Executive Summary

Q:
A brief recap or highlights of the entire program review document. (500 words or less)

- Highlight major strengths and weakness.
- Highlight areas for improvement over the next 3-6 years.

Response:

Reviewing data, evaluating strengths and goals, and developing and implementing concrete strategies for systematic improvement remain cornerstones of informed, responsible assessment. Moreover, for a new program such as Academic Resource Center developed in 2014, these steps are critical in ensuring that a department in its initial stages is on track for meeting student needs and supporting the College's mission defined in the education master plan. With data indicating that the Academic Resource Center (ARC) makes a significant contribution in increasing student, success, and retention, the evaluation after the first year is promising. However, the data also suggests a reconsideration of class scheduling to maximize success for Writing Center courses, to focus on increasing awareness of all tutoring services to boost enrollment, and to institutionalize baseline funding to maximize the College's capacity for generating revenue.

 Success, retention, and persistence data for the overall ARC department on average meet and exceed college standards. For ARC's primary course Supervised Learning Assistance, data shows that Students who use tutoring succeed up to 15% higher, and they are retained at up to 8% higher than those who do not use tutoring. The data also shows that for the Writing tutoring completely mitigates the success gap for race and age. On average a student without tutoring has a 70% success rate. All racial demographics succeed at over 79+% with tutoring. All age demographics pass at an 83+%. In math, students without tutoring pass their courses at a 49% success rate. With tutoring most the lowest performing group's success rate increase to 48% for African Americans, 57% for Hispanics, and 51% for students over the age of 55 erasing the success gap for all but one low performing demographics. The impact tutoring has on persistence is also significant. Data from the OEI shows that without tutoring services, the students persist at 51%; however, with tutoring on average students persist at 71% (and with 16-20 hours of tutoring up to 86%. Conversely, for the Writing Center's English 67 and 68 courses, the success rates are slightly lower than College Standard (63% compared to 65%). The uniquely flexible schedule of these courses was designed to provide a framework for students to take advantage of the service, yet, the success rates, being below the institutional standard, reflect that this flexible structure may be a contributing factor comprising student success.

Increasing awareness of the services is an important area of focus for moving forward. In the Fall 2014 LAVC (Core) Campus Wide Survey, 25% of students surveyed used the Math Lab, 23% used the Writing Center, and 15% used the General Tutoring Services. When asked why the students did not use the service, 6.5% said they were uncomfortable asking for help and 12% did not know that tutoring services were available. Similarly, when asked about Writing Center Workshops, 37% of students surveyed were not aware of the workshops. When looking at the percentage of students who are categorized as "at risk" through 3SP efforts, it underscores the needs to create a more structured pathway for providing academic support to more students. More work needs to be done in terms of raising awareness about the services, and coordinating thoughtful integration into existing courses to provide the necessary ancillary support students.

Perhaps the most important factor that will contribute to the success of the Academic Resource Center is to institutionalize baseline funding. As noted throughout the program review document, over the last eight years, program 10100 funding decreased 74% while tutor salaries increased 84%. Although the College prioritized tutoring through Tutor Conference Committee Recommendation, and decentralized tutoring centers were consolidated into the Academic Resource Center to increase coordination and efficiency, funding remains a challenge. Currently, the Academic Resource Center operates through a portion of general funds, with a heavy reliance on grant funding in order to provide enough access to meet campus needs. As a short term solution grant funding has been critical for providing access; however, baseline funding must be established and implemented for the ARC to continue meeting campus needs and supporting the education master plan in the absence of external funds. The sum total of existing grant funding that's providing an adequate level of access may be one approach to establishing a clearer picture of baseline funding.

Participants

Q: Please indicate the individuals that participated in the completion of this program review.

Response:

The following individuals contributed information to help complete this program review:

Robert Leavitt

Lily Salter

Nick Olshansky

Holly Batty

Jose Cancino

Farzeneh Sheikholeslami

Deborah diCesare

Ani Zarpas

Scott Weigand

Validation & Feedback

Validation Comments for Program

Q:

Response:

The executive summary captures the essence of the program.

*Reviewed. KD

Comments for Review Committees

Q:

Response: