HAWAI'I COMMUNITY COLLEGE
UNIT ANNUAL REVIEW REPORT

The Learning Center
Tutoring

November 15, 2015

Review Period
July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015

Initiator: Joni Onishi

Writer(s): Gwen Kimura

Program/Unit Review at Hawai'i Community College is a shared governance responsibility related to strategic planning and quality assurance. Annual and 3-year Comprehensive Reviews are important planning tools for the College's budget process. This ongoing

systematic assessment process supports achievement of Program/Unit Outcomes. Evaluated through a college-wide procedure, all completed Program/Unit Reviews are available to the College and community at large to enhance communication and public accountability. Please see http://hawaii.hawaii.edu/program-unit-review/

Unit Description

 Please provide a brief description of your Unit. Include your Unit Mission statement.

<u>DESCRIPTION</u>

The Learning Center (TLC) is an academic support program of Hawaiʻi Community College which is a shared service with University of Hawaiʻi at Hilo. Over the years, TLC has maintained its strong ties to instruction, providing faculty with an extension to their classroom and providing academic support college-wide. Its basic role of supporting faculty and students in reading, writing, math, and ESL continues to be the focus which provides a firm academic foundation for all students. Along with these services, TLC provides academic resources in the form of instructional materials, computers/programs, a multi-media classroom, open lab for computers/independent study, make-up testing, and tutoring. TLC is open Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. The staff includes: one full time Faculty Center Coordinator, one full time Office Assistant IV (Office Manager), one full time Educational Specialist A, four Faculty Lab Instructors (reading, writing, ESL, and math who are assigned three credits each to coordinate their area), five clerks, and 35 tutors.

TLC services include:

•   Tutoring – Reading Lab, ESL Lab, Math, Writing, Content Subjects, Learning Skills, computer assistance

•   Academic resources in the form of instructional materials, computers/programs for instructional purposes

•   A multi-media classroom

•   General study/with computers

•   Make-up testing

•   Clearinghouse for community request for tutors (unadvertised)

<u>MISSION</u>

The mission of The Learning Center (TLC) and Hale Kea Advancement and Testing Center (HKATC) as an academic support program for the college needs to be a responsive one which supports the college's mission and its academic programs. TLC and HKATC seek to provide services that support and enhance academic development for the college community. These services focus on academic support for an "open door" institution, providing initial student assessment, access to technology, support for successful learning, and testing services.

Part I. Review of Unit Data

If ARPD data is submitted for your Unit, go to the Annual Reports for Program Data (ARPD) website linked below and review the data for your Unit.

http://www.hawaii.edu/offices/cc/arpd/

Part II. Analysis of the Unit

Provide a detailed analysis of the Unit during the review period. If ARPD data is available for your Unit, base this part on the ARPD data from Part 1 and analyze the Unit in terms of Demand, Efficiency, and Effectiveness.

Demand Health	Efficiency Health	Effectiveness Health
Demand – Healthy ***Strengths:*** Demand for TLC/HKATC tutoring services is healthy as evidenced by the following data: • The percentage of unduplicated number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions per student FTE was 53% in AY 15, up from 51% in AY 14. This scored in the **healthy** category of the scoring rubric. • The percentage of unduplicated students enrolled in Dev/Ed classes who were tutored per number of students enrolled in Dev/Ed classes was 45%, placing it in the **healthy** category of the scoring rubric. **Weaknesses:** • Because data for tutoring services only reflect TLC, the percentage of unduplicated students enrolled in Dev/Ed classes who were tutored may be higher because students may be receiving tutoring from other programs.	Efficiency – Healthy **Strengths:** Efficiency is healthy as evidenced by the following data: • AY 15 - Tutor contact hours per tutor paid hours in one-on-one sessions was 3.1, placing it in the **healthy** category of the scoring rubric. There was an increase from AY 13 at 2.3. • AY 15 - Tutoring budget per student contact hours was $19.00, placing it in the **healthy** category of the scoring rubric. **Weaknesses:** • AY 15 - Although the budget is healthy, $19.00, it increased from $18.00 from the previous year. This increase could be attributed to the across the board pay raises tutors received.	Effectiveness – Healthy **Strengths:** Effectiveness is healthy as evidenced by the following data: • AY 14 - CCSSE survey results (averaged mean score) was 2.0 (1.99 round up), placing it in the **healthy** category but close to cautionary score of 1.9. • The passing rate of tutored students was 73%, placing it in the **healthy** category, although it dropped 1% from 74% from the previous year. **Weaknesses:** None

All Units should include and analyze significant Unit actions or changes (e.g., changes to the Unit's services or numbers served, gain/loss of positions, etc.). Also discuss results of prior year's action plan and include any trends or other factors (internal/external) affecting the Unit.

