# **Spring 2011 Tutoring Analysis**

Spring 2011, Cerro Coso focused on analyzing tutoring data from our campuses We sought to describe how tutoring usage impacted student performance. Infrastructure is being developed to allow more robust tracking of tutoring effectiveness on class performance and outcomes.

Spring 2011, 251 students enrolled in our open entry/open exit Supervised Tutoring\* course over four campuses. Two criteria, (reliable data collection and a threshold of 4 hours or more of tutoring) reduced usable data to 61% or 154 students. Unusable data (39%) was attributed to tutoring of 0-3 hours or invalid data.

#### **Results:**

Class performance when compared to hours tutoring showed 74.7% of students with 4 or more hours received grades above a "C" and the remaining 25.3 percent were below a "C".

We broke tutoring into four hour increments. The number and % of students with below "C' performance decreased steadily such that 20% used only 4-13 hours while 3.9% students used 14-18 hours. By comparison 45 % of students with 'C' or better used 4-13 hours while 26.5 % used 14-23 hours. The average hours tutoring for below "C' students was 6.5 as compared to 19 for the above "C' group.

In total 95% of tutoring hours were within the range of 4-23 hours and 81.3 % were in the range of 4-18 hours.

### Considerations:

- 1. Infrastructure for accurate data tracking is needed.
- 2. Actual numbers fall to fall need to determine the impact of "Supervised Tutoring" on student enrollment.
- 3. The impact of tutoring on subsequent semesters GPA
- 4. Do students in tutoring do better than class counterparts?
- 5. Would a tutoring limit of 18 sessions be a reasonable consideration?
- 6. What are the reasons for students who use less than for hours
- 7. Why do some not follow through with needed tutoring?
- 8. What is the impact of requiring referrals?

<sup>\*</sup> The course name was changed during the semester to Supervised Tutoring from a lab due to state requirements covering supplemental instruction therefore all students Spring 2011 were self-referrals.

### **Analysis Fall 2011 Tutoring**

Student Learning Outcomes showed great improvement over previous data. We were unable to include several groups' data due to incomplete sheets over multiple sessions.

### SLO's at IWV

#1 student will identify question or difficulty at the beginning of a session by the fourth tutoring session

91%. This showed the greatest improvement but is still lower than other areas, so the pattern is consistent with previous findings

#2 Student will articulate what was learned during a session either to the tutor or in writing by the fourth session. 95% were able to do so.

#3 Student will identify specific study strategy for use after the session by the fourth session. 93% were able to do so.

The Bishop campus did not provide Tutoring sheets- only an hourly tally sheets. Grades are reported for this campus.

### SLO's at KRV

All students with 4 or more hours met the student learning outcomes.

**SLO's at ESCC.** Of the students with four or more hours for SLO #1 62.5 % students identified a need or came with questions SLO #2 87.5 % of the students articulated what they learned during a session SLO #3 100 % identified a study skill

\_\_\_\_\_\_

# SLOs only deal with expectations for INST C004 other data is relevant to student success.

Data Set #1 -Hourly use- less than four hours used

# students	grade	hrs used average
5	A	2
8	В	2.85
4	C	2.62
1	D	3
6	F	2.5
6	W	2.16

Conclusion- NONE-Other analysis is needed.

### Data set #2 Hours used over 15 hours

Range 16-47.25 for known DSPS students

4	NP/F	average 21.03 hrs	range 17-47.25
1	A	16 hrs	
2	В	21.62	
3	C	27	

Conclusion: A few students use large amounts of time are self-identified DSPS students

# Data Set#3 Range for known ESL 15-35.25

1	A	18
4	В	20
2	C	30

Conclusion: Some students identified as ESL also use large amounts of time but tend to be successful.

Data Set #4 Others using over 15 hours

2	A	16.75
2	В	15
3	C	17.3
1	D	19.75

Conclusion Data Sets 1-4: Most students who require large amounts of time do well, the few who do not may be DSPS or ESL.

# Analysis of all students using between 4-15 hours tutoring

Majority of students with

A's used 12-15 hours

B' used 8-11 hours

C's 8-11 hours

D's 4-7 hours

F/W 4-7 hours

Further analysis of D/W/F showed of the students using 4-7 hours those receiving D's F's W's constituted 58.6% of those students. Of those using more hours 8-11 the number decreased to 20% receiving D's, F's or W's.With 12-15 hours the number was slightly more than ½ % receiving D's, F's or W's.

Conclusion: Students should receive a minimum of 8 hours of tutoring for success to occur. This is similar to previous years' calculations.

Classes with the greatest number of D/F/W's were all basic skills courses. #1 English 40=8, #2 math 50=5 then third with English 30, math 20 & 40 each with four.

Of the total number of students at IWW who received at least one hour of tutoring 70.7 % were successful in the courses for which they received tutoring.

## KRV-

55% of students receiving tutoring had NP, W or F with an average of 9.8 hours The majority of the remaining (45%) of students received C's with an average of 10.4 hours

Analysis needs to be done on why these statistics are vastly different from IWV.

15 % of the students receiving tutoring received D,F,W grades with an average of 5.5 hours

Of the remaining students their average number of hours was 4.1. It is theorized students used fewer hours to reach levels above IWV was again the use of faculty for tutoring.

Further analysis is needed as to why at all three campuses unsuccessful students used and average number of hours greater than successful students and if these students fall into groups of students with additional needs such as DSPS students or ESL students. IF so, what should be done differently to reach these students..