



# Annual Program Review 2011-2012 - STUDENT SERVICES

## Division - Program STUDENT SERVICES LEARNING CENTER

### Authorization

After the document is complete, it must be reviewed and submitted to the Program Review Committee by the appropriate area manager or Dean.

Author/Manager: Andrew Stires  
 Area Manager/Dean: Brenda Jones/Rick Perez  
 Date Received by Program Review November 16, 2011

### Overview of the Program

*All degrees and certificates are considered programs. In addition, divisions may further delineate and define programs based on their assessment needs (developmental sequences, career track, etc).*

**Statement of Purpose** – briefly describe in 1-3 sentences.

The Learning Center supports the mission of the college by providing tutoring services which help students achieve success in the classroom and workplace. Specifically, through personal interaction, the Learning Center assists with verbal and written communication, mathematics, and various study skills necessary to succeed in today's world. In cooperation with faculty and staff, we support student success by encouraging a variety of learning strategies, elevating students' confidence, and empowering students to achieve their highest potential.

Please list the **most significant achievement** accomplished since your last program review.

With money from the Basic Skills Initiative, we expanded our workshop series which is very popular with students. Through outreach we have informed more students of the workshops and attracted more faculty members to teach workshops. The Learning Center Coordinator, Shant Shahoian, is developing pre/post test assessments to measure the efficacy of the workshops.

List the current major strengths of your program

1. Workshop Series
2. Student Development 150: Tutor Training
3. SLO Progress

List the current weaknesses of your program

1. Tutoring referral process.
2. Minimal apportionment due to limited faculty oversight.
3. Lack of faculty involvement in the Center.

## 1.0. Trend Analysis

For each program within the division, use the data provided to indicate trends (e.g., steady, increasing, decreasing, etc.) for each of the following measures.

Service Function	Acad. Year	Service Contacts	Trends/Comments
CAI Lab	2007-2008	13,468	
	2008-2009	11,288	Student contacts down 16% from 07-08.
	2009-2010	10,271	Student contacts down 9% from 08-09
	2010-2011	6,560	Student contacts down 36% from 09-10
Math Tutoring	2007-2008	2,029	
	2008-2009	1,590	Student contacts down 22% from 07-08
	2009-2010	1,270	Student contacts down 20% from 08-09
	2010-2011	1,502	Student contacts up 18% from 09-10
Writing Tutoring	2007-2008	3,532	
	2008-2009	3,363	Student contacts down 5% from 07-08
	2009-2010	3,204	Student contacts down 5% from 08-09
	2010-2011	2,461	Student contacts down 23% from 09-10
Other Subject Tutoring	2007-2008	1,570	
	2008-2009	972	Student contacts down 38% from 07-08
	2009-2010	1,620	Student contacts up 67% from 08-09
	2010-2011	1,773	Student contacts up 9% from 09-10
Studying	2007-2008	18,355	
	2008-2009	16,982	Student contacts down 7.5% from 07-08
	2009-2010	10,759	Student contacts down 37% from 08-09
	2010-2011	7,176	Student contacts down 33% from 09-10
Workshops	2008-2009	223	Workshops began in Fall 2007; stats are not available until 08-09
	2009-2010	481	Student attendance up 116% from 08-09
	2010-2011	424	Student attendance down 12%
All Services Combined	2007-2008	38,954	
	2008-2009	37,118	Student contacts down 5% from 07-08
	2009-2010	27,605	Student contacts down 26% from 08-09
	2010-2011	19,714	Student contacts down 28.5% from 09-10

STAFFING	FTEF	Mgmt.	Classified	Hourly	Student Workers Hrs.
2007-2008	.60	1	3	0	13,566
2008-2009	.50	1	3	0	7,987
2009-2010	.50	1	3	0	9,340.25
2010-2011	.50	1	3	0	7,953

1.1. Describe how these trends have affected student achievement and/or student learning:

More GCC students would benefit from tutoring, especially the growing number of basic skills students, so it is good to see an increase in math and other subject tutoring; however, we continue to see a decrease in writing tutoring.