Although AY 13 and AY 14 plans to establish Starfish in TLC didn't materialize, the **Demand** for the number of unduplicated students tutored still increased by 2% from AY 14– AY 15 (51% and 53% respectfully).   Similarly, the number of unduplicated Dev/Ed students tutored increased from AY 14–AY 15 (44% and 45% respectfully). This steady increase in tutoring demand could be attributed to the following assessment strategies and interventions TLC vigilantly implemented: distributed flyers and advertised tutoring information on both campuses, conducted classroom visitations to promote services, provided an in-class biology tutor for BIOL 142, and kept TLC/HKATC website current with resources available.

As tutoring demand increased, the **Efficiency** in regards to tutor contacts also increased from 2.1 for AY 14 to 3.1 in AY 15. During AY 15, as an assessment strategy, Lab Coordinators provided numerous workshops for their tutors to increase their tutoring skills in their specific discipline. Moreover, TLC's Educational Specialist provided tutoring modules with discussion activities on Laulima to further enhance their tutoring abilities. All of these workshops are counted towards a tutor receiving a College Reading and Learning Association's (CRLA) certificate, a Nationally recognized tutor certification. It is believed that TLC's well-trained corps of tutors increased the efficiency rate in the number of students they tutored.

With an increase of developmental students utilizing tutoring services, our tutors need to be trained to work with these students who are usually underprepared, lack study skills, lack persistence, and may have other personal issues affecting their lives. TLC implemented a number of strategies to increase the quality and **Effectiveness** of its tutoring services by conducting numerous area specific workshops, providing general tutor trainings sessions, making tutorial modules accessible through Laulima, and providing an in-class tutor for BIOL 142.   Data results indicate that students who were tutored at least once or more had a higher course success rate than non-tutored students. In fact, based on the system-wide common learning outcomes, the average pass rate for students who received tutoring was 74%. When compared to the 61% pass rate for students who didn't receive tutoring, there is a 13% improvement for students tutored at least once or more and a significant difference of 18% improvement for those received tutoring 5 times or more. When analyzing the data by specific areas, you can see a significant difference in the following results: students in reading (16%), writing (22%), math (8%), and ESL (30%) on the average, passed their courses at a higher rate than non-tutored students. Moreover, the averaged results indicated that students

passed their courses at an even higher success rate in reading (27%), writing (25%), math (15%), and ESL (42%) when tutored five or more times. The high correlation between tutoring and course pass rates is powerful evidence that TLC has a great impact on providing academic support for student success at HawCC.

UNIT LEARNING OUTCOME: Students who receive tutoring will pass their tutored course. (System-wide common SLO)

Non-Tutored vs. Tutored for Fall-Spring Semesters

	2013-2014	**2014-2015**	**2014-2015 Average**
Non-tutored students who passed their classes	**61%**	**60%**	**61%**
*Students who receive tutoring (At least once or more) will pass their tutored courses	**74%**	**73%**	**74%**
Students who received tutoring (5 or more times) will pass their tutored course	**79%**	**79%**	**79%**

*Common Student Learning Outcome

The following chart provides data on students who were non-tutored, tutored at least one-four times, and tutored five times or more by subject area.

Non-Tutored vs. Tutored Students by Subject Area

Subject	**Non-Tutored Ave. % passing**	**Tutored (At least one or more times) Ave. % passing**	**Tutored (five times or more) Ave. % passing**
Reading AY 14	**54%**	**73%**	**78%**
AY 15	**59%**	**73%**	**76%**
Average	**57%**	**73%**	**77%**
Writing AY 14	**61%**	**81%**	**83%**
AY 15	**53%**	**76%**	**85%**

Average	**57%**	**79%**	**84%**
Math AY 14	**63%**	**71%**	**75%**
AY 15	**59%**	**67%**	**76%**
Average	**61%**	**69%**	**76%**
ESL AY 14	**42%**	**75%**	**89%**
Ay 15	**54%**	**81%**	**90%**
Average	**48%**	**78%**	**90%**

Describe and analyze other significant information not included elsewhere.

Persistence for AY 2014-2015
Non-Tutored vs. Tutored
% of reenrolled

Term (AY)	Non-Tutored	Tutored 1-4 hours	Tutored 5 or more hours
2014	72%	71%	76%
2015	68%	68%	74%
Average	70%	70%	75%

Persistence Rate: Students will reenroll (persistence) at the same rate as or higher than non-tutored students:
To determine the effectiveness of tutoring on persistence rate, data on students tutored in business, ESL, math, reading, writing, nursing, and general content subjects were monitored. For AY 14- AY 15, the average outcome for students tutored at least once or more reenrolling the following semester remained the same at 70% for students who did not use TLC services, but there was a greater persistence rate of 5% when they were tutored 5 times or more.

Aside from individual tutoring, small group tutoring sessions, and a having a social support environment, students may take advantage of and benefit from the support services. Although not the only reason for students' persistence, these factors may contribute and influence their decisions to reenroll the following spring semester.

Part III. Action Plan

Describe in detail the Unit's overall action plan for the current/next academic year. Discuss how these actions support the College's Mission. Include specific action plans to address any barriers or challenges that affect the Unit's efficiency, effectiveness, and operational performance.

The following Action Plans support the College's Mission by providing services that support and enhance academic development for the college community. These services focus on academic support for an "open door" institution, providing initial student assessment, testing services, access to technology and support for successful learning.

2013-2014 AY Action plans were not met for Goal #1: Establish Starfish in TLC to increase tutoring contacts and success rates of students who receive tutoring. Starfish was not able to be implemented for those academic years; therefore, it will be put on the action plan again for 2015-2016. It is hoped that features in Starfish will alert faculty and student services to refer students early for tutoring and feedback on their progress can be communicated back to all the stakeholders. This goal specifically targets the following three areas in the HawCC's Strategic Directions 2015-2021:

> HGI2: "Strengthen developmental education initiatives that increase preparation, improve placement methods and reduce time spend in developmental education."
>
> HPMS1: "Increase utilization of available software and database such as Destiny One, STAR, STARFISH, KFS, Curriculum Central, and Laulima."
>
> HPMS2: "Collaborate on shared services to improve operating efficiencies and effectiveness in student support services."

Goal #2: Support students in the STEM related field by providing a biology tutor in the STEM Center.   Last Spring 2015, TLC supported a BIOL 142 vidcon class from West Hawaii to Hilo with an in-class tutor. Results of the initiative were positive with a 100% pass rate and higher class GPA for those tutored students. This new initiative will hopefully impact more students who utilize the newly developed STEM Center by providing a tutor who can work with any student needing assistance in their biology courses. This goal targets HawCC's Strategic Directions 2015-2021 HI2 in "Productivity and Efficiency Measures" by increasing the number of STEM degrees.

Goal #3: Identify issues/concerns related to Developmental Education and implement solutions that will provide wrap around services to those students. Specifically this goal targets HawCC's Strategic Directions 2015-2021 HGI Strategy 2: "Strengthen developmental

education initiatives that increase preparation, improve placement methods and reduce time spent in developmental education."

Part IV. Resource Implications

Please provide a brief statement about any implications of current operating resources for the Program.
Budget asks are included in the 3-year Comprehensive Review, except for the following that may be included here: health and safety needs, emergency needs, and/or necessary needs to become compliant with Federal/State laws/regulations. Describe the needed item(s) in detail, including cost(s) and timeline(s). Explain how the item(s) aligns with one or more of the Strategic Initiatives of the Hawai'i Community College 2015-2021 Strategic Plan. Identify and discuss how the item(s) aligns with the Initiative's Goal, Action Strategy, and Tactic. HAWCC Strategic Plan

The following are budget expenses for both TLC and HKATC:

1.   Currently, expenses for Pay for printing have already been budgeted for 2015-2016.
2.   HKATC uses Appointment Plus which is a software that schedules testing appointments. At this time, HKATC plans to continue using Appointment Plus on a month-to-month basis until the staff becomes more familiar with STARFISH capabilities. This item has been included in the allotted budget for 2015-2016 and the contract can be renewed or discontinued when a decision is made.
3.   Replacing old computers are done on a cycle determined by the Academic Computing Unit. Other computer equipment, software, and supplies have already been budgeted for 2015-2016.
4.   Hiring of a Biology tutor for the STEM Center has already been budgeted for 2015-2016.
5.   Establishing an APT position for HKATC as a budget ask will be reported in detail in the 3-year Comprehensive Review, which has been submitted for this AY 16 period.

Part V. Comprehensive Review Information

Please provide a short summary regarding the last comprehensive review for this Unit. Discuss any significant changes to the Unit since the last comprehensive review that are not discussed elsewhere.

See TLC/HKATC's 2013-2015 Comprehensive Review Report for a complete analysis of significant changes made to its unit since its last review.

Required for ARPD Web Submission: Provide the URL to the specific location of this Unit's last Comprehensive Review on the HawCC Program/Unit Review
http://www.hawaii.hawaii.edu/program-unit-review/docs/2011_tlc_comprehensive_unit_review.pdf

Part VI. Unit Outcomes

For all parts of this section, please provide information based on the Unit Outcomes assessed in AY 2014-15.

TLC/HKATC Unit Outcomes (UOs)
Unit Outcomes
1.Students who receive tutoring will pass their tutored courses (System-wide SLO)
2.TLC/HKATC will provide tutoring services for students to support their success in their academic endeavors
3.TLC/HKATC will provide computer access for students.
4.TLC/HKATC will provide the College and community with testing services

A) Assessment Strategy/Instruments

Provide a description of the Unit's assessment strategy, including the type of work or activities assessed; type of assessment rubrics developed/adopted and used; how and when the assessment was conducted; and how the assessment was analyzed.

Unit Outcome #1: Students who receive tutoring will pass their tutored courses (System-wide SLO) As a strategy, TLC planned to establish Starfish to increase success rates of students tutored by improving operating efficiency and effectiveness of its tutoring services. Data was to be collected by Starfish and TLC during the 7-1-2014 to 6-30-2015 AY to determine the success rate of students who received tutoring. It was hoped that with the implementation of Starfish, early referrals from faculty and student services would be made and tutoring interventions would help to contribute to their success. A tutoring rubric was designed to measure and assess the results for this outcome.

