, the loss of repeatability to improve skills in process-based courses, the changing restrictions to financial aid, and the current AB86 and adult education vs. community colleges debate--these are all trends affecting offerings at the community colleges and influence the need for support services such as tutoring. Related to these political changes is the information on student engagement and how it affects student success.

Economic: It should be noted that Madera, with its depressed economic status, means that more students need access to technology on campus; they don't have either the computers at home or the Internet access needed at home. Further, they often don't have the reliable transportation to attend our sister campuses for needed courses. Sometimes this means they try online versions of courses when they don't have the skills or desire to take courses in that format.

Technology: The development of more and more distance education courses has drawn attention to the need these students have for academic support services when they are at a distance from the campus. There is evidence that students enrolled in these courses experience the same problems with course work as do students enrolled in courses taught in a traditional format. As the Noel-Levitz report specifically recommended, the college and centers have invested in a trial of an online tutoring service. SmartThinking was purchased and a trial started just this past summer; however, it is too soon to draw any conclusions about its effectiveness. The ELC has considered trying to offer online tutoring of writing through students submitting drafts and getting feedback on them within a 24- or 48-hour period. This would be similar to the service the RC Writing Center provides. However, our tutors are currently maximized through small group tutoring, so adding online writing tutoring would need to wait until the budget situation improves.

Through the Tutoring and Learning Centers group meetings, the ELC is investigating adding to the website services connected to tutoring, similar to the FCCWise site. Having a way for students to access more of the college's and Madera Center's tutorial resources online would be another tool to aid the distance education (online) student.

Another development is the continuing interest by instructional departments in assuming more responsibility for addressing their students’ out-of-class learning assistance needs within the department itself. In August 2014, Madera Center was awaiting word on a new Title V Co-op Grant designed to lead to funding to create a Math Center. Although we did not get awarded this grant, the specific characteristics of any future math center are yet to be fully determined, and we are currently seeking alternative funding to expand services to math students. The math tutors that would work within a future Math Center would have the benefits of a discipline-specific supervisor and training, so a Math Center should improve the effectiveness of the math tutoring provided. The mathematics faculty have indicated that they do not anticipate developing a complete, full-service, math tutoring program. Rather, they hope for a center that will serve as an additional resource for math students, and one that will work cooperatively with the existing services provided by the ELC so that the information for all tutorial services will continue to be centralized. Since Madera Center is still relatively small in comparison to Reedley Campus, it is not as cost-effective or efficient to have multiple locations for students to discover where and when the tutors will be located. While we support the benefits of a discipline-specific supervisor and training, we believe that the information about various tutors and their schedules should be centralized so that students can check one location to find out who is tutoring where. We have already seen benefits to centralized services with the TRiO program's separate tutors and with the beginning of the BTC program here, which is operating as an extension of the ELC. In addition, since all tutoring is currently taking place in the ELC, there are already tutors who have multiple specialties who could be shared more easily if a Math Center is developed as an extension of the ELC. Finally, because the ELC has the tracking contract with CalWORKs for its students, if a future Math Center was located nearby, the tracking process could still be centralized.

Through the meetings of the TWM coordinators, we have seen how separate centers can sometimes build, grow, and try new services that the other centers on the same campus aren't aware of. It takes time and effort to keep separated centers collectively informed. There are many benefits of specialized tutoring centers, but while Madera is still a small campus with a strong sense of community, we'd like to see as much centralization and cohesiveness of tutorial services as possible.

B. Describe and include rationale for any curriculum changes anticipated in the next 5 years. (If not applicable leave blank)

* Major course revisions
* Course deletions
* New courses
* Revised or new options within a program
* Proposed new programs
* Distance education/hybrid courses
* Enrollment trends
* Articulation changes
* Provide justification for programs consisting of 30 units or more in the major. (Reference quantitative data relative to degrees and certificates awarded)

We need to revise and update the INTDS 301 Course Outline since its student learning outcomes are worded incorrectly. However, we must find a way to code the class so as to keep it in the course bank or find a different method to track the different kinds of tutoring that occurs in the ELC should the course be discontinued. The difficulty seems to be in having the same TOPS code for more than one non-credit tutoring course, yet we have had the course for multiple semesters with no word from the state about changing the course. There seem to be other TOPS codes in the same area that we might be able to use. We will explore this with the Curriculum Committee at the local and state level.

We also discovered a need to clarify the wording of one SLO in the English 72 course outline. The majority of the other course outlines used by the ELC were recently revised or updated by Rebecca Snyder, with input from the other writing coordinators.

It is difficult to say when the COUNS 2, COUNS 1, or COTR19G outlines will be updated since they are housed within other disciplines but used by both the RC Tutorial Center and the ELC. We will work with the Curriculum Committee and the Counseling department to determine when these outlines might be updated.

C. Discuss how your program meets the needs of the College’s diverse student, including:

C1. High-quality instruction of varying delivery modes and teaching methodologies.

Within the training courses and mandatory meetings, we provide all tutors with training on professional tutor ethics, learning styles, improving collaborative learning in the groups, and strategies for tutoring one-on-one vs. group tutoring. Only writing tutors attend the English 72/72A course where most of the training takes place. Most of the tutors for other subjects receive training at only the three mandatory meetings, which provides essential but minimal survival training. However, it is almost impossible to find a time when all tutors can attend the three mandatory meetings. The training of a large number of our tutors could be improved with systematic training in a course format. Therefore, one goal to improve training for all tutors and make it more equitable is to offer COUNS 1. Systematic training of the other discipline tutors needs to take place as we pursue the International Tutor Training Program Certification, which is also a goal of the other centers at Reedley campus. We hope to supplement training in these both Engl 72 and COUNS 1 with materials like Tutorlingo or developing independent study units.

Along with the many other training programs the Learning Center uses to train its tutors for high quality instruction and to meet the needs of diverse students, it also utilizes outside sources and workshops. These allow the trainees another aspect/viewpoint to the education. For example, in the past guest speakers like Dr. Claude May (retired school psychologist) were brought on to campus to discuss the different types of learning disabilities and give some insight with how to work with this population of students. The ESL, Reading, Math, and other discipline-specific instructors have spoken to trainees and shared expertise, not only about their courses but also about serving diverse student needs. Other workshops like the "dis-ABILITY Awareness Workshop" increased the awareness of the tutors and staff to the different types of disabilities that might be encountered and introduced them to some resources to help. This style of training is a crucial part of the training practicum for the tutors of the center. However, because of time and budgetary restraints, events are harder to plan and/or schedule.

As described earlier, online tutoring is now available to students on a limited basis through *Smarthinking*, and work is underway to determine how best to continue and to expand this effort.

Computer technology is also impacting conventional tutoring. Tutor training, which has been described earlier, also makes use of digital lessons—audio recordings and DVD programs. Tutors are increasingly making use of computers during the course of their tutoring sessions. This development seems to be driven by the steady increase in the number of instructors making use of *Blackboard* and other web-based resources (such as *MyMathLab*), and the increased use of computers by students in managing their coursework. Students have wireless access in the ELC, which has led to an increased use of laptops and notepads by both students and tutors. The ELC is not set up for students to charge their laptops easily. This is a safety issue that should be addressed.

Back in 2007 - 2008, the Extended Learning Center started the Learning Across the Disciplines (LAD) program of embedded tutors and supplemental instruction services. This program is similar to the Beyond the Classroom (BTC) program at Reedley College that is funded by the college’s Title V grant program. However, since Madera Center’s embedded tutor program started under its last Title V Cooperative grant, funding has been cut, and the ELC is able to offer very little in terms of embedded tutors currently. We still have an embedded tutor in the Maintenance Mechanic program, paid through the C6 grant. We occasionally have an embedded tutor in an English course or two, and we continue to have requests for embedded tutors in several English, ESL, and Math courses, but rarely can we meet the need. Because of the success data in many reports, a goal of the ELC is to expand embedded tutors in the English and ESL classes along with bringing the BTC supplemental instruction program to Madera as soon as the budget allows. With the recent transfer of an instructor used to the benefits of the BTC program, momentum picked up to try to grow that program here with large group, lecture based courses at Madera. We have started a small trial of the BTC program with funding supplied by Reedley for the current year; the trial start is being done with the Political Science classes currently. Even with the trial program starting halfway through the Fall '14 semester, students participating in BTC sessions have already shown some improvement in their scores for the class. The ELC hopes to expand the trial to at least one other course in the next semester and other courses in the future.

C2. Appropriate breadth, rigor, sequencing, and completion time.

Not applicable

D. For students completing vocational and occupational certificates and degrees, describe how students will meet employment and other applicable standards and are prepared for external licensure and certifications.

Although this area is for vocational and occupational programs primarily, the ELC does have tutoring in writing resumes and job application letters. Tutors also aid students in completing online applications. Finally, tutors are available for students in the vocational and occupational areas, for example OT and IS tutors, biology and chemistry tutors for pre-nursing students, child development tutors, criminology tutors, and an embedded tutor in the Maintenance Mechanic/Welding program.

E. Describe what your program has done to create links with support services or other instructional programs, if any.

Collaboration with Other Departments

The Extended Learning Center has attempted to develop strong working relationships with instructional and student service departments. For example, the ELC works with EOPS to track specified probationary students who have been told to put in extra study hours on campus. In addition, the tutorial instructor serves as a member of the Student Success Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and other committees.

A major program connection occurs between the ELC and the CalWORKs program. The Extended Learning Center serves as the resource center for meeting a contracted tracking requirement for all CalWORKs student hours of participation on campus. Tracking is needed daily, with monthly reports required, year-round. The ELC uses the TutorTrac system to track the CalWORKs student hours of attendance, tutorial hours, study time, participation in campus events, and campus employment hours, indicating if the employment is voluntary, FWS, or paid via another budget. Enrolling CalWORKs students into the TutorTrac system is a coordinated effort between the CalWORKs Counselor and the Extended Learning Center. In addition, midterm progress reports that the CalWORKs Counselor does often conclude with tutorial referrals. For all this tracking work, the ELC has a contract with Madera County Department of Social Services. They provide some funding to pay for 3 – 4 student aide desk workers or extra tutors for CalWORKs students, some supplies, and sometimes some coordinator hours. The library and the campus CalWORKs office also help with tracking students’ campus hours through TutorTrac, but the primary resource for tracking is the ELC, so it is the location for any corrections to a tracking report. Although the contracted tracking agreement runs through the full year, there is a continual challenge in providing the services through the summer because the ELC Coordinator is not contracted to work year-round. This challenge has been met each summer by maximizing budgets as well as with some volunteer hours by the Coordinators and some student workers. A better solution to this challenge would be to specify the need for paid coverage in the summers in the future contracts with the Madera County Department of Social Services.

It is important to note that, although the ELC has grown to where it tracks approximately the same number of tutees as the larger Reedley College Tutorial Center does each semester, we have, since Spring 2007, had this second major tracking task that, for several semesters, eclipsed the tracking of tutorial data. As the chart below summarizes, the number of hours tracked for the CalWORKs students has been up to twice the number of non-CalWORKs tracked hours, leveled off to be relatively similar, and has recently (since Spring 2013) become a little less. The recent trend is due in part to fairly steady growth of overall usage combined with a decline in the numbers of students served in the CalWORKs program because of the economic decline coupled with tighter restrictions for financial aid and categorical programs.

We must also note that the TutorTrac software needs updating. We are using an old version that no longer has support, and it is starting to go down more frequently and experience glitches more frequently, thus causing it to need to be reset by the computer technician. We have explored other tracking software such as eSARS, but several of them either weren't designed for tracking repeated group appointments or would take extra, expensive programming to track all the variables and configure the reports we need that are already set up in TutorTrac. In order to continue to provide the services we are contracted to, as well as to track all the tutorial data we need for our reports and grant writing (see chart below), a goal is to locate the one-time funding of approximately $3,600 to purchase the upgraded software and training to use the upgrade.

**TABLE 41**

Collaboration with Other Departments - Continued

The DSPS counselors and learning disabilities specialist routinely make themselves available for consultation about the providing of services to DSPS students. The learning disabilities specialist created a 14-page booklet to acquaint tutors with the referral process, the nature of learning disabilities, and practical tutoring strategies that can be applied in their sessions. Upon recommendation by DSPS staff, students in their program are eligible for additional hours of tutoring service or to request one-on-one tutoring.

The TRiO grant program has provided funding for tutoring hours and sometimes designated specific TRiO tutors to serve their students, but to maintain cohesion and cost-effectiveness of coordinator coverage, these tutors work in the ELC so students can still check in one location for all tutorial services. The CalWORKs program has also provided substantial funding for desk worker coverage as well as tutoring hours and some supplies. The ELC also works closely with Art dept. faculty in the development of *The NC (and now MC) Review,* a magazine of student art and prose. The tutors judge the prose entries and help with proofreading the final copy for print or for online publication.

Students participating in tutoring will sometimes reveal needs that might be better addressed by another service on campus. Students are routinely referred to counseling, DSPS, health services, psychological services, and other departments as appropriate.

In 2012 the instructor-coordinator and assistant coordinator were invited to join Reedley’s Tutorial and Learning Centers Committee (formerly the Tutorial, Writing, and Math Centers Group). This group meets each semester to share information, work on joint activities (e.g., service promotion), and otherwise look for opportunities to collaborate. The committee has representatives from the tutorial center, writing center, math study center, communications lab, and Madera’s ELC program. Administrators for the various areas are frequently in attendance for meetings.

The instructor-coordinator worked with reading faculty to develop the Learning Across the Disciplines program, which was a supplemental instruction program that worked closely with some discipline faculty, such as Psychology and Child Development. This program has shifted to become more of an embedded tutor model of supplemental instruction, and currently works closely with the Maintenance Mechanic program. The LAD program started back in 2007-2008, when the ELC was still funded under a Title V Co-op Grant.

The tutorial instructor regularly consults with individual classroom instructors and departments on matters relating to the providing of tutoring services to their students. We also work closely with the counselor instructor of Counseling 2 in order to locate specific subject tutors willing to tutor for a unit or two.

For many years the ELC has assisted the teaching faculty by serving as an unofficial test administration center. The center has been called upon by faculty to administer make-up exams at times when the instructor is unavailable to administer these tests themselves, to aid with DSPS exam proctoring, since our center is next door to their lab, and to administer on-campus exams for some online classes.

At the Madera Center, our Extended Learning Center and library are the two primary support systems for all courses, but especially the "bread and butter" courses of English and Math. Our ELC has a library of its own of English readers, textbooks, handbooks, and novels. Most required texts for English and several other courses are on reserve in the ELC, so students and tutors have access to the material. The computers in the ELC also are equipped with research and editing assistance. The ELC also works closely with the TRIO program (STEM & SSS) and the CalWORKS program. In addition, because the ELC incorporates the Writing Center, Tutorial Center and Math Center into one yet is coordinated by an English faculty instructor, there are continually growing links between English and Math faculty, English and Biology faculty, English and Chemistry faculty, etc. Any discipline for which subject tutors are requested gets contacted to determine the best way to support student success in learning. DSPS, TRiO, and Library Services have all spoken to the tutors in the past to educate them about their services so they are better informed when they work with students. The library has even provided training to the tutors on how best to utilize the databases, so tutors can help in disseminating that information on to other students. DSPS and other Counselors regularly bring students in to the ELC to help them set up tutorial appointments, since the offices for those services are within the same main building. Faculty from several disciplines have come and spoken at the tutor training sessions to help guide tutors on the ways they can best aid their students and many have provided example model papers for the ELC tutors to use. Other links to various programs have been discussed earlier in this report.

F. Describe any community or other institution partnerships or collaboration of which your program has had a part.

Because we know student engagement is a factor in student success, the ELC is involved in the institutional campus club events and campus extra-curricular activities such as the Readings in the Library. Often tutors are among the student readers at these events or they take their group to listen for part of their tutorial session and then discuss what they've heard read. The Madera Center continues to cultivate the MCCAP Program, a program that brings high school students from Liberty High School and Madera High School to take English 125 and English 1A, among other courses. The program immerses the students in the college experience in hopes of preparing them for success beyond high school. Students in the MCCAP program are introduced to the services in the ELC during the first week tours that the ELC hosts and can receive tutorial support for their classes. Faculty members at Madera are often requested to make presentations to tutors in the ELC on various topics, like how to help students analyze prompts. English faculty have even had norming sessions with tutors in the ELC and discuss rubrics for continuity. In Spring 2012, the ELC English coordinator, along with a Math instructor, worked with the Madera County Office of Education and the Madera County Workforce Investment Board to consider creating curriculum to help train laid-off After School employees (100-150) to take the CODSEP test, Cooperative Organization for the Development of Employee Selection Procedures. Although we met numerous times and started developing materials for tutorial and/or preparatory classes, they did not end up needing to contract with us. Nevertheless, it was an example of collaboration with a community partner. A more recent collaboration with a community partner is the ELC is working with the Madera Dept. of Social Services to help offer GED tutoring to a few CalWORKs students because the adult schools are cutting back on this area.

# **V. Summary Statement**

A. Describe the major conclusions reached based on this report’s quantitative and qualitative analyses and evaluation of the assessment of student learning outcomes.

The various services of the Extended Learning Center are well utilized, and judging from all the positive assessment results and data analysis, the tutorial support is high quality. We identified many goals to start working on, which fall into several broad categories: centralization/outreach, personnel, facilities/technology/supplies, professional development, and assessment/analysis. Online services are limited and need improvement, especially since that is one of the few ways we can reach out to Oakhurst students and offer some tutorial support to them. We are constantly assessing our services, but it is a continuing struggle to find enough time to analyze the data and write up the required reports. More work could be done to refine assessment tools and make improvements to the program. Some of our technology was upgraded but some was not; we need to work on all our equipment being included in a regular maintenance cycle. If a math center or lab is developed, we need to work on it being an extension of the ELC so that all tutorial services are centralized for maximum efficiency and cost-effectiveness. There is a demand for more tutors, especially for basic skills, and to continue the evening hours of access; this demand, coupled with increasing minimum wage rates as well as pay increases for experienced tutors continues to fuel the need for an ever-increasing budget. In addition, we need to increase funding to achieve a more equitable ratio of paid tutors to volunteer tutors.

As noted in the Composition Department's last Program Review, one suggestion to aid student success in their writing courses is always to find more funding for the writing center, which at Madera, is part of the Extended Learning Center or ELC, so more tutors could be hired. Increased funding would also ideally lead to resuming and building embedded tutors for the classroom, which we believe would be particularly effective in adding in that all important but many times elusive task of creating greater academic support for our students. Before the loss of funding for the ELC, we began an embedded tutor classroom program and witnessed some promising success, especially in the basic skills courses, where we can have the most difficulty convincing students to make use of the support services available. We were also able to offer tutorial support services for more students in English courses before funding cuts. Because of cuts and the loss of repeatability of Engl. 272, we have seen the numbers drop in enrollment for Engl.272. The hours have increased some in INTDS 301, but the numbers of students served has not substantially increased. Also because of the cuts, tutoring for the higher level English courses often suffers first, especially since the reduced or uncertain budget has caused the ELC to suspend pay increases for several semesters. This translates into an increasing inability to retain the higher level, well trained English tutors. A restoration and increase of the funding would enable more students to receive more tutorial support as they strive for academic success.

It was also noted in the Composition Department's last Program Review that there were some gaps in success in English 2 and 3. To address these gaps, and to increase student success at all writing levels, we should work to find funding to attract and retain higher level tutors in the ELC. Other Program Reviews that have included the need for tutorial support include Math, ESL, Chemistry, and Philosophy.

With the budget reductions, the embedded tutor program was virtually cut along with reducing tutoring hours in the ELC. Despite cuts, requests for tutoring are expanding, and, at present, out-pacing enrollment increases as well as out-pacing the demand for experienced tutors with breadth and with the ability to respond well to the increasingly diverse needs of students. This raises the issue of the need for additional funds if the ELC is to meet the growing demand for services without restricting the availability of tutoring or comprising the quality of assistance. Further, all pay increases for tutors in the ELC were suspended indefinitely, whereas at the main campus, tutors with more experience and breadth to tutor higher levels usually received pay raises commensurate with their additional training and semesters of experience. This practice is able to take place in both the main tutorial center and their writing center, but because the Madera ELC has not been able to offer raises for several semesters, it has continually lost experienced tutors to other jobs that are able to pay a little better. This greatly affects our ability to offer higher level English tutorial support as well as higher level tutorial support for Math and other subjects. **Note:** As of the Spring 2014 semester, due to strong administrative support, a pay raise was approved for the experienced tutors at the ELC, which is a step in the right direction. A goal is to continue offering pay raises in a manner similar to what the other centers do.

We do not anticipate any immediate need for additional full-time certificated staff. However, there is a need for at least part time classified staffing to aid in all the detailed office work. There will be a continuing need for adjunct faculty to provide Assistant Coordinator hours, especially for evening and summer session supervision.

If decisions are made to expand services, consideration will need to be given to whether additional staff will be required to ensure effective implementation of those services. For example, offering locally-based online tutoring would require considerable time to develop and coordinate. Similarly, in order to offer more embedded tutoring or supplemental instruction (BTC) tutoring, additional staffing may be needed for effective management. Depending on how these ideas develop, such additional staffing might be needed at the adjunct or classified level.

Schedule C money has been provided for many years to compensate the tutorial services instructor for a few days of service before each semester and at the end of the school year. This time has been used for such necessary duties as tutor recruitment, which must occur early if services are to be available promptly upon the start of classes. (Some Schedule C funds have also been available for overload hours during the regular school year and to provide supervision during summer session.) This funding has worked well for the ELC's cohesive management, and it is recommended that it continues.

B. Based on the conclusions above, complete the table below. List goals in priority order, including learning outcomes-related goals. Add/delete rows as needed.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal(s)\***  (please provide the page number(s) where this goal is substantiated) | **Activities/Facilities/Curriculum/**  **Equipment Necessary to Accomplish Goals** | **Resources Needed, Include Estimate Costs** | **Proposed Timeline** |
| 1. Maintain centralization of tutorial services for cohesiveness, cost- effectiveness, and ease of access for students (11, 46, 50, 52, 53) | Support of Administration | NA | Ongoing |
| 2. Hire a part-time OA to help with office operations, reception, tracking, student employment paperwork, etc. (5, 37, 54) | Support of Administration | TBD | Spring 2015 or Fall 2015 |
| 3. Purchase TutorTrac upgrade (50,Table 41) | TutorTrac software, tech support, and training; work with accountant to locate funding possibilities | $3,600; check on annual tech support after 1st time cost | Spring 2015 |
| 4. Offer a section of COUNS 1 to help improve training of other discipline tutors (3, 8, 40, 42, 44, 47) | Support of Administration | Add lhe to Assist Coord. load; reduce wkly supervisor hours by 2 | Spring 2015 |
| 5. Expand Embedded Tutors in Basic Skills and ESL classes and Expand BTC program to at least one other class ( 48, 53) | Support of Administration | Varies depending on hours and services | Ongoing |
| 6. Increase budget incrementally to achieve ratio of more paid tutors than volunteer tutors (5, 38, 53) | Budget Worksheet process | TBD | Ongoing |
| 7. Maintain current supply budget for all necessary tutorial supplies and continue to seek incremental increases in ELC supply budget for toner and updated reference materials (13, 37) | Budget Worksheet process | $3,500 | Annual/Ongoing |
| 8. Continue pay raises to incentivize training and attract/recruit/retain transfer-level tutors and budget for minimum wage increases (8, 53) | Support of Administration | Varies depending on hours and services | Ongoing |
| 9. Expand evening and Saturday tutoring and begin online tutoring to serve Oakhurst and part time students (12, 28, 36, 45, 52,53) | Support of Administration | Varies depending on hours and services | Ongoing |
| 10. Continue Schedule C pay for coordinator hours outside of regular duty days for cohesive ELC management (54) | Support of Administration | NA | Ongoing |
| 11. Increase coordinator budget so volunteer hours could be reduced or eliminated (7, 28,54) | Support of Administration | TBD | Ongoing & depends on funding |
| 12. Specify Some Summer Coordinator Hours in next Madera DSS contract for CalWORKs tracking or institutionalize summer hours (49) | Work with Mario Gonzales re date of next contract revision | TBD | Summer 2015 |
| 13. Maintain current equipment (51,52) | a) Include equipment on a regular maintenance cycle | Work with Technology Committee | Ongoing |
| 14. Add at least 2 laptops for use in either AM 154 and 3 for AM 137; purchase industrial headsets & microphones for 20 computer stations with for online and ESL tutoring (11, 36) | Support of Administration Follow Requisition process | $4,000 for laptops; $2,500 for 20 industrial headsets with microphones | 2015 |
| 15. Improve AM 137 facilities or multi-purpose usage and add a work desk (10-11) | a) Purchase tables and chairs on wheels for second ELC room (AM 137) for easy re-configuration for multiple uses; purchase small work desk (9) | TBD | 2015 |
| 16. Improve training of tutors in relation to learning objectives and involve them in SLO analysis more (34) | a) Modify lesson plans for ENGL 72/72A and Couns 2 | Time | Ongoing |
| 17. Consider institutional Tutorlingo purchase for tutor training (8, 47) | Support of Administration & other coordinators | $1,000 for campus cost; $1,500 for institutional cost | TBD & Annual |
| 18. Apply for ITTPC/CRLA Certification in budget worksheet for professional tutor development (10, 47) | a) Purchase ITTPC/CRLA certification if application approved | $350 | Annual |
| 19. Purchase membership in CRLA and IWCA for coordinators’ professional development (14) | a) Request funding on budget worksheet process | IWCA: $140 for 2 memberships  CRLA: $140 for 2 memberships | Annual |
| 20. Add second phone to 2nd reception desk in ELC (10) | Support of Administration | TBD | Depends on funding |
| 21. Develop more charging stations for safety purposes (11, 48) | TBD | Variable, depends on how achieved | Depends on funding |
| 22. Provide Schedule C pay for faculty tutors (5, 6) | Incorporate in budget planning process | TBD | Depends on Budget |
| 23. Research process for employing tutors not restricted by 12-unit rule; Research possibility of changing limit to 9 or 6 units (6) | Research state regs, ed code, and district policies? | Time unknown | 2015 |
| 24. Conduct ELC outreach (8) | a) Advertise the ELC services in the catalog and schedule of courses (8) | NA | Ongoing |
|  | b) Create a PowerPoint for display in A & R area to advertise ELC services (8) | NA | Ongoing |
|  | c) Update MC website with ELC services (8) | NA | Ongoing |
| 25. Review past SLO work of RC Tutorial Center, BTC program, and MSC Center to improve our practices (34-35) |  | Time | Ongoing |
| 26. Create surveys to collect instructor and tutor feedback to improve program (35) |  | Time | Ongoing |
| 27. Re-examine Assessment Tool for INTDS 300/301 and continue training on learning objectives (41, 42, 44) |  | Time | 2017-2018 |
| 28. Obtain a larger sampling of anonymous mini-survey in next assessment cycle (42) | Administer survey over a longer period than 1st cycle | Time | Fall 2015 |
| 29. Re-examine assessment tool for Engl. 272 (44) |  | Time | 2015-2016 |
| 30. Develop a less cumbersome evaluation or assessment tool for coordinators to use to evaluate tutors (40) |  | Time | 2014-2015 |
| 31. Analyze grades specific to courses tutored over a few semesters to see what data reveals (31, 32) | Support of Institutional Researcher hours | Time | TBD |
| 32. Compare multiple semesters of data for correlation of tutoring hours & success rates to determine trends (35) | Support of Institutional Researcher hours | Time | TBD |
| 33. Revise SLOs on INTDS 301 Course Outline of Record and continue to research potential problem with TOPS code (42, 47) | Curriculum Process | Time | Spring 2015 |
| 34. Revise wording on one SLO on Engl. 72 Course Outline of Record (44, 47) | Curriculum Process | Time | Spring 2015 |

**TABLE 42**

\*As supported primarily by the report’s quantitative and qualitative analyses and evaluation of the assessment of student learning outcomes

**Note: Summary Statements are needed for each campus, if applicable.**

### Student Learning Outcome Assessment Timeline

Complete the following chart indicating which year course, program, degree, and certificate outcomes will be completed. Each course must be assessed at least once during this timeframe. The program may conduct as many assessments of a single course, program, degree, or certificate as is meaningful.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Courses, Program, Degree, and/or Certificate to be assessed | Person responsible for heading assessment and completing Reporting Form |
| Year 1  2014-2015 | ENGL 72, ENGL 72A | Sheryl Young-Manning |
| Year 2  2015-2016 | ENGL 272 | Sheryl Young-Manning |
| Year 3  2016-2017 | Couns 2, Couns 1 | Sheryl Young-Manning & Counselor |
| Year 4  2017-2018 | INTDS 300, INTDS 301 | Sheryl Young-Manning |
| Year 5  2018-2019 | Program Assessment | Sheryl Young-Manning |

### Curriculum Revision Timeline

This Curriculum Revision Timeline will be tracked by the Curriculum Chair. Add/delete rows as needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Course** | **Semester revision to be submitted** | **Person responsible for revision** |
| **INTDS 300** | **Spring 2014** | **Rebecca Snyder (completed)** |
| **Engl. 72** | **Spring 2014** | **Rebecca Snyder (completed)** |
| **Engl. 72A** | **Spring 2014** | **Rebecca Snyder (completed)** |
| **Engl. 272** | **Spring 2014** | **Rebecca Snyder (completed)** |
| **INTDS 301** | **Spring 2015** | **Sheryl Young-Manning** |
| **Engl. 72** | **Spring 2015** | **Sheryl Young-Manning** |
| **Coun 2, Couns 1, COTR19G** | **TBD** | **TBD** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Appendix A:

### Course SLO Assessment Report Form

Please complete one form for each course.