While it is difficult to draw a direct causal relation between tutoring and pass/fail rates, tutoring can be one reason students succeed in classes in which they struggle. The goal of the Learning Center is not necessarily to improve student grades, but to improve student learning, which will hopefully lead to success over time. For example, in a writing tutoring session, the goal of the tutor is not to make sure the student leaves with an "A" paper, but rather to make sure the student is able to master one or two concepts for which she was referred by her instructor. The student might receive a low grade on the essay, but hopefully she will be able to apply what she has learned to future essays and gradually improve, eventually mastering skills she will need in school and the workplace.

Our workshop series is very successful. Spring 2011 workshop series surveys show that 90% marked "strongly agree" when asked if the workshops are valuable. Students have also requested workshops in a variety of areas outside of writing including art history, chemistry, economics, history, psychology, political science, sociology, and study skills. Skills taught in the workshop series can help students be more successful in their coursework, so hopefully we can broaden the subject area of the series in the future. We offered 64 workshops in 2009-2010 and helped 484 students. Due to limited funding, in 2010-2011 we were only able to offer 43 workshops, but we still helped 424 students. Attendance should continue to increase as we plan to offer more workshops in the future.

1.2. Is there other relevant quantitative/qualitative information that affects the evaluation of your program?

Yes.

Since our last Program Review, we saw increases in math and other subject tutoring, but continue to see a decline in writing tutoring and CAI usage.

We continue to promote the Learning Center in various ways. We contact faculty each semester asking them to inform their students of our services. Our Fall 2010 Faculty Survey revealed that 68% of faculty wanted a Learning Center representative to visit their classes to provide information about our services. In Spring 2011, staff visited 34 classes at the request of instructors. This outreach effort may be one reason why we saw increases in math and other subject tutoring. We plan to continue to visit classes in the future.

There are many other ways we promote our services. Information about our services and workshop series is now available on the GCC homepage under "What's Happening On Campus." Our workshops are also advertised in El Vaquero and as part of the Staff Development Series. We also attend the Student Services Fair every year. The ASGCC will include information about our services in their newsletter which is distributed to students. We will continue to work with individual faculty members who want tutors available for their classes. This is another reason why we've seen an increase in other subject tutoring; more faculty members from different disciplines have asked us to hire tutors to help their students.

One reason for the decline in writing tutoring may be the decentralization of tutoring services. Beginning in Spring 2009, the Language Lab began utilizing faculty to tutor students in ESL classes. In 2009-10 we had 1126 ESL tutoring sessions. In 2010-2011 that number decreased to 698. During 2010-2011 (when stats are first available) the Language Lab had 1890 tutoring sessions. This may account for the decline in writing tutoring in the Learning Center.

Even though our math tutoring appointments increased, it should be noted that over the past three years the Math Discovery Center has seen a steady increase in students served. They served 2,303 students in 2007-2008, 2,424 in 2008-2009, 2,504 in 2009-2010, and 2,645 in 2010-2011. Perhaps some students who might have received math tutoring in the Learning Center decided to use the Math Discovery Center instead.

Due to budget cuts in the last few years, we limit the number of tutors working per hour which could be another reason why numbers have declined. For example, in the past we sometimes had 2-3 tutors for writing during busy times, but we now only have 1 writing tutor each hour. Although we still have appointment slots that go unfilled each year, it's possible that students are simply unable to book appointments during those times.

The fact that our tutors receive better training and enforce Learning Center policies more strictly might also impact usage. Students must also sign contracts, which state that tutors will not proofread, edit, or correct papers for students, before they can receive writing tutoring.

Another reason for the continued decline in writing tutoring could be the referral process that was implemented in Fall 2009. All students are required to get a referral from a faculty member before receiving tutoring. They are informed of this policy when they schedule their initial tutoring appointment. Some students may feel that requesting a referral from their instructors is too bothersome, or that doing so will identify them to their instructors as needy or having difficulty in the class. For these or similar reasons, they may decide to forgo tutoring to avoid any perceived stigma. However, it should be noted that we do not turn students away for not having referrals because we've found that the majority of faculty who utilize our services do not complete referrals for their students.

The CAI Lab numbers are down because fewer instructors require students to use our Passkey software to improve math, reading, and writing skills. Also, ESL level 1-3 classes now complete lab work in the Language Lab instead of the CAI Lab. This was done to meet legal mandates regarding lab use on campus related to TBA hours and lab oversight; the Learning Center does not have a full time faculty member who can provide oversight of the CAI Lab. In the future, if the CAI Lab expands its software offerings, we may see an increase in usage.

In our Fall 2010 faculty survey, we asked instructors for their thoughts about the workshop series. 40% of instructors surveyed recommend the workshops to their students. However, 25% do not know about the workshops, which indicates that we need to publicize the series more aggressively. Of the 40% of instructors who refer students, 50% felt that the workshops were very helpful, but many want more feedback on student progress. In the future, we plan to offer pre- and post-tests for each workshop to measure student success. If these tests were electronic, we could then e-mail this information to faculty. 15% of instructors indicated that they would design and teach a workshop if compensated at their hourly rate. 36% do not want to teach workshops. Another 30% are unsure if they would want to teach a workshop. Continued recruitment is necessary if we want to expand the series and offer more topics at a variety of times. Our future involvement with Title V should allow us to offer more workshops and recruit more faculty to teach them.

The Learning Center's goal is to serve more students in the future, but it should also be noted that serving more students requires having more resources. For example, increased student usage of the Learning Center might result in the inability to provide enough tutoring. Tutors must be hired, trained, and supervised, which is a time-consuming and intensive process. Adding additional tutors will require additional faculty coordination in the Learning Center. Current Basic Skills and Title V initiatives are proposing that the Learning Center play an ever-expanding role in helping basic skills students succeed. We will have to proceed with caution in implementing such proposals which require expansion of the Learning Center program. According to the Campus Profile 2011, satisfaction with the Learning Center's services is at 89%. We don't want increased quantity of services to affect the quality of the program.

Currently, Learning Center staff consists of one 50% Faculty Coordinator, one full-time Lab Manager, and three full-time Lab Technicians. There is also a vacant Lab Technician position that may need to be filled in the future should services expand.

## 2.0. Student Service Learning and Program Outcomes

Please provide the following information for each SLO/SAO within this area (add rows as needed).

Program Service/Function	SLO / SAO	Have program outcomes been assessed? Yes or No	Has the assessment data been analyzed? Yes or No	Has the data been used for program improvement?
Math, Writing, Other Subject Tutoring	Students recognize individual areas in need of improvement	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Students solve errors identified by instructors, counselors, or tutors	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Students compose assignments independent of a tutor's help	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Students explain successful study habits and memory techniques	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Students organize large assignments into manageable tasks	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Students illustrate verbal and written communication and/or computational skills	Yes	Yes	Yes

2.1. Please comment on your answers above.

We continue to assess, analyze, and use SLO data to improve our program.

2.2 If available, please provide a *link*\* to any program [assessment reports/timelines](#) here. This link could be to your program/department website, eLumen, etc.

Not available.

2.3 Does the evidence from assessments show that students are achieving the desired outcomes?

Yes.

Tutor logs have provided us with better data, although more subjective. After each tutoring session tutors rate the six SLO/SAO's listed above using a five point scale with 1 being "No, not at all" and 5 being "Yes, very well."

For math tutoring, in Fall 2009 all six areas averaged a 4 rating, "Yes, adequately." For the fifth and sixth items in the chart above, we saw an average of 3, "Somewhat" in Math 102, 103, and 104. These numbers held steady through Spring 2010, but ratings improved in Math 102, 103, 104, which received a 4 rating. From Fall 2010 to Spring 2011 all six areas averaged a 4.5 rating, "Yes, adequately."

For writing tutoring, from Fall 2009 to Spring 2010 all six areas averaged a 3.75 rating, "Somewhat." From Fall 2010 to Spring 2011 all six areas averaged a 4 rating "Yes, adequately." Ratings tended to be higher in English 101, 104, 120, and Writing Across the Curriculum which averaged 4.2, "Yes, adequately." There was a slight decline in ESL classes which averaged a 3.7 rating "Somewhat." In ESL classes, for the fourth item in the chart above, we saw an average of 3.5 "Somewhat" in Fall 2010 and Spring 2011.

For tutoring in subjects other than math and writing, from Fall 2009 to Spring 2010 all six areas averaged a 3.8 rating, "Somewhat." From Fall 2010 to Spring 2011 all six areas averaged a 4.2 rating, "Yes, adequately."

