2024 Annual Report of Program Data Tutoring



1. Program or Unit Mission

Mission Statement: To help empower students to become efficient, confident, and independent learners and develop the requisite skills they need to achieve their academic, career, and personal goals, thus enabling them to lead self-directed and productive lives now and in the future.

The tutoring center, the Academic Support Center (ASC), is available to support student learning by providing tutoring services in person or online. The ASC offers mostly math and writing tutoring but also provides tutoring in chemistry, accounting, and other subjects as demand and availability of tutors allow.

Next CPR: 2026

2. Program Student Learning Outcomes or Unit/Service Outcomes

#	Student and Faculty Information	2019 - 2020	2020 - 2021	2021 - 2022	2022- 2023	2023- 2024
1	Annual Unduplicated Head					
	Count	1,788	1,835	1,715	1,623	1,697
2	Annual FTE Faculty	67	66	65	54	53
2a	Annual FTE Staff	99	102	95	91	84
3	Annual Students	654	651	527	525	547
#	Demand Indicators	2019 - 2020	2020 - 2021	2021 - 2022	2022- 2023	2023- 2024
4	Unduplicated number of students Tutored in one-on-one sessions per Student FTE	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.25	0.27
5	Unduplicated number of students enrolled in Dev/Ed classes who were tutored per number of students enrolled in Dev/Ed classes	0.3	0.3	0.89	0.36	0.38
#	Efficiency Indicators	2019 - 2020	2020 - 2021	2021 - 2022	2022- 2023	2023- 2024

2024 Kaua'i Community College ARPD Program: Tutoring

6	Tutor contact hours per tutor paid hours in one-on-one sessions	0.47	0.24	0.17	0.13	0.25
7	Duplicated number of students tutored in groups per tutor paid	0.42	0.23	0.67	0.1	0.11
8	Tutoring budget per student contact hours					
#	Effectiveness Indicators	2019 - 2020	2020 - 2021	2021 - 2022	2022- 2023	2023- 2024
		2020	2021		2020	202.

Effectiveness Indicators – Community College				
Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)	2016	2018	2022	2024
Tutored or taught other students (survey item 4.h)				
Mean	1.69	1.43	N/A	1.42
Very Often	3.0%	3.5%	4.2%	3.2%
Often	5.6%	5.6%	4.2%	4.1%
Sometimes	19.2%	21.5%	14.5%	23.7%
Never	72.1%	69.3%	78.5%	68.9%
Frequency of using peer or other tutor (survey Item 12.1.d)				
5 or more times	1.35	1.08	8.5%	16.8%
2-4 times	9.7%	17.3%	12.9%	20.7%
1 time	21.8%	21.7%	10.7%	7.5%
Never	45,8%	12.6%	67.8%	55.0%
N/A	22.7%	48.4%		
Satisfaction with peer or other tutoring (survey Item 12.2.d)				
Mean	2.23	1.59	N/A	1.81
Very	21.8%	34.9%	57.7%	84.5%
Somewhat	24.9%	1.7%	5.3%	12.0%
Not at All	8.8%	1.7%	5.3%	3.7%
N/A	44.6%	44.2%	0.9%	
	Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Tutored or taught other students (survey item 4.h) Mean Very Often Often Sometimes Never Frequency of using peer or other tutor (survey Item 12.1.d) 5 or more times 2-4 times 1 time Never Never N/A Satisfaction with peer or other tutoring (survey Item 12.2.d) Mean Very Somewhat Not at All	Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) 2016 Tutored or taught other students (survey item 4.h) Mean 1.69 Very Often 3.0% 3.0% Often 5.6% Sometimes 19.2% Never 72.1% Frequency of using peer or other tutor (survey Item 12.1.d) 5 or more times 2-4 times 9.7% 1.35 Never 45,8% Never 45,8% Never 45,8% N/A 22.7% Satisfaction with peer or other tutoring (survey Item 12.2.d) Mean 2.23 Very 21.8% Somewhat 24.9% Not at All 8.8%	Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) 2016 2018 Tutored or taught other students (survey item 4.h) Mean 1.69 1.43 Very Often 3.0% 3.5% Often 5.6% 5.6% Sometimes 19.2% 21.5% Never 72.1% 69.3% Frequency of using peer or other tutor (survey Item 12.1.d) 1.35 1.08 2-4 times 9.7% 17.3% 1 time 21.8% 21.7% Never 45,8% 12.6% N/A 22.7% 48.4% Satisfaction with peer or other tutoring (survey Item 12.2.d) Mean 2.23 1.59 Very 21.8% 34.9% Somewhat 24.9% 1.7% Not at All 8.8% 1.7%	Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) 2016 2018 2022 Tutored or taught other students (survey item 4.h) Mean 1.69 1.43 N/A Very Often 3.0% 3.5% 4.2% Often 5.6% 5.6% 4.2% Sometimes 19.2% 21.5% 14.5% Never 72.1% 69.3% 78.5% Frequency of using peer or other tutor (survey Item 12.1.d) 1.35 1.08 8.5% 2-4 times 9.7% 17.3% 12.9% 1 time 21.8% 21.7% 10.7% Never 45,8% 12.6% 67.8% N/A 22.7% 48.4% Satisfaction with peer or other tutoring (survey Item 12.2.d) Mean 2.23 1.59 N/A Very 21.8% 34.9% 57.7% Somewhat 24.9% 1.7% 5.3% Not at All 8.8% 1.7% 5.3%