## **ENGL 72 / 72a SLO Assessment**

1. Date: 12/7/14
2. Contact Person: Sheryl Young-Manning
3. Department: English/Madera Extended Learning Center
4. Course Name and Number: ENGL 72 and 72A (course is linked and taught at same time)
5. Assessed Course SLO(s):

72

1. Guide writers through understanding and completing assignments by applying writing center theory and practices to specific writers' needs.

2. Reflect on their own writing processes and growth in their own skills and learning.

3. Implement collaborative techniques in their group sessions.

72A

1. Employ a range of tutoring strategies specific to ESL and international student writers as well as SLD student writers (students with a Specific Learning Disorder) and discipline-specific writers.

2. Help student writers understand the components of a successfully written composition in that particular discipline including various forms of documentation across the curriculum.

3. Show knowledge and appropriate techniques in responding to students’ written compositions in group, walk-in, and online sessions.

1. Describe your assessment timeline, including a rationale for your decision:

The timeline indicates the Extended Learning Center will assess its two writing training courses every semester. The purpose is to provide each group of tutors in the English 72 & 72A tutor training courses an opportunity to engage in and contribute to the assessment process.

1. Institutional Outcome Alignment:

Which institutional outcome(s) is central to your course?

Communication Skills

* Interpret various types of written, visual, and verbal information.
* Organize ideas and communicate precisely and clearly to express complex thoughts both orally and in writing.

Critical Thinking and Information Literacy

* Analyze quantitative information and apply scientific methodologies.
* Employ critical and creative modes of inquiry to solve problems, explore alternatives, and make decisions.
* Synthesize researched information obtained from accurate, credible, and relevant sources to support, advance, or rebut an opinion.

Global and Community Literacy

* Analyze the fine arts, humanities, and social sciences from cultural, historic, and aesthetic perspectives.
* Apply historical and contemporary issues and events to civic and social responsibility.
* Demonstrate sensitive and respectful treatment of a variety of ethnic, religious, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Personal Development

* Assess current knowledge, skills, and abilities to further develop them and apply them to new situations.
* Incorporate physical and emotional principles to make healthy lifestyle choices.
* Make ethical personal and professional choices.

1. Assessment Assignments and/ or Instruments:

Which were used to assess the SLO?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item analysis of exams, quizzes, problem  sets, etc. (items linked to specific  outcomes)  Assignments based on rubrics (essays/  reports, projects, performances,  presentations, etc.)  Assignments based on checklists  Direct observation of performances,  structured practice or drills, “practical”  exams, small group work, etc. | Student self-assessments (e.g. reflective  journals, surveys)  Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATS,  “clicker” mediated responses, etc.)  Capstone projects or final summative  assessment (final exams, capstone projects,  portfolios, etc.)  Other (please describe) |

1. Please attach any instruments used for assessment (rubrics, checklists, surveys, etc.).

Posted on Blackboard.

1. What is your expected level of achievement for measuring success?

ENGL 72: We expect that at least 50% of use a variety of teaching/tutoring strategies while helping student writers.

ENGL 72A: We expect that at least 50% recognize and respond to the diverse needs of ESL, DSPS, and discipline specific writers.

1. Assessment Results:

What did members of your program learn from the assessment of the outcome? Did the assessment work, and if not, what needs to be revised?

In 2012, we had the following results:

ENGL 72:

“Use a variety of teaching/tutoring strategies while helping student writers, including considering different learning styles of modalities.”

28% of the tutors responded - excellent or very skilled

29% of the tutors responded - good skills.

29% of the tutors’ responded - average skills

14% of the tutors’ responded - weak or poor skills

0% of the tutors responded - Don’t know or not able to do

While not all of the tutors responded that they used a variety of teaching or tutoring strategies, we did meet our goal of 50%. We are concerned about those who felt they had weak or poor skills, and plan to address in tutor training and through adding a comment section in survey form to understand more fully this issue.

ENGL 72A:

“Recognize and respond to the diverse needs of ESL, DSPS, and discipline-specific writers.”

37% of the tutors responded - excellent or very skilled

37% of the tutors responded - good skills.

13% of the tutors’ responded - average skills

0% of the tutors’ responded - weak or poor skills

13% of the tutors responded - Don’t know or not able to do.

We met the goal of 50%. The majority of tutors responded with average or above skills, while 13% responded less skilled in recognizing and responding to the diverse needs of the tutees. In response a course of action to continue to monitor these skills to see if this is a continual concern each semester while increasing methods to instruct tutors how to recognize and respond to diversity within the tutoring train class is planned.

1. Action Plan:

Based on the assessment results, what changes, if any, are planned to increase student success? When will they be implemented? Please check any appropriate boxes and *provide a brief description with a timeline for changes*.

Results are positive—no changes to be made

Conduct further assessment related to the issue and outcome

Use new or revised teaching methods (e.g., more use of group work, new lecture, etc.)

Develop new methods of evaluating student work

Plan purchase of new equipment or supplies needed for modified student activities

Make changes in staffing plans (e.g., modified job descriptions, requests for new

positions, etc.)

Engage in professional development about best practices for this type of class/activity

Revise the course sequence or prerequisites

Revise the course syllabus or outline (e.g., change in course topics)

Unable to determine what should be done

Other:

Provide a brief description with a timeline for changes:

We plan to monitor tutor surveys and change form to add a comment section.

**INTDS 300 SLO Assessment**

1. Date: 12/04/2014
2. Contact Person: Sheryl Young-Manning
3. Department: English/Madera Extended Learning Center
4. Course Name and Number: INTDS 300
5. Assessed Course SLO(s):

Apply learned skills to increase success in coursework.

1. Describe your assessment timeline, including a rationale for your decision:

The timeline requires the Extended Learning Center to assess its activities every semester. The purpose is to provide each cohort of tutors and trainees an opportunity to engage in and contribute to the assessment process.

1. Institutional Outcome Alignment:

Which institutional outcome(s) is central to your course?

Communication Skills

* Interpret various types of written, visual, and verbal information.
* Organize ideas and communicate precisely and clearly to express complex thoughts both orally and in writing.

Critical Thinking and Information Literacy

* Analyze quantitative information and apply scientific methodologies.
* Employ critical and creative modes of inquiry to solve problems, explore alternatives, and make decisions.
* Synthesize researched information obtained from accurate, credible, and relevant sources to support, advance, or rebut an opinion.

Global and Community Literacy

* Analyze the fine arts, humanities, and social sciences from cultural, historic, and aesthetic perspectives.
* Apply historical and contemporary issues and events to civic and social responsibility.
* Demonstrate sensitive and respectful treatment of a variety of ethnic, religious, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Personal Development

* Assess current knowledge, skills, and abilities to further develop them and apply them to new situations.
* Incorporate physical and emotional principles to make healthy lifestyle choices.
* Make ethical personal and professional choices.

1. Assessment Assignments and/ or Instruments:

Which were used to assess the SLO?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item analysis of exams, quizzes, problem  sets, etc. (items linked to specific  outcomes)  Assignments based on rubrics (essays/  reports, projects, performances,  presentations, etc.)  Assignments based on checklists  Direct observation of performances,  structured practice or drills, “practical”  exams, small group work, etc. | Student self-assessments (e.g. reflective  journals, surveys)  Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATS,  “clicker” mediated responses, etc.)  Capstone projects or final summative  assessment (final exams, capstone projects,  portfolios, etc.)  Other (please describe) |

1. Please attach any instruments used for assessment (rubrics, checklists, surveys, etc.).

Posted on Blackboard.