2.4 Briefly summarize any elements of your program/services that have been changed or will be changed as a result of assessments.

Lack of referral forms from faculty impacts our ability to analyze data in the first and second SLO/SAO's listed above because students will not recognize areas in need of improvement or be able to solve errors identified by faculty if faculty do not provide guidance via the referral form. We receive referral forms for approximately 1% of tutoring sessions. Even when faculty submit referrals, students do not always schedule time to meet with a tutor. Also, many faculty do not fill out referrals correctly, either providing very general goals for a tutoring session (i.e. "student needs help with problems in chapter 4") or asking tutors to cover too much material in one session (i.e. "student needs help with fragments, run-ons, organization, thesis, conclusion, commas").

Although we do a lot of outreach to both faculty and students informing them of the referral process, it is still difficult to get faculty to fill out referrals. We recognize that the process can be arduous, and we have tried to streamline the process, providing multiple ways referrals can be submitted (PeopleSoft, Learning Center website, hardcopy forms). We are currently working with ITS to have referrals automatically emailed to students when faculty submit them electronically. In our Fall 2010 Faculty Survey, 60% indicated they would like referrals linked to early alert within PeopleSoft. We plan to implement this in the future.

Tutors overwhelmingly support the referral process, as referrals provide guidance and structure to a tutoring session, and lead to fewer conflicts about the role of the tutor and the Learning Center. In our Fall 2010 Faculty Survey, 69% indicated that referrals are helpful in their disciplines. We will continue to need faculty and institutional support for the referral process.

We plan to create a student exit survey that students will complete at the end of a tutoring session. This will allow us to gauge what students think they learned in the tutoring session. We will then be able to compare tutor/student perceptions of tutoring and make improvements to tutor training and Learning Center policies.

In order to analyze SLO data more effectively, it will be necessary to create electronic versions of tutor logs and student exit surveys that can be saved in a database. This will allow us to easily chart student progress during a semester. We will need to make sure tutors have laptops so they can input this data. We are currently working with ITS to create electronic forms and a functional database. The ultimate goal is for faculty to receive feedback from tutoring sessions, so they can monitor student progress. Hopefully, this will also increase the number of tutoring referrals we receive and further invest faculty in the Center and our mission. This will also improve our data in the first and second SLO's listed above.

Further collaboration with faculty will help us improve our SLO's, improve tutoring training, and show a stronger correlation between tutoring and student success. This collaboration will also help integrate the Learning Center in the larger campus community and help communicate our mission to instructors and students.

It should be noted that most tutoring sessions are 30 minutes in length and many issues cannot be addressed in that limited timeframe. It is also difficult to see individual student improvement with the data we have collected. We do sometimes receive anecdotal data from students but not quantitative data.

We will improve our tutor training to address deficient areas in writing tutoring. Various modules have been added to Student Development 150: Tutor Training including areas on reading and working with students with hidden disabilities.

2.5 Based on the program assessment timeline and/or evidence you have gathered, please comment briefly on how far along your department/program is in the assessment process.

We have compiled two years worth of SLO data thus far, and as discussed in section 2.4, results are being used to improve our program.

**3.0. Reflection and Action Plans**

3.1 What recent activities, dialogues, discussions, etc. have occurred to promote student service outcomes or improved program/division processes?

GCC recently received a Title V grant with which the Learning Center will be involved. This grant will increase the Learning Center Coordinator’s released time position to 75%. More faculty will tutor in the Center, and more workshops will be offered.

Beginning Fall 2011, the Learning Center is collaborating with IMPACT to link tutoring to developmental composition classes. English faculty are tutoring writing across the curriculum in the Center as well as providing training for our tutors in working with students in developmental composition classes. We have also installed Kurzweil software on several computers in our lab that students and tutors can use to improve their writing skills.

We are currently working with ITS to create electronic tutor logs and a functional database. The ultimate goal is for faculty to receive feedback from tutoring sessions, so they can monitor student progress. Hopefully, this will also increase the number of tutoring referrals we receive and further invest faculty in the Center and our mission.

New modules on reading and working with student with hidden disabilities will be added to Student Development 150: Tutor Training.

With a grant from the Basic Skills Initiative we will offer 35 workshops in Fall 2011. We plan to continue to grow the workshop series.