In addition, TLC focused on increasing the quality of its tutoring services by conducting numerous workshops, tutor in-service training sessions, and providing on-line tutoring modules for tutors, students, and staff.   To improve student success in ESL, mini workshops were provided in the ESL lab. Workshops were conducted for Reading tutors training them on lab procedures and the newly added short stories module with exercise questions to improve students' reading performance. The Writing and Math Coordinators worked with tutors to create additional worksheets and study guides for problem areas to support student success. Qualitative data were used to determine student and faculty perception regarding satisfaction of tutorial and center services. Surveys used included TLC Evaluation, Reading Lab Evaluation, ESL Lab Evaluation, and the Academic Support Unit (ASU) Satisfaction Survey.   TLC Evaluations were distributed to all students using center services and the ASU survey was sent electronically to all faculty/lecturers at the end of the Fall 2015 semester.

The following rubrics, evaluations, and surveys were designed and used to assess the level of performance in successfully achieving unit outcomes #1:

TLC/HKATC TUTORING RUBRIC

Area	Benchmark	Scoring
1) Demand **Unduplicated number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions per student FTE** **Source: #4**	40% - 50% Healthy 30% - 39% Cautionary 20% - 29% Unhealthy	2 = Healthy 1 = Cautionary 0 = Unhealthy
Unduplicated number of students enrolled in Dev/Ed classes who were tutored **Source: #5**	40% - 50% Healthy 30% - 39% Cautionary 20% - 29% Unhealthy	2 = Healthy 1 = Cautionary 0 = Unhealthy **Average the two scores together and use the scoring rubric to determine the final "Demand" Health call score:** 1.5 – 2.0 Healthy 0.5 – 1.0 Cautionary 0.0 – 0.4 Unhealthy
2) Efficiency **Tutor contact hours per tutor paid hours in one-on-one sessions** **Source: #6**	1.5 – 2 Healthy 0.5 – 1.4 Cautionary 0.0 – 0.4 Unhealthy	2 = Healthy 1 = Cautionary 0 = Unhealthy

Tutoring Budget per student contact hours
 	
Source: #8
	\$15 – 25 Healthy
	  26 – 35 Cautionary
	  36 – 45 Unhealthy
		2 = Healthy
		1 = Cautionary
		0 = Unhealthy
		
		Average the two scores together and use the scoring rubric to determine the final "Efficiency" Health call score:
		1.5 – 2.0 Healthy
		0.5 – 1.0 Cautionary
		0.0 – 0.4 Unhealthy

3) Effectiveness **Students who receive tutoring should pass their tutored course** **Source: #9**	70% - 80% Healthy 60% – 69% Cautionary 50% – 59% Unhealthy	2 = Healthy 1 = Cautionary 0 = Unhealthy
CCSSE survey results **Source (Average): #10, 11, 12**	2.0 – 3 Healthy 1.0 – 1.9 Cautionary 0.0 – 0.9 Unhealthy	2 = Healthy 1 = Cautionary 0 = Unhealthy
Persistence (fall to spring)	Healthy: 70% or higher Cautionary: 50% - 69% Unhealthy: < 50%	2 = Healthy 1 = Cautionary 0 = Unhealthy **Average the three scores for "Effectiveness" Health call score:**

		1.5 – 2.0 = Healthy 0.5 – 1.0 = Cautionary 0.0 – 0.4 = Unhealthy

LEARNING CENTER EVALUATION
FALL 2014

Please circle your response in the specified areas:

1.   The tutors are available.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	No Response
Com/Lsk/ Sub. Tutoring	SA	A	U	D	SD	N/A	NR
ESL	SA	A	U	D	SD	N/A	NR
Math	SA	A	U	D	SD	N/A	NR
Writing	SA	A	U	D	SD	N/A	NR
Reading	SA	A	U	D	SD	N/A	NR

2.   The tutors are knowledgeable.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	No Response

3.   The tutors are concerned about my progress.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	No Response

4.   The learning activities materials in the lab help in my overall learning.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	No Response

5.   I find the clerks at The Learning Center to be helpful and informative regarding services available at The Learning Center and Hawaii Community College.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	N/A	No Response

6. Studying at The Learning Center helps me improve my overall performance as a student.

    Strongly
    Agree   Agree   Undecided   Disagree   Strongly
Disagree   N/A   No
Response

7. My work in The Learning Center is helping me learn to become more independent as a student.

    Strongly
    Agree   Agree   Undecided   Disagree   Strongly
Disagree   N/A   No
Response

8. Using and receiving assistance with computers help me recognize the importance of technology in the world today.

    Strongly
    Agree   Agree   Undecided   Disagree   Strongly
Disagree   N/A   No
Response

9. Make-up testing services allow me to catch up with tests I missed at a convenient time and location.

    Strongly
    Agree   Agree   Undecided   Disagree   Strongly
Disagree   N/A   No
Response

10. My overall rating of The Learning Center is:

    Excellent
    Good
    Fair
    Poor
    Very Poor
    No Response

Reading Lab Evaluation Form

Semester_____   Year_____   Date_____

A.   **Reading Course I am taking: (Check One)**
___**ENG 18**   ___**ENG 20R**   ___**ENG 21**
___**ENG 102**   ___**Walk-In**   ___**Other**

B. My class usually comes to the Reading Lab on: Day _____ Time _____
C. Outside of class, I also come in to the Lab on: Day _____ Time _____

Directions: Rate the following questions about the Reading Lab using the following criteria: Strongly Agree (SA = 5), Agree (A = 4), Undecided (U = 3), Disagree (D = 2), and Strongly Disagree (SD = 1).
For items 1-6, circle the appropriate number or word for your rating. Please make any additional comments you may have for items 7 and 8.