1. What is your expected level of achievement for measuring success?

At least 70% of students report that they achieved the goal(s) of their session.

1. Assessment Results:

What did members of your program learn from the assessment of the outcome? Did the assessment work, and if not, what needs to be revised?

The INTDS 300 course is proving to be successful with 100% of the students reporting that they improved to some degree in their course work that semester.

77% of the tutees reported – a big improvement

8% of the tutees reported – a more than average improvement

15% of the tutees reported – average (improvement)

0% of the tutees reported – less than average improvement

0% of the tutees reported – no improvement

The assessment appeared to work, but needs revision to collect data more clearly and define the terms more specifically for the students using the questionnaire.

1. Action Plan:

Based on the assessment results, what changes, if any, are planned to increase student success? When will they be implemented? Please check any appropriate boxes and *provide a brief description with a timeline for changes*.

Results are positive—no changes to be made

Conduct further assessment related to the issue and outcome

Use new or revised teaching methods (e.g., more use of group work, new lecture, etc.)

Develop new methods of evaluating student work

Plan purchase of new equipment or supplies needed for modified student activities

Make changes in staffing plans (e.g., modified job descriptions, requests for

new positions, etc.)

Engage in professional development about best practices for this type of class/activity

Revise the course sequence or prerequisites

Revise the course syllabus or outline (e.g., change in course topics)

Unable to determine what should be done

Other:

Provide a brief description with a timeline for changes:

In Fall 2012, the results of the INTDS 300 SLO survey questionnaire were positive. Students responding to the survey question felt that improvement in their course of study had taken place. We are continuing to use the end-of semester questionnaire and plan to modify it to explore this issue further.

## **ENGL 272 SLO Assessment**

1. Date: 12/04/14
2. Contact Person: Sheryl Young-Manning
3. Department: English/Extended Learning Center
4. Course Name and Number: English 272
5. Assessed Course SLO(s):

Generate, narrow, and select appropriate topics and organize effective supporting details for written compositions.   
Analyze compositions for development, focus, logic, and clarity and provide the same useful feedback to peers.   
Incorporate revision techniques, including self-editing for sentence mechanics such as punctuation and grammar.

1. Describe your assessment timeline, including a rationale for your decision:

The timeline requires the Extended Learning Center to assess its activities every academic year. The purpose is to provide each cohort of tutors and trainees an opportunity to engage in and contribute to the assessment process.

1. Institutional Outcome Alignment:

Which institutional outcome(s) is central to your course?

Communication Skills

* Interpret various types of written, visual, and verbal information.
* Organize ideas and communicate precisely and clearly to express complex thoughts both orally and in writing.

Critical Thinking and Information Literacy

* Analyze quantitative information and apply scientific methodologies.
* Employ critical and creative modes of inquiry to solve problems, explore alternatives, and make decisions.
* Synthesize researched information obtained from accurate, credible, and relevant sources to support, advance, or rebut an opinion.

Global and Community Literacy

* Analyze the fine arts, humanities, and social sciences from cultural, historic, and aesthetic perspectives.
* Apply historical and contemporary issues and events to civic and social responsibility.
* Demonstrate sensitive and respectful treatment of a variety of ethnic, religious, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Personal Development

* Assess current knowledge, skills, and abilities to further develop them and apply them to new situations.
* Incorporate physical and emotional principles to make healthy lifestyle choices.
* Make ethical personal and professional choices.

1. Assessment Assignments and/ or Instruments:

Which were used to assess the SLO?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item analysis of exams, quizzes, problem  sets, etc. (items linked to specific  outcomes)  Assignments based on rubrics (essays/  reports, projects, performances,  presentations, etc.)  Assignments based on checklists  Direct observation of performances,  structured practice or drills, “practical”  exams, small group work, etc. | Student self-assessments (e.g. reflective  journals, surveys)  Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATS,  “clicker” mediated responses, etc.)  Capstone projects or final summative  assessment (final exams, capstone projects,  portfolios, etc.)  Other (please describe) |

1. Please attach any instruments used for assessment (rubrics, checklists, surveys, etc.).

Posted on Blackboard.

1. What is your expected level of achievement for measuring success?

At least 90% of students report improvement in their writing (achieved)

1. Assessment Results:

What did members of your program learn from the assessment of the outcome? Did the assessment work, and if not, what needs to be revised?

Results Fall 13:

The Engl 272 course is proving to be successful with 83% of the students reporting that they had above average improvement in their course work and 95% reporting that had average or higher improvement. However, 5% of the tutees reported less than average improvement.

34% of the tutees reported – a big improvement

49% of the tutees reported – a more than average improvement

12% of the tutees reported – average (improvement)

5% of the tutees reported – less than average improvement

0% of the tutees reported – no improvement

The assessment appears to work, but improvement can be made concerning specifics on why tutees feel that they did not improve. Adjustments need to be made in assessing tutees to understand this issue.

1. Action Plan:

Based on the assessment results, what changes, if any, are planned to increase student success? When will they be implemented? Please check any appropriate boxes and *provide a brief description with a timeline for changes*.

Results are positive—no changes to be made

Conduct further assessment related to the issue and outcome

Use new or revised teaching methods (e.g., more use of group work, new lecture, etc.)

Develop new methods of evaluating student work

Plan purchase of new equipment or supplies needed for modified student activities

Make changes in staffing plans (e.g., modified job descriptions, requests for

new positions, etc.)

Engage in professional development about best practices for this type of class/activity

Revise the course sequence or prerequisites

Revise the course syllabus or outline (e.g., change in course topics)

Unable to determine what should be done

Other:

*Provide a brief description with a timeline for changes:*

The results were positive, but some adjustments must be made to the questionnaire.

**INTDS 301 SLO Assessment**

1) Date: 12/04/2014

2) Contact Person: Sheryl Young-Manning

3) Department: English/Madera Extended Learning Center

4) Course Name and Number: INTDS 301

5) Assessed Course SLO(s):

1) student felt tutoring improved his/her basic writing, reading, or study skills;

2) during tutoring, the student felt he/she received constructive feedback on assignment(s);

3) the student felt more successful in coursework after tutoring.

6) Describe your assessment timeline, including a rationale for your decision:

The timeline requires the Extended Learning Center to assess its activities every semester. The purpose is to provide each cohort of tutors and trainees an opportunity to engage in and contribute to the assessment process.

7) Institutional Outcome Alignment:

Which institutional outcome(s) is central to your course?

Communication Skills

* Interpret various types of written, visual, and verbal information.
* Organize ideas and communicate precisely and clearly to express complex thoughts both orally and in writing.

Critical Thinking and Information Literacy

* Analyze quantitative information and apply scientific methodologies.
* Employ critical and creative modes of inquiry to solve problems, explore alternatives, and make decisions.
* Synthesize researched information obtained from accurate, credible, and relevant sources to support, advance, or rebut an opinion.

Global and Community Literacy

* Analyze the fine arts, humanities, and social sciences from cultural, historic, and aesthetic perspectives.
* Apply historical and contemporary issues and events to civic and social responsibility.
* Demonstrate sensitive and respectful treatment of a variety of ethnic, religious, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Personal Development

* Assess current knowledge, skills, and abilities to further develop them and apply them to new situations.
* Incorporate physical and emotional principles to make healthy lifestyle choices.
* Make ethical personal and professional choices.