Program: Tutoring

13	Importance of peer or other tutoring (survey item				
	12.3.d)				
	Mean	2.20	2.42	N/A	2.5
	Very	44.3%	58.1%	44.2%	58.2%
	Somewhat	31.6%	25.5%	34.6%	33.3%
	Not at All	24.0%	16.5%	21.1%	8.4%
14	Frequency of using skills labs – writing, math,				
	Etc. (survey item 12.1.e)				
	5 or more times	1.75	0.82	11.0	11.9
	2-4 times	17.3%	15.2%	13.3%	58.2%
	1 time	25.4%	13.8%	9.2%	7.6%
	Never	37.1%	9.2%	6.5%	69.6%
	NA	20.3%	61.8%	N/A	
15	Satisfaction with skills labs – Writing, math, etc.				
	(survey item 12.2.d)				
	Mean	2.3	1.51	N/A	1.33
	Very	25.6%	24.1%	57%	84.4%
	Somewhat	28.6%	17.3%	37.6%	12.0%
	Not at All	6.9%	2.1%	4.2%	3.7%
	N/A	39.0%	2.1%	4.2%	
16	Importance of skill labs – writing, math, etc. (survey				
	Item 12.3.e)				
	Mean	2.6	2.20	N/A	2.23
	Very	47.3%	43.8%	34.6%	45.0%
	Somewhat	31.2%	32.0%	34.6%	32.8%
	Not at All	21.5%	24.1%	21.1%	22.1%

PSLO: Students who receive tutoring will pass their tutored course. The desired outcome is to increase the student pass rate in tutored courses as measured in QI 9.

Results: The pass rate decreased from .75 to .74.

The pass rate for students who received tutoring and those who did not receive tutoring was compared in the following courses: Eng. 75, Eng. 100, Math 75X, Math 88, and Math 103. Tutored students passed at a rate of 74%. Those who did not receive tutoring passed at a rate of 81%.

3. Analysis of the Program/Unit

The number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions (QI 4) increased slightly from 0.25 last year to 0.27 this year.

Similarly, the number of unduplicated developmental students (QI 5) tutored increased slightly from 0.36 to 0.38 from the previous year. As in recent years, the campus still has smaller class sizes and

Program: Tutoring

more nontraditional classes. This results in fewer requests for embedded tutors which impact this indicator.

Efficiency in one-on-one sessions (QI 6) increased from 0.13 to 0.25 after three years of decreases.

Efficiency for group sessions (QI 7) which includes embedded and group tutoring increased from 0.1 in the '22-'23 academic year to 0.11 in the '23-'24.

Math faculty held weekly tutoring sessions in the ASC. These tutoring sessions are not included in the data report.

CCSSE:

The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) was administered in 2024. Comparisons are based on the 2022 survey results.

QI 10 asks how often students tutored or taught other students. Possible answers are very often, often, sometimes, and never.

The number of students who answered *very often* or *often* decreased by 1%, while the number of students who answered *sometimes* increased by over 9%. The number of students who answered *never* decreased by 8%.

QI 11 addresses the frequency of using peer or other tutors. Possible replies are 5 or more times, 2-4 times, 1 time, and never.

Students who answered 5 or more times increased by 8.3%. Students who answered 2-4 times increased by almost 8%. Students who answered 1 time or never answered decreased by almost 3% and by almost 8% respectively.

QI 12 addresses student satisfaction with peer or other tutoring. Possible replies were very, somewhat, and not at all.

Students who were *very satisfied* increased by nearly 27%. Those who were *somewhat satisfied* increased by 6.7%. Students who said they were not *at all satisfied* decreased by 1.6%.

QI 13 asks students about the importance of peer or other tutoring. Possible replies are very, somewhat, and not at all.

