Program Efficacy Report
Spring 2013

Name of Department: Success Center/Tutoring

Efficacy Team: **Yon Che, Denise Knight and Geoff Schroder**

Overall Recommendation (include rationale): Conditional

The Student Success Center/Tutoring efficacy report demonstrates that there is clearly an unmet need in the area of academic support for Valley College students. The Program Review Process should have been the perfect opportunity to tell the story of the Student Success Center and its relevance to our campus community, unfortunately the document provided was more of a first draft as opposed to a final report. Relevant questions went unanswered and in the areas where data was provided it was either not adequately analyzed or the analysis was not in line with the data presented. For this reason the efficacy team is recommending Conditional.

Strategic Initiative	Institutional Expectations	
	Does Not Meet	**Meets**
	Part I: Access	
Demographics	*The program does not provide an appropriate analysis regarding identified differences in the program's population compared to that of the general population*	*The program provides an analysis of the demographic data and provides an interpretation in response to any identified variance.* *If warranted, discuss the plans or activities that are in place to recruit and retain underserved populations.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not Meet

Although demographic data was provided the analysis of the data was insufficient. The variances indicated in the demographic information provided were either not addressed or poorly explained.

Pattern of Service	*The program's pattern of service is not related to the needs of students.*	*The program provides <u>evidence</u> that the pattern of service or instruction meets student needs.* *If warranted, plans or activities are in place to meet a broader range of needs.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not meet

Although a lot of information was provided ie. Hours of operation and actual contact hours the document did not provide <u>evidence</u> that the pattern of service met the needs of the students. A student evaluation form/questionnaire or user satisfaction survey could have been used to document whether the needs of the students were being fully met. The survey could be completed on a periodic basis.

Part II: Student Success		
Data demonstrating achievement of instructional or service success	*Program does not provide an adequate analysis of the data provided with respect to relevant program data.*	*Program provides an <u>analysis</u> of the data which indicates progress on departmental goals.* *If applicable, supplemental data is analyzed.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not meet

Although the information was provided the document does not reflect an adequate anlaysis of the data. For example, the number of students served has increased but how has that increase in contact hours impacted student success?

Student Learning Outcomes and/or Student Achievement Outcomes	*Program has not demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.*	*Program has demonstrated that they have made progress on Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) and/or Service Area Outcomes (SAOs) based on the plans of the college since their last program efficacy.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not meet

No SAOs have been developed for this program. No time table provided to indicate when SAOs would be established.

Part III: Institutional Effectiveness		
Mission and Purpose	*The program does not have a mission, or it does not clearly link with the institutional mission.*	*The program has a mission, and it links clearly with the institutional mission.*
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets		
Productivity	*The data does not show an acceptable level of productivity for the program, or the issue of productivity is not adequately addressed.*	*The data shows the program is productive at an acceptable level.*
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Meets **Although the numbers indicate that the Student Success Center/Tutoring is operating at an acceptable level of productivity, the presentation and analysis of this information could have been clearer.**		
Relevance, Currency, Articulation	*The program does not provide evidence that it is relevant, current, and that courses articulate with CSU/UC, if appropriate.* *Out of date course(s) that are not launched into Curricunet by Oct. 1 may result in an overall recommendation no higher than Conditional.*	*The program provides evidence that the curriculum review process is up to date. Courses are relevant and current to the mission of the program. Appropriate courses have been articulated or transfer with UC/CSU, or plans are in place to articulate appropriate courses.*
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not meet **There was no narrative provided to address the relevance of the information listed. The rest of the questions (i.e. Content Review and Articulation and Transfer were left unanswered. If the information was not applicable that should have been indicated.**		
Part IV: Planning		
Trends	*The program does not identify major trends, or the plans are not supported by the data and information provided.*	*The program identifies and describes major trends in the field. Program addresses how trends will affect enrollment and planning. Provide data or research from the field for support.*
Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not meet **There was no narrative provided to explain how the major trend listed impacted the discipline, student enrollment/service utilization. Nor was any explanation provided to explain how the trend impacts future planning.**		

Accomplishments	*The program does not incorporate accomplishments and strengths into planning.*	*The program incorporates substantial accomplishments and strengths into planning.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not meet

This item was marked N/A but should have been used to summarize information provided in page three of the document.

Weaknesses/challenges	*The program does not incorporate weaknesses and challenges into planning.*	*The program incorporates weaknesses and challenges into planning.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not meet

Although six challenges were listed there was no narrative provided to connect how future planning would address the challenges or the trends and weaknesses identified in the program.

Part V: Technology, Partnerships & Campus Climate		
	Program does not demonstrate that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate. *Program does not have plans to implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships, or Campus Climate.*	*Program demonstrates that it incorporates the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.* *Program has plans to further implement the strategic initiatives of Technology, Partnerships and/or Campus Climate.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback: Does not meet

This was another failed opportunity to address the strengths of the program. In actuality this item was left blank. Although the efficacy team was aware of some of the technology being used in the program (ie. The San Bernardino Valley College website (the document failed to demonstrate how the technology, partnerships or campus climate are incorporated into the program. No partnerships either internal or external were identified. Additionally no plans to implement strategic initiatives of Campus Climate Technology, Partnerships or Campus Climate were indicated.

Part VI: Previous Does Not Meets Categories	
Program does not show that previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.	*Program describes how previous deficiencies have been adequately remedied.*

Efficacy Team Analysis and Feedback (N/A if there were no "Does not Meets" in the previous efficacy review):
N/A (first submission by the Student Success Center/Tutoring).