Ratings:	SA	A	U	D	SD
1. The Reading Lab is a pleasant learning environment.	5	4	3	2	1
2. The reading tutors are helpful.	5	4	3	2	1

3. The reading tutors seem to know the
   procedures well and are able to assign   5   4   3   2   1
   lessons and test appropriately.

4. My experience in the lab is improving my   5   4   3   2   1
   attitude toward reading in general.

5. My work in the Reading Lab is helping me become   5   4   3   2   1
   a better reader in my other academic courses.

6. My overall rating of the lab is: (circle one)
   Excellent   Good   Average   Poor   Very Poor

7. What do you like best about the Reading Lab? _____
_____

8. What do you like least about the Reading Lab? _____

The following ESL Lab Evaluation is one of six. The evaluations include ESL 20W, ESL 20G, ESL20R, ESL 21, ESL 22G and ESL 22W. These evaluations seek to get feedback from students regarding the appropriateness of the assignments and working with a tutor in the Lab. The ESL 20W Lab Evaluation below is a sample of all six. On the final assessment report, results of all 6 will be provided with an analysis of the results as well as plan for implementation.

ESL 20W Lab Evaluation – Fall 2014

Writing Practices

Please circle the appropriate symbol.

1. I was able to write easily about the writing topics.

    Strongly Agree   Agree   Neutral/Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

2. The writing practices made me think about how to develop and organize my ideas.

    Strongly Agree   Agree   Neutral/Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

3. The writing practice assignments helped me improve my writing.

    Strongly Agree   Agree   Neutral/Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

4. The writing practices helped me apply what I learned in class.

    Strongly Agree   Agree   Neutral/Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

5. The instructor's expectations regarding writing assignments were easy to understand.

    Strongly Agree   Agree   Neutral/Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

6. The writing practice activity was an important part of this course.

😊😊   😊   😐   😠   😠😠

Strongly Agree   Agree   Neutral/Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

7. The tutors were concerned about my learning and understanding.

😊😊   😊   😐   😠   😠😠

Strongly Agree   Agree   Neutral/Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

8. What did you like best about the writing practices?

9. What did you like least about the writing practices?

Academic Support Unit Satisfaction Survey

Faculty Awareness, Referral, and Satisfaction of Tutoring Services
Academic Support Unit Satisfaction Survey

1. Are you aware of TLC/HKATC tutoring services?   **Yes/No**

2. Have you referred your students for tutoring at TLC/HKATC?   **Yes/No**

3. When my students use TLC/HKATC tutoring services, I feel it positively affects my students' learning.

           SA/A   Neutral   **SA/A   Neutral**   **SA/A   Neutral**

Unit Outcome #2 TLC/HKATC will provide tutoring services for students to support their success in their academic endeavors: As a strategy, TLC planned to establish Starfish to increase the total number of sessions, unduplicated number of classes, and unduplicated number of teachers' usage of the Centers, especially for students enrolled in STEM related classes. It was hoped that with the implementation of Starfish, there would be an increase in student contacts. Also distributing flyers on both campuses to promote services, especially highlighting tutorial services to support student success in STEM areas and conducting presentations in classes were part of the strategy to increase awareness and usage of tutoring services. (See TLC chart for statistics)

B) Expected Level of Achievement

For each assessment conducted during the review year, describe the rubric(s) standards and the benchmark goal(s) for successful achievement of the Unit's Outcomes (e.g., "85% of work orders will have been filled within the original estimated completion time" or "90% of students will report satisfaction with Unit services"). Discuss why this achievement level is expected and how it compares to appropriate service industry standards.

Unit Outcomes #1: 70% of the students who receive tutoring will pass their courses (see tutoring rubric - effectiveness). Evaluations and surveys regarding qualitative measure will exceed 80% scoring at the agree to strongly agree levels.

Unit Outcomes #2: 10% increase in student usage according to data collection of the center and Starfish (see TLC statistics chart)

C) Results of Unit Assessment

Provide a detailed description of the assessment(s) results. Discuss how these results collectively demonstrate achievement of the Unit's Outcomes and support of the College's Mission. Describe how the Unit's assessment results have guided the implementation of changes to improve the Unit's function(s), service(s), delivery, and/or organizational structure during the review period. If no change has been implemented for improvement based on assessment results, discuss any barriers or challenges that have hindered implementing improvements.

