Department: Math Learning Center (MLC)  Manager: Eldon Young

Names of those participating in the report: Eldon Young, Virginia Derakhshanian, Kevin Peery, Gonzalo Arenas, Zoe Megginson, Daren Smoley, David Nusbaum, and Richard Fee

Date: November 25th, 2009  Date of previous quality review: February 7th, 2009

Student Satisfaction with Support Services Provided:

*Please indicate the proportions (%) of students who rated each aspect as “excellent” or “good” (separately and combined). The Cypress College standard is met whenever 75% or more of responses fall in the “good” or “excellent” categories (combined).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student satisfaction with:</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding Good / Excellent (Combined %)</th>
<th>College Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Excellent”</td>
<td>“Good”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of operation</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of response</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of procedures</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of materials</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>93.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor helpfulness</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor knowledge</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of service</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department-specific indicators (if applicable):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding Good / Excellent (Combined %)</th>
<th>College Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computer program helpfulness</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough tutors</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough computer stations</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Changes since last quality review

Please provide a comparative analysis of current results with the previous cycle.

Regarding the combined “good/excellent” ratings, the overall quality of service has improved 3.5%, including modest to substantial improvement in nine areas: timeliness of response (1.7%), clarity of procedures (7.4%), quality of materials (7.1%), tutor helpfulness (9.5%), tutor knowledge (14.4%), enough tutors (22.6%), enough computer stations (12.6%), and ease-of-use of pay-for-print stations (31.6%). There was also a substantial decrease in satisfaction with the hours of operation (23.9%). The latter can be attributed to the loss of a dedicated, full-time instructor who was previously in charge of the MLC.

Student Learning Outcomes

Please provide a summary of Student Learning Outcomes according to the Five-Column Model for the department.

Survey responses by 115 students indicated an overall high level of satisfaction: 92.1 percent. Although there was substantial improvement in the area of tutor availability (in comparison to the previous survey), the 68.2 percent level of satisfaction does not meet the college standard of 75 percent. The 63.7 percent level of satisfaction with the hours of operation also does not meet the college standard.

Faculty/Staff Involvement

Summarize the involvement of faculty/staff in the review process.

All LRC staff members were consulted in the development of the student surveys; and almost all were involved in the evaluation of the results. The Math Department Coordinator and Science/Engineering/Math Dean also participated in the review process.
Narrative

Reflect on standards met and any standards not met.

Standards Met – To be used when department wants to improve on an indicator even though a standard for this indicator has been met. Use this section to briefly reflect upon major accomplishments.

The biggest improvement was in the level of satisfaction with the pay-for-print system: a new one was recently acquired. Improvements in the quality of materials and staff helpfulness and knowledge are also notable.

Standards Not Met – Please provide any insight into significant challenges or obstacles that may have contributed to low student satisfaction. Identify the types of changes necessary for improvement.

The two areas that fail to meet the college standard (hours of operation and enough tutors) are intertwined in that the MLC closes when no tutors are available. More funds are needed to hire additional tutors.

Previous Review Goals and Objectives

Please describe if the goals and objectives identified in the previous review was met or not. Please provide explanations if the goals were not met.

I. 1. Improve access to all students through the purchase of PLATO mathematics application appropriate to the needs of basic skills math students.

Three PLATO stations were purchased.

I. 2. Improve access to all students through the training of tutors and faculty on the use of PLATO mathematics application.

Math faculty members received training.

II. 1.2. & 3. Expansion of math/science tutorial support (three phases)

Math and science tutoring has expanded.

Long-range Plan and Objectives

In the following section, identify general goals and specific, measurable objectives your area plans to achieve within the next three years. Programs should identify 3-5 goals, with at least one goal per year. Goals set for next year that require fiscal resources must also be submitted as a Budget Request and Action Plan (separate form).

I. Goal: Improve Staff Helpfulness

Supports Strategic Direction (if applicable): Two—Student and Academic Support Services: Developing and providing comprehensive student and academic support services to foster a positive and effective learning environment.

1. Objective: Provide one-on-one math tutoring for all levels of math.

1.1 Person(s) responsible: Dean of the L/LRC

1.2 Timeframe: Spring 2011

1.3 Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): $36,244 (annual cost)
2. Objective: Install EWPATAS scanning system to track impact of tutoring on student academic success.
   2.1 Person(s) responsible: Dean of the L/LRC
   2.2 Timeframe: Fall 2010
   2.3 Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

3. Objective: Hire a Director
   3.1 Person(s) responsible: Math Dept. Coordinator & L/LRC Dean
   3.2 Timeframe: Fall 2010
   3.3 Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): $25,000 annually

II. Goal: Improve Hours of Operation
Supports Strategic Direction (if applicable): Two—Student and Academic Support Services: Developing and providing comprehensive student and academic support services to foster a positive and effective learning environment.

1. Objective: Increase number of math tutors to expand hours of the MLC (9:00 to 7:00 Mon-Thurs & 9:00 to 5:00 Fri)
   1.1 Person(s) responsible: Dean of the L/LRC
   1.2 Timeframe: Fall 2012
   1.3 Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): $4,850 annually

III. Goal: Improve Materials (including technology)
Supports Strategic Direction (if applicable): Two—Student and Academic Support Services: Developing and providing comprehensive student and academic support services to foster a positive and effective learning environment.

1. Objective: With changes in textbooks, ensure timely updating of solutions manuals and instructional software.
   1.1 Person(s) responsible: Dean of the L/LRC
   1.2 Timeframe: Ongoing
   1.3 Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

2. Objective: Purchase four computers and one printer to accommodate one-on-one math tutoring.
   2.1 Person(s) responsible: Dean of the L/LRC
   2.2 Timeframe: Fall 2012
   2.3 Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): $5004 (computers) & $435 (printer)

Use the above outline format to add additional goals or objectives as necessary.
Additional resource requirement identified by the results of the Quality Review

Identify the resources needed by the department. The resource identification process should link the findings of survey with SLOs and departmental mission. The resource needs should address two distinct areas:

- **Facilities**
  
  *No needs at this time.*

- **Technology**
  
  *The technology request is relevant to the L/LRC’s mission: “to support the campus and community by encouraging life-long learning, including the abilities to locate, evaluate, and apply information to daily living.” All requests are also relevant to SLO’s, which were measured in the surveys: “students will experience satisfaction with the support received in the L/LRC in terms of physical facilities, skilled and caring staff, services and tools that enhance academic advancement, and access to information required to meet their educational needs.”*

Fiscal resources and planning

Describe how the department wants to utilize the resources to accomplish its goals. Please provide an analysis of how the department plans to achieve its goals if resources identified are not available immediately.

*The MLC will look for funding support from the Basic Skills Initiative, Title V and other grants, and Cypress College One-Time Funding Requests. Without this support, objectives that require financial resources cannot be achieved.*
Reminder: If fiscal resources are needed for next year’s goals, submit a separate Budget Request and Action Plan for budget unit review.