The Learning Center coordinator, Shant Shahoian, contacted the English departments at CSULA and CSUN to recruit graduate students to intern as writing tutors. So far we have received no response, but we will continue to pursue this opportunity.

Shant Shahoian met with David Attyah (Student Diversity Coordinator) to discuss student equity and diversity in the Learning Center.

We continue to conduct Learning Center outreach to inform students and staff of our mission. In the future we want to increase signage and set up an information table on campus.

3.2 Using the weaknesses, trends and assessment outcomes listed on the previous pages as a basis for your comments, please briefly describe your plans and/or modifications for program improvements.

Plans or Modifications	Anticipated Improvements
Title V Involvement	Increase LC Coordinator position increased to 75% allowing for collection of more apportionment. Increase faculty involvement in the Center. Increase use of referral forms. Increase number of tutoring sessions. Increase number of workshops offered.
IMPACT Involvement	Link tutoring to developmental composition classes. Increased faculty involvement in the Center. Increase use of tutoring referral forms. Increase number of tutoring sessions.
SLO’s	Continue to create, assess, and analyze SLO’s and use data for program improvement. Add modules to STDV 150 (Tutor Training) to improve SLO’s.

Student Exit Survey	Create a student exit survey which can be compared to tutor logs to assess the benefits of tutoring.
Increase Workshops	Continue to offer a variety of workshops at different times to help students improve writing skills.
Tutor Log Database	Work with ITS to create a database of tutor logs which will be linked to tutoring referrals and can be emailed to instructors for updates on student progress.
Outreach	Continue to improve outreach efforts to educate faculty and students about the mission of the Learning Center. Have more signage on campus directing students to tutoring. Set up an information table on campus to encourage students to get tutoring or apply to work as tutors.

Format Rev. 9.19.11

## 2011 PROGRAM REVIEW

**LIBRARY & LEARNING  
RESOURCES**  
*Learning Center Remodel*

**S: LC-1**

### Section 4 Resource Request

#### Type of Resource Request:

Facilities/Maint.       Classroom Upgrades       New space       Conference/Travel  
 Instructional Equip.       Non-Instructional Equip       Training       Other  
 Computer/Hdware       Software/Licenses       Supplies

**Mandatory:** Is this request for one-time funding?  OR Does this request require ongoing funding?

If this is a repeat request, please list the Resource ID code or year requested: 2010-2011 Program Review

Mark if the following apply to this request:  Health & Safety Issue       Legal Mandate  
 Accreditation Requirement       Contractual Requirement

#### 4.1. Clearly describe the resource request.

The Learning Center remodel was approved by the Campus Development Committee in May 2007 and was added to the 2007-2008 Campus Development Priority Project List. In Fall 2007, the project was ranked 6 out of 11 requests as evaluated by the Campus Development Committee, but funding has not been available to actually do the work.

The original floor plan for the remodel adds a centralized front desk and waiting area, cubicles for tutoring and for staff, a conference room, tutor break area, and new carpet, furniture, paint, and lighting.

Amount requested    Approximately    \$100,000

#### 4.2. Justification and Rationale: What planning goal, core competency or student outcome does this request address? Use data from your report to support your request.

This resource request addresses Educational Master Plan (EMP) Strategic Goal 1 (Students Awareness, Access, Persistence, and Success).

Remodeling the Learning Center will improve traffic flow, help reduce noise, provide better lighting, and create a warmer, more welcoming atmosphere. This will help attract more people to our services, and a cleaner, quieter environment will be more conducive to learning and improve student success.

#### 4.3. What measurable outcome will result from filling this resource request?

Currently, the Learning Center has a collection of old, outdated furniture that does not match and is not very functional. The carpet is so old that cleaning it does more harm than good. Students have complained about the poor lighting, especially in the evening. Creating a more inviting and functional environment will help increase usage and improve student learning.

**APPROVALS**

<b>AGENCY</b>	<b>DECISION</b>					
The Program Review Committee has reviewed the data, outcomes and plans in the report and finds this request to be:	Well supported					
	Adequately supported					<b>X</b>
	Not supported					
	Reason:	Sect.1: Data		Sect.2: SLOs		Sect.3: Plans
Standing Committee Review of Resource Request <b>Committee: Academic Affairs</b>						Prioritization Score