Unit Outcomes #1: Students who receive tutoring will pass their tutored course is a system-wide common SLO. As a strategy, TLC planned to establish Starfish to achieve 70% and above as its benchmark goal (see tutoring rubric on effectiveness) in reaching this unit outcome. Although Starfish was not available for this AY 15, data from TLC system was collected and analyzed. TLC successfully achieved this outcome for AY 15 when 73% of the students who receive tutoring passed their courses. In addition, interventions and activities implemented to help tutored students successfully pass their courses were assessed through evaluations and surveys. These qualitative data reflect student and faculty perception regarding satisfaction of tutorial and center services and also indicate concerns that we can address in the future.

TLC Center Evaluation: 193 student evaluations were completed with ratings all in the 80% and above "Agree to Strongly Agree" category. Overall rating was 97% in the "Excellent to Good" range. Students rated TLC service over 90% in areas that promote academic success. Other recognized areas such as improving overall performance of the student, becoming more independent, and recognizing the importance of technology (instruction/use of computers) in the world today all rated above 90%. TLC has met its benchmark of 80% with the lowest ratings of 82% in the statement, "Tutors are concerned about my progress."

Reading Lab Evaluation: The Reading Lab provided an extension to classes in Eng. 18, 20R, 21 and 102 in Fall 2014 with most of the responses coming from Eng. 21 students. A total of 58 evaluations were completed by lab users. Lab ratings were well above 80% in the "Strongly Agree to Agree" rating. The overall rating for the Reading Lab in the good to excellent rating was 93%. Other significant ratings were: 91% felt that the reading activities helped the student read better in other classes and experience in the lab improved their

attitude toward reading in general. The Reading Lab also received high ratings for pleasant environment and tutors being helpful.   Students' comments included those that appreciated the support of the tutors, lab assignments helped them become better readers and an increase in their reading rate. Areas of concerns were with the noise level due to conversations during crowded times and not allowing food or drink. We asked folks to keep conversation to a minimum, try to space class lab times and we created a space inside for students to store their food and drinks if they did not have a bag. The reading lab met its benchmark of 80% and as part of its ongoing improvement plan, selected additional readings for students and created appropriate questions that will be offered starting in the fall 2015.

ESL Lab Evaluation: The ESL Lab provided an extension to classroom instruction for ESL 20R, 20G, 20W, 21, and 22G. Evaluation questions seek student input regarding lab activities, relevance to class, appropriateness, and value. Student evaluations were very positive but may have not represented all students. ESL 20W and 20G had only 2 and 3 responses respectively. One rating that may be a concern is regarding "tutors concern for student learning." One of the three students marked disagreed in ESL 20G and one person out of two marked Neutral/Undecided. Eight students in ESL 20R rated all areas very good with at 100% except the statement that tutors are concerned about students learning (88%). Seven ESL21 student evaluations revealed that majority of the students rated all of the statements in the 60 to 70% range. Six students provided evaluations for ESL 22. Most of the statements were rated between 34% to 50% range with tutors concern for students learning rated at 34%. Reflections on student lab activities and the materials will be addressed by the ESL Coordinator.   ESL tutors received lower ratings in the area "concern for student academic progress" similar to those in the overall TLC student evaluations. This low rating for "tutors concern for student learning" will be addressed by the TLC coordinator and area coordinators in the fall 2015 semester.

As a strategy to increase Effectiveness in the ESL LAB, the Lab Coordinator hosted a mini workshop for students. This student workshop directly related to promoting valuable student input and also increased the number of student evaluations. The following is a detailed report of the outcome of the activity.

<div align="center">

For TLC Assessment Plan - Fall 2014
ESL Lab Report "Mini Workshop"

</div>

On November 7, 2014, the ESL lab hosted a mini workshop titled, "In their shoes: be a professor for a day – Tips for giving written feedback." The workshop took place in the ESL lab, from 2:00-3:00 pm, and was attended by 6 students. Other participants included the five other ESL lab tutoring staff.

The workshop was inspired by an article written for "The Word", a publication locally produced for and by English language professionals affiliated with Hawai`i TESOL

(http://hawaiitesol.wildapricot.org/Resources/Documents/Word/2012%20Feb.pdf). As illustrated in the article, many English language learners (ELL) have little to no experience in providing effective feedback. Therefore, when asked to complete course evaluations, ELLs often provide vague or unconstructive comments. In order to assist students and teachers alike, this workshop was offered to teach students how 1) to give constructive feedback, 2) to assist students with better expressing their opinions in writing, and 3) to give students confidence in completing class evaluations.

In preparation for the workshop, students were paired and grouped with a tutor. Each group was assigned a "stakeholder identity" which corresponded with the delivery of the lesson plan. Thus, one group represented administrators, another represented teachers, and the third represented students. Using these various personas, students were then asked to evaluate sample feedback through the eyes of their assigned identities and to think about the possible implications or impressions that the feedback would make. Lastly, students were guided to transform the comments into meaningful feedback.
Tutors had previously been assigned to cover specific sections of the lesson plan.