8) Assessment Assignments and/ or Instruments:

Which were used to assess the SLO?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item analysis of exams, quizzes, problem  sets, etc. (items linked to specific  outcomes)  Assignments based on rubrics (essays/  reports, projects, performances,  presentations, etc.)  Assignments based on checklists  Direct observation of performances,  structured practice or drills, “practical”  exams, small group work, etc. | Student self-assessments (e.g. reflective  journals, surveys)  Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATS,  “clicker” mediated responses, etc.)  Capstone projects or final summative  assessment (final exams, capstone projects,  portfolios, etc.)  Other (please describe) |

9) Please attach any instruments used for assessment (rubrics, checklists, surveys, etc.).

Posted on Blackboard.

10) What is your expected level of achievement for measuring success?

At least 70% of students will report that they "somewhat agree" or "strongly agree" with achieving one or all three of these SLOs.

11) Assessment Results:

What did members of your program learn from the assessment of the outcome? Did the assessment work, and if not, what needs to be revised?

The INTDS 301 course is proving to be successful; we met or exceeded our predicted level of success.

73% of the tutees reported that they "somewhat agree" or "strongly agree" that their writing, reading, and/or study skills improved as a result of tutoring strongly

80% of the tutees reported that they "somewhat agree" or "strongly agree" that they received constructive feedback during their tutorial session(s); and

80% of the tutees reported that they "somewhat agree" or "strongly agree" that they felt more successful in their coursework after tutoring.

The assessment appeared to work, but we would like to expand the number of those taking the survey in our next assessment cycle to see if that yields more substantial or varied data for analysis.

12) Action Plan:

Based on the assessment results, what changes, if any, are planned to increase student success? When will they be implemented? Please check any appropriate boxes and *provide a brief description with a timeline for changes*.

Results are positive—no changes to be made

Conduct further assessment related to the issue and outcome

Use new or revised teaching methods (e.g., more use of group work, new lecture, etc.)

Develop new methods of evaluating student work

Plan purchase of new equipment or supplies needed for modified student activities

Make changes in staffing plans (e.g., modified job descriptions, requests for

new positions, etc.)

Engage in professional development about best practices for this type of class/activity

Revise the course sequence or prerequisites

Revise the course syllabus or outline (e.g., change in course topics)

Unable to determine what should be done

Other:

Provide a brief description with a timeline for changes:

This assessment revealed the need to revise the SLOs for the INTDS 301 course to be clearer and more accurate in wording. This will be accomplished through the Curriculum process in the Spring 2015 semester. Also, we would like to expand the number of those taking this 3-question anonymous survey in our next assessment cycle to see if that yields more substantial or varied data for analysis.

Appendix B:

Instructional Program/Degree/Certificate SLO Assessment Report Form

Please complete one form for each assessed program/degree/certificate.

1) Date: 12/4/2014

2) Contact Person: Sheryl Young-Manning

2) Instructional Program: Extended Learning Center

3) Assessed Program/Degree/Certificate SLO(s):

We measure several items on a Tutor Self-Evaluation form that attempts to help them analyze how well they are doing in learning all the skills needed to be effective tutors. We focused on one question for this program SLO from the tutor perspective:

1. Tutors help students utilize the writing process or a problem-solving process to improve coursework skills.
2. Tutors use a variety of techniques and strategies to meet diverse student needs.

For the measurement of the success of a program SLO from the tutee side, we used the student satisfaction survey from the 3 tutorial classes coupled with the internal data on whether students are achieving greater success rates in their courses.

5) Describe your assessment timeline, including a rationale for your decision:

The timeline requires the Extended Learning Center to assess its activities every semester. The purpose is to provide each cohort of tutees, tutors, and trainees an opportunity to engage in and contribute to the assessment process. Tutoring is, after all, an instructional technique, and assessment is a necessary skill needed in instruction. Therefore, we have decided to add more training on it in our tutor training meetings and to have the tutors get more involved in assessment analysis.

6) Institutional Outcome Alignment:

Which institutional outcome(s) is central to your program?

Communication Skills

* Interpret various types of written, visual, and verbal information.
* Organize ideas and communicate precisely and clearly to express complex thoughts both orally and in writing.

Critical Thinking and Information Literacy

* Analyze quantitative information and apply scientific methodologies.
* Employ critical and creative modes of inquiry to solve problems, explore alternatives, and make decisions.
* Synthesize researched information obtained from accurate, credible, and relevant sources to support, advance, or rebut an opinion.

Global and Community Literacy

* Analyze the fine arts, humanities, and social sciences from cultural, historic, and aesthetic perspectives.
* Apply historical and contemporary issues and events to civic and social responsibility.
* Demonstrate sensitive and respectful treatment of a variety of ethnic, religious, and socioeconomic backgrounds.

Personal Development

* Assess current knowledge, skills, and abilities to further develop them and apply them to new situations.
* Incorporate physical and emotional principles to make healthy lifestyle choices.
* Make ethical personal and professional choices.

7) Assessment Assignments and/ or Instruments:

Which were used to assess the SLO(s)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item analysis of exams, quizzes, problem  sets, etc. (items linked to specific outcomes)  Assignments based on rubrics (essays/reports, projects, performances, presentations, etc.)  Assignments based on checklists  Direct observation of performances,  structured practice or drills, “practical”  exams, small group work, etc. | Student self-assessments (e.g. reflective journals, surveys)  Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs, “clicker” mediated responses, etc.)  Capstone projects or final summative assessment (final exams, capstone projects, portfolios, etc.)  Internal/External Data  Other (please describe) |

8) Please insert any instruments used for assessment (rubrics, checklists, surveys, etc.) or include a hyperlink to such documents here.

Assessments posted on Blackboard.

9) What is your expected level of achievement for measuring success?

For the tutor training program SLO:

We expect 70% tutors and trainees will say they help students utilize the writing process or a problem-solving process to improve coursework skills.

For the tutee (improvement?) program SLO:

We expect 90% of the tutees will report improvement in their coursework.

10) Assessment Results:

What did members of your program learn from the assessment of the outcomes? Did the assessment work, and if not, what needs to be revised?

Subjective Survey Results:

On the tutor training SLO: When tutors and trainees self-evaluate skills related to helping students utilize appropriate problem-solving processes in order to tutor effectively, all feel confident in their abilities. The results were 73% -strong, 27% average. We met the goal of 70%. The assessment does work, and we will continue to use it.

On the tutee improvement SLO: The results are positive from the tutees also. For example, the Engl 272 course is proving to be successful with 83% of the students reporting that they had above average improvement in their course work and 95% reporting that had average or higher improvement. However, 5% of the tutees reported less than average improvement. The survey results for INTDS 300 and 301 were similar.

Internal Data Results

We did a one-semester comparison of student's tutorial hours, Fall 2013, in relation to their relative success rates. No matter which of the three types of tutorial classes the students were enrolled in, GPA, retention, and successful completion increased with higher hours of tutoring, with one exception: students enrolled in INTDS 301 and receiving over 20 hours of tutoring did not follow this pattern. More semesters of data would need to be studied to determine if this is a trend or not. However, the increased numbers in GPA, retention, and successful completion correlated with hours of tutoring supports the subjective survey results.

We have learned that it is very difficult to devise quick assessment tools to measure the different tutoring courses in the ELC in any specific manner. The assessments we use are still useful, but often suspect in that the majority of tutees seem reluctant to be critical of their tutors. The most varied responses came from the random sampling done with a 3-question survey of INTDS 301 students anonymously, so we should consider more assessment tools that are anonymous, as well as training tutors to be more honest and critical and to encourage their tutees to do likewise.

8) Action Plan:

Based on the assessment results, what changes, if any, are planned to increase student success? When will they be implemented? Please check any appropriate boxes and provide a brief description with a timeline for changes.

A.  Results are positive—no changes to be made

B.  Conduct further assessment related to the issue and outcome

C.  Use new or revised teaching methods (e.g., more use of group work, new lecture, etc.)

D. ☐ Develop new methods of evaluating student work

E. ☐ Plan purchase of new equipment or supplies needed for modified student activities

F. ☐ Make changes in staffing plans (e.g., modified job descriptions, requests for new positions, etc.)

G. ☐ Engage in professional development about best practices for this type of class/activity

H. ☐ Unable to determine what should be done

I. ☐ Other: Click here to enter text.

Provide a brief description with a timeline for changes:

We have learned that it is very difficult to devise quick assessment tools to measure the different tutoring courses in the ELC in any specific manner, and we will investigate options to our current process.

While the subjective results were possibly overly positive, they do give us some feedback that is useful. To balance the subjective assessment surveys, the Extended Learning Center will continue to assess its various courses using different methods, and we will be sure to include more anonymous assessment tools.

9) The dialogue that occurred while planning assessments, evaluating data results, and determining action plans took place

A. ☐ with others in my program during department/division meetings

B. ☐ during on-campus workshops, duty day, flex, etc.

C. ☐ over email

D. ☐ with colleagues from other campuses

E. ☐ with my dean and/or colleagues in my division

F. ☐ other: Click here to enter text.

G. ☐ No dialogue occurred. Reason no dialogue occurred (i.e. “Dialogue was difficulty due to the large number of adjuncts in this program” etc.): Click here to enter text.

### Dean/Manager Program Review Sign-Off

After reading the program review report, please complete the following and send electronically, along with the report draft/final document, to the Program Review Chair. Thank you.

I have read the attached Program Report draft/final report from the Click here to enter text. Program. The following sections are completed as required or are still in need of attention.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Program Review Section | Complete | Incomplete |
| General information, including staffing summary | ☐ | ☐ |
| Mission, Strategic Plan, and Ed Master Plan support | ☐ | ☐ |
| Previous goal status/outcome | ☐ | ☐ |
| Quantitative analysis in support of goals | ☐ | ☐ |
| Funding/budget summary | ☐ | ☐ |
| SLO summary/reports, including mapping, assessment results, gaps, and action plans | ☐ | ☐ |
| Qualitative analysis, including future trends, curriculum changes, teaching methodologies, collaborations | ☐ | ☐ |
| Goals | ☐ | ☐ |
| SLO timeline | ☐ | ☐ |
| Curriculum Revision timeline | ☐ | ☐ |

Comments: Click here to enter text.

Dean/ Manager’s Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

### Reedley College Program Review Rubric

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Review Section | Does Not Meet | Meets | Exceeds |
| General information, including staffing summary | One or more sections are incomplete | All sections are complete and accurate | All sections are complete and accurate with analysis which support’s program’s goals |
| Mission, Strategic Plan, and Ed Master Plan support | One or more sections are incomplete | All sections are complete and exhibit support | All sections are complete, supportive with analysis which supports program’s goals |
| Previous goal status/outcome | Incomplete | Completed | Completed with some degree of depth |
| Quantitative analysis in support of goals | Sections are incomplete or poorly executed | Sections are complete and data analyzed | Analysis of data supports the program’s goals |
| Funding/budget summary | Incomplete | Completed | Completed with some degree of depth |
| SLO summary/reports, including mapping, assessment results, gaps, and action plans | Reports for courses, program, and/or certificates are incomplete or poorly executed. Mapping, results, gaps, and/or action plans are not addressed or poorly executed. | Program completed all sections, including mapping and reports. Program analyzes assessment results and creates action plans with at least some degree of critical thought. | Program completed all sections, including mapping and reports. Program analyzes assessment results and creates action plans which support program’s goals |
| Qualitative analysis, including future trends, curriculum changes, teaching methodologies, collaborations | Sections are incomplete or poorly executed. | Program completed all sections with at least some degree of critical thought. | Program analyses sections in support of program’s goals. |
| Goals | Incomplete, including no page numbers | Complete, including page numbers | Complete, including page numbers |
| SLO timeline | Incomplete | Complete | Complete |
| Curriculum Revision timeline | Incomplete | Complete | Complete |

### Program Review Committee Response To Programs’ Drafts

Program: Click here to enter text.

Date: Click here to enter text.

Thank you for submitting your program’s program review report draft. The Program Review Committee has read your program’s report draft and offers the following suggestions/comments as you revise your final report.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Review Section | Does Not Meet | Meets | Exceeds |
| General information, including staffing summary |  |  |  |
| Mission, Strategic Plan, and Ed Master Plan support |  |  |  |
| Previous goal status/outcome |  |  |  |
| Quantitative analysis in support of goals |  |  |  |
| Funding/budget summary |  |  |  |
| SLO summary/reports, including mapping, assessment results, gaps, and action plans |  |  |  |
| Qualitative analysis, including future trends, curriculum changes, teaching methodologies, collaborations |  |  |  |
| Goals |  |  |  |
| SLO timeline |  |  |  |
| Curriculum Revision timeline |  |  |  |

**(OVER)**

### Committee Comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Program Review Section | Comments |
| General information, including staffing summary | Click here to enter text. |
| Mission, Strategic Plan, and Ed Master Plan support | Click here to enter text. |
| Previous goal status/outcome | Click here to enter text. |
| Quantitative analysis in support of goals | Click here to enter text. |
| Funding/budget summary | Click here to enter text. |
| SLO summary/reports, including mapping, assessment results, gaps, and action plans | Click here to enter text. |
| Qualitative analysis, including future trends, curriculum changes, teaching methodologies, collaborations | Click here to enter text. |
| Goals | Click here to enter text. |
| SLO timeline | Click here to enter text. |
| Curriculum Revision timeline | Click here to enter text. |

Your oral presentation will take place on: Click here to enter text.

Please contact the Program Review Chair with questions. Thank you for your participation in this important process.

### Program Review Substantiation Scoring Sheet

To be completed by the Program Review Committee members

Program: Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | | | | | |  |
| **Rating Scale** | **1**  **Unsubstantiated within the report** | **2**  **Minimally substantiated within the report** | | **3**  **Substantiated within the report** | | | | | **4**  **Well substantiated within the report** |  |
| **Goal** | | | **1** | | **2** | **3** | **4** | **Comments** | |  |
| Click here to enter text. | | | ☐ | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Click here to enter text. | |  |
| Click here to enter text. | | | ☐ | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Click here to enter text. | |  |
| Click here to enter text. | | | ☐ | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Click here to enter text. | |  |
| Click here to enter text. | | | ☐ | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Click here to enter text. | |  |
| Click here to enter text. | | | ☐ | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Click here to enter text. | |  |
| Click here to enter text. | | | ☐ | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Click here to enter text. | |  |
| Click here to enter text. | | | ☐ | | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | Click here to enter text. | |  |
| **General Comments** | | | | | | | | | |  |
| Click here to enter text. | | | | | | | | | |  |

### Reedley College Program Review Goals Annual Progress Report

**(email to Program Review Chair each May 1)**

**Program:** Click here to enter text. **Year: 20\_\_-20\_\_ Contact:** Click here to enter text.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goals**  (as appropriate, identify the campus where the goal applies) | **Proposed Timeline** | **Activities/Facilities/Curriculum/**  **Equipment Necessary to Accomplish Goals** | **Resources Needed, Include Estimate Costs** | **Status** | **Outcome** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Additional Information:**

1. Provide any additional changes made to the program that were not a part of your program review report.

Click here to enter text.

2. List in detail any new program needs and a brief rational for this need.

Click here to enter text.

3. Summarize the progress your program has made this year on SLO assessment.

Click here to enter text.

4. Provide any additional information that your program would like to share.

Click here to enter text.