Students who replied *very* increased by 14%. Students who replied *somewhat* decreased by 1.3%. Those who replied *not at all* decreased by 12.7%.

QI 14 asks about the frequency of using skill labs - writing, math, etc. Possible replies were 5 or more times, 2-4 times, 1 time, never.

Students who answered *5 or more times* increased by 0.9%. Students who answered *2-4 times* increased nearly 50%. Students who answered *1 time* decreased by 2.4%. Students who answered that they never used skills labs increased by 63.1%.

QI 15 addresses student satisfaction with skill labs - writing, math, etc. Possible replies were very, somewhat, and not at all.

Program: Tutoring

Students who answered *very* increased by 34.4%. Students who responded *somewhat* decreased by 25.6%. Those who answered *not at all* decreased by 0.5%.

QI 16 asks respondents to rate the importance of skill labs. Possible answers were very, somewhat, and not at all.

Those who answered *very* increased by 10.4%. Those students who answered *somewhat* decreased by 1.8%. Those who responded *not at all* remained the same as the last time the CCSSE was administered in 2022.

While QI 10 through QI 13 pose questions that respondents likely answer based on tutoring received in the ASC, QI 14 through QI 16 uses the phrase "skill labs." Kauai CC does not have skill labs like some of the other community colleges in the UH system, so it's unclear whether students are basing their answers on tutors and tutoring the ASC provides.

Staff: Staffing consisted of three professional tutors, three peer tutors, and one community volunteer (in the fall semester). Attempts to recruit peer tutors remained difficult, so the ASC was never fully staffed in the fall or spring semesters.

Training: Meetings and training were held on an as-needed basis. Topics covered included procedures, professionalism in person and on the phone, helping students fulfill their responsibilities when requesting tutoring support, tutor responsibilities during a tutoring session, and learning styles.

Online tutoring: There were 47 one-on-one Zoom sessions.

Tutor.com: In the previous reporting year, 362 hours of Tutor.com usage compared to 376 hours used this year (the 2023-2024 AY). There were 611 live sessions last year and 533 this year. Notably, the number of math sessions decreased by 38, down to only 11 for the 2023-2024 AY. This is likely due to a lack of confidence the math faculty have in the service. The most used service offered by Tutor.com is the drop-off essay review with 389 last reporting year and 413 this reporting year.

Student Evaluation of Tutors: Students evaluated tutors for approximately three weeks in the fall semester and three weeks in the spring semester. The following eight questions are asked on a questionnaire that students fill out and submit anonymously. The questions on the evaluation are:

- Did the Tutor arrive on time for the appointment, if applicable?
- Did the Tutor seem supportive?
- Was the tutor knowledgeable in the specific subject area?
- Did the tutor respond positively to your questions and concerns?
- Did the tutor provide adequate explanations?
- Was the tutor attentive?
- Would you recommend this tutor to another student?
- Do you feel better prepared after tutoring than you did before?

Program: Tutoring

The possible responses are Yes, No, Somewhat, and N/A. There is a place on the form for students to write in comments if they choose.

Of the 37 evaluations (fall and spring semesters combined) submitted, there were 286 yes replies, 5 somewhat replies, and 5 N/A replies. As in previous years the evaluations, including the comments, were overwhelmingly positive.

Class Visits: Ten class visits were conducted either in classrooms or impromptu mini-tours of the ASC when instructors brought their classes in to see the tutoring area and hear about the services offered.

Study Sessions: Math tutors attempt to set up study sessions right after class when scheduling allows. These sessions are not well attended.

4. Action Plan

Goals to increase the number of students tutored in one-on-one sessions and students in developmental classes increased, although very slightly in both instances. These efforts align with KCC goals 1 & 2 and strategic goals 1,4,6, and 7.

The action plan will remain largely unchanged. Class visits will continue to be promoted and study sessions will be offered proactively by tutors. Attempts to hire more peer tutors will continue. As the campus returns to more in-person classes, recruiting peer tutors will become easier. With more peer tutors more embedded tutors will likely be requested. As the number of tutors and embedded tutors increases, the results of both goals are expected to improve.

One finding this reporting year was a significant decrease in the pass rate for students who received tutoring compared to those who did not. Training, availability, and staffing have been constant in recent years. That said, this finding brings to mind several questions. Is there a different population requesting tutoring? How well did the tutored students do in other classes for which no tutoring was provided? Was there a difference in readiness? Were these students full-time or part-time? These questions and perhaps similar ones will be explored next year.

5. Resource Implications

☒ I am NOT requesting additional resources for my program/unit.