The lesson plan for the workshop was as follows:
Title: "In their shoes: be a professor for a day"
Tips for giving written feedback

Objectives:
1.   Students will learn how to provide meaningful feedback
2.   Students will learn how to better express their opinions in writing
3.   Students will have more confidence in completing evaluations

Lesson Plan:
Introduce the workshop. (3 mins)

Explain the significance of providing written feedback: (3 mins)
•   it is a valuable opportunity to support what a teacher is doing well and
•   it is a valuable opportunity to make suggestions for how a teacher can do better

Divide students into 3 groups. (3 mins)
Group 1: Teachers
Group 2: Administrators
Group 3: Students

Explain that at the college level, three groups of people provide feedback to teachers. The groups are: 1) other teachers 2) administrators (people who run and manage the college) and 3) students. (2 mins)

Explain that teachers need feedback (advice) and that they have expectations about the type of feedback that they receive. (2 mins)

Have each individual group: 1) select a note-taker, reporter, and facilitator, 2) determine what they as stakeholders would expect the results of an evaluation to tell them and 3) how they would use the information. (10 mins)

Provide each group with two poorly written evaluations and one well written evaluation. Ask each group to determine: 1) whether the evaluation comments meet their expectations and 2) what the information would lead them to believe about the teacher. (10 mins)

Work to transform the comments into something meaningful. (15 mins)
*Provide list of descriptive verbs and helpful word chunks (i.e.: This class was helpful because… or The teacher can improve the class by -ing…)

Have each stakeholder group share their impressions with all participants: (5 mins)
1.   What did your stakeholder group expect the results of an evaluation to tell them?
2.   How would your group use the information?

Wrap up with a discussion of how students play an important role in teacher evaluations and how this workshop can be applied to other types of evaluations (i.e.: peer evals). (5 mins)

Discuss Questions: (time permitting)

Elicit any questions.
Possible discussion questions include: What is the purpose of evaluations? What are the expectations? How long do people spend on evaluations? How much time/thought/effort is put into them?

Workshop Evaluation Questions: (via email)

How has this workshop prepared you to provide better written feedback?
How are you now better able to express your opinions in writing?

Do you feel more confident about writing feedback for evaluations? Why or why not?
In asking students to evaluate the workshop, the following comments were received:
"1. I feel the evaluation workshop has helped me in some ways. I could evaluate if the teachers are good or bad in doing his/her job, and to give my opinions and suggestions for them to make the teaching better.
2. Yes, now I feel much better to express my feedback in writing. I learned more about how to express my opinions and suggestions more specifically and helpfully.

3. I do feel confident about writing feedback for evaluations now, because I have the experience with the teachers and I now know how to evaluate better."

"1. Yes. The evaluation workshop was helpful to write effective evaluation for each class. If I had not attended the workshop, I would not know how to write effective evaluation, and how important evaluation is. I think pretending ourselves as teachers was efficient to consider what kind of evaluation are needed.
2. Yes. At least I tried.
3. Yes. I do because now what kind of evaluation are needed."

1. Yes, it is helpful. It helps me in future and practice English rightnow.
2. I think so. I think anythings have related with study are helpful.
3. Yes, I feel more confident than before."

In asking other participants to provide feedback, the following comments were received:

"For the most part, I felt that the workshop accomplished what we set out to accomplish and provided students with the vocabulary and information that they needed to write constructive reviews for their teachers and professors. The students seemed engaged and were interacting well during the workshop. There are a few things that I think could happen to help it run more smoothly next time. If those running the workshop met the day before (or anytime) to do a quick run through it would make the workshop flow better. Because there are different people conducting the workshop, maybe transitions could be planned between each tutor's part.
I also think it wouldn't hurt to design and implement a 'check understanding' portion of the workshop to give the students a chance to show that they have a handle on the material. I don't think it would hurt to have the workshop time extended to an hour and fifteen minutes to accommodate for the addition of a 'check understanding' part.
Anyway, thought it went well! I also thought that the students seemed to have fun."

 "What went well:
excellent team/group work--allowed for students to discuss why meaningful evals are important
eval examples were a helpful, concrete aid
writing their own example of corrective feedback (or a bad example)

What can be improved:
practicing ahead of time
clear expectations of what each instructor should focus on
introduction of each task (i.e. transitions) may have been hard for students to understand or connect to main idea"

Summary

In conclusion, the workshop provided meaningful instruction for an unmet need at the college. Though participation was less than expected (an invitation was extended to all students enrolled in all English classes), the students that did attend expressed that the experience was beneficial. From the feedback received verbally and via email, all 6 students noted that the workshop was helpful. Specifically, the students indicated that they felt better equipped to give feedback and that they felt more confident about completing evaluations. This workshop was also helpful in encouraging students to use evaluations as a way to improve their classes. Before the workshop, many students believed that they could not be honest when completing evaluations because they would be identified and retaliated against. This myth was dispelled, but not before all of the staff personally attested to the fact that eCafe evaluations are in fact confidential.

In the future, improvements would be to 1) increase participation and 2) provide more mentoring to the tutors in preparation for presenting the workshop.

Respectfully submitted by Carrie B. Mospens, ESL Lab Coordinator

Each year, the Academic Support Unit sends out a satisfaction survey for the entire campus using survey monkey. The following survey specifically targeted faculty who used TLC and HKATC tutoring services.

Academic Support Unit Satisfaction Survey
Faculty Awareness, Referral, and Satisfaction of Tutoring Services

Survey Question	Centers	Fall 2013		Spring 2014		Spring 2015	
	TLC	31 respondents		34 respondents		36 respondents	
	HKATC	33 respondents		31 respondents		35 respondents	
		yes		yes		yes	
Are you aware of tutoring services?	TLC	97%		85%		89%	
	HKATC	91%		90%		83%	
Have you referred your students for tutoring?	TLC	68%		69%		60%	
	HKATC	71%		69%		51%	
When my students use tutoring services, I feel it positively affects my students' learning.		SA/A	Neutral	SA/A	Neutral	SA/A	Neutral
	TLC	69%	31%	81%	19%	60%	40%
	HKATC	74%	26%	73%	27%	61%	39%

Results from the Academic Support Unit Satisfaction Survey reflect that faculty are aware of TLC and HKATC tutoring services; however, only 60% and 51% respectfully refer their students during spring 2015. In fact, for AY 15, 40% of the faculty who referred their students was neutral in their response to whether tutoring helped their students' learning. Based on these results, this is an area worth exploring.

Unit Outcome #2: TLC/HKATC will provide tutoring services for students to support their success in their academic endeavors: As a strategy, TLC planned to establish Starfish to achieve a 10% increase of student contacts through faculty and student services referrals. We were not able to establish Starfish (new target would be summer 2015) but continued to advertise services and make presentations in classes. Center services were posted on flyers and posted on both campuses. Tutors were sent to classes to invite students to come for tutoring services.

Another strategy to increase student contact as well as support STEM courses occurred when an in-class tutor was hired for BIOL 142 vidcon class from West Hawaii to Hilo. Since the instructor was in West Hawaii with one student and the rest of the class was in Hilo, with approximately 8-10 students, an in-class tutor was provided. An evaluation by students, the tutor, and the instructor was requested to get feedback on the support activity. The tutor reported positive comments from students and also mentioned that he would like to have started at the beginning of the class instead of the 4th week into instruction. I agree that it would have been better if we knew the circumstance earlier, but enrollment in vidcon classes is difficult to predict and the last minute hiring process can cause a delay on when the tutor can start working. Results for BIOL 142 (SPR 15/SPR 13-control group) revealed that the course with the in-class tutor averaged a higher class GPA (3.7 compared to 3.3, 3.1, and 3.0) than those without a tutor (same instructor). Also, the course with the in-class tutor yielded a higher percentage of "A" grades than the other BIOL 142 courses (72% - A's compared to 30%, 50%, and 30%) taught by the same instructor. Regarding pass rates, all four BIOL 142 classes were at 100%. The results from this activity support the use of in-class tutoring for BIOL 142 and this instructor. This activity supports the Center's goal of supporting academic success of STEM majors and will be explored further in the upcoming fall semester.

At the end of the academic year for AY 15, TLC logged a total of 11,660 student contacts, a decrease from 13,691 from AY 14. A slight reduction in all areas except Writing can be seen in the statistics. Establishing Starfish in summer 2015, may increase overall contacts and target special populations. TLC did not meet strategy #2 benchmark of increasing student usage by 10%.   See detailed statistical breakdown below:

TLC	TLC 2013-2014	TLC 2014-2015
Statistics		

# of Student Contacts	13,691	11,660
# of Students Unduplicated	1,740	1,655
# of HawCC Students	1,358	1,351
# of UHH Students	380	303
# of non-HawCC/UHH Students	3	1
Make up tests	235	207
General Study	1,951	1,774
Reading	4,829	4,665
Writing	1,626	1,634
Math	2,059	1,737
ESL	987	694
Courses	102	92
Computer Internet, e-mail, word processing	1,769	971

D) Other Comments

Include any additional information that will help clarify the assessment results. Include comparisons to any applicable College or Unit standards, or to any national standards from industry, professional organizations, or accrediting associations. Include, if relevant, a summary of student survey results, graduate-leaver survey, special studies, or other assessment instruments used.

N/A

E) Next Steps

Based on the Unit's overall AY 2014-15 assessment results, describe the Unit's intended next steps to improve services in support of the College's Mission of promoting student learning. Discuss plans the Unit has developed for continuous improvement based on assessment results.

1. Continue pursuing the use of Starfish management system for TLC and HKATC for checking in students, tracking their success, providing feedback to faculty who use TLC tutors, and keeping track of data needed for reporting purposes.

2. Increase success rate of students in Biology by supporting the STEM Center with a tutor. 70% of students tutored will pass their Biology classes with a "C" grade or better.
3. Provide wrap-around services for students placing below the college level courses.
4. Develop more positive level of satisfaction ratings from faculty who refer their students for tutoring.
5. Increase the number of tutors becoming CRLA certified by 10%.