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## INTRODUCTION

The Basic Skills Initiative/Title V Hispanic Serving Institution Steering Committee is charged with implementing a broad collection of activities and services geared toward improving student outcomes for basic skills and disadvantaged students. As part of the effort to make ongoing improvements to these activities and services, the Office of Institutional Research and Planning has collected data relevant to some of these components. The current focus of this study is on (1) Learning Communities, (2), the Teaching and Learning Center, (3) Tutoring, and (4) Summer Bridge. This report summarizes the data gathered in this effort.

## BASIC SKILLS STUDENTS

Before focusing on the activities, it may be informative to examine some data regarding basic skills students. Therefore, this section presents data regarding placement, basic skills course taking, and some demographics of basic skills students

## Placement

For the purposes of this report, basic skills students are defined as students who are taking a basic skills course (regardless of placement). So, a basic skills student is one who in a given term is taking a course numbered below 50. However, it is still useful to consider the placement of our students. The numbers of placements per academic year are shown in Table BS1.

Table BS1. Placements by Academic Year

| Academic <br> Year | Subject |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | English | ESL | Math | Reading |
| $2009-10$ | 9,022 | 2,314 | 9,558 | 9,013 |
| $2010-11$ | 8,801 | 1,894 | 9,103 | 8,800 |
| $2011-12$ | 7,969 | 1,650 | 8,575 | 7,967 |

Tables BS2 through BS5 display the levels at which students were placed in each subject area. For English, two out of five of those assessed were placed at transfer level. For math, approximately 11-12\% were placed at transfer level. However, for reading, twothirds were placed at transfer level. Of the ESL placements, half were at seven or eight levels below college level.

Table BS2. English Placement Level by Academic Year

| English Placement Level | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ | $2011-12$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $100+$ - Transfer Level | $39.6 \%$ | $39.7 \%$ | $39.0 \%$ |
| $50-1$ Level Below Transfer | $26.1 \%$ | $26.2 \%$ | $26.8 \%$ |
| $10-2$ Levels Below Transfer | $34.3 \%$ | $34.1 \%$ | $34.2 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table BS3. ESL Placement Level by Academic Year

| ESL Placement Level | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ | $2011-12$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 103 - 1 Level Prior to College | $3.5 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ |
| 102 - 2 Levels Prior to College | $4.4 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |
| 101 - 3 Levels Prior to College | $8.0 \%$ | $7.6 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ |
| 36/55 - 4 Levels Prior to College | $12.3 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ |
| $35 / 45$ - Levels Prior to College | $11.8 \%$ | $11.4 \%$ | $12.4 \%$ |
| 34 - 6 Levels Prior to College | $10.7 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ |
| 3 - 7 Levels Prior to College | $14.3 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ |
| 1 \& 2 - 8 Levels Prior to College | $35.0 \%$ | $35.9 \%$ | $33.2 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table BS4. Math Placement Level by Academic Year

| Math Placement Level | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ | $2011-12$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $100+$ - Transfer Level | $12.2 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ |
| 60 - 1 Level Below Transfer | $12.1 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ | $12.8 \%$ |
| 56 - 1 Level Below Transfer | $7.0 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ |
| 50 - 2 Levels Below Transfer | $12.6 \%$ | $21.9 \%$ | $22.2 \%$ |
| 15 - 3 Levels Below Transfer | $54.1 \%$ | $46.9 \%$ | $46.0 \%$ |
| 10 - 4 Levels Below Transfer | $1.9 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table BS5. Reading Placement Level by Academic Year

| Reading Placement Level | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ | $2011-12$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 110 - Transfer Level | $67.6 \%$ | $68.0 \%$ | $67.5 \%$ |
| $50-1$ Level Below Transfer | $27.4 \%$ | $27.1 \%$ | $28.0 \%$ |
| $30-2$ Levels Below Transfer | $5.0 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

## Basic Skills Course Taking

The enrollments at different levels below transfer are summarized in Table BS6. Approximately one in ten enrollments were below transfer level. Just over two percent of enrollments are three levels below transfer or lower.

Table BS6. Enrollments by Levels Below Transfer

|  | Levels Below Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Term | None | One | Two | Three | Four | Five | Six | Total |
| $2009-10$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fall | $89.1 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Spring | $90.8 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| $2010-11$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fall | $89.0 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.4 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Spring | $90.1 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $0.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| $2011-12$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fall | $88.8 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Spring | $89.7 \%$ | $4.6 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| $2012-13$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fall | $88.6 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $2.0 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ | $0.2 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table BS7 shows English enrollments by levels below transfer. About 37 percent of English enrollments were one or two levels below transfer. Table BS8 shows the ESL enrollments, all of which are below college level. Nearly two-thirds of math enrollments were below transfer level, as indicated in Table BS9. Just under half of the reading enrollments are at transfer level. This is seen in Table BS10.

Table BS7. English Enrollments by Levels Below Transfer

| Term |  | Levels Below Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | None |  | One |  | Two |  | Total |  |
|  |  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2009- | Fall | 2,664 | 60.0\% | 889 | 20.0\% | 886 | 20.0\% | 4,439 | 100.0\% |
| 10 | Spring | 2,621 | 67.1\% | 745 | 19.1\% | 542 | 13.9\% | 3,908 | 100.0\% |
| 2010- | Fall | 2,532 | 59.8\% | 885 | 20.9\% | 815 | 19.3\% | 4,232 | 100.0\% |
| 11 | Spring | 2,858 | 65.5\% | 892 | 20.5\% | 611 | 14.0\% | 4,361 | 100.0\% |
| 2011- | Fall | 2,652 | 61.4\% | 881 | 20.4\% | 783 | 18.1\% | 4,316 | 100.0\% |
| 12 | Spring | 3,014 | 66.0\% | 915 | 20.0\% | 635 | 13.9\% | 4,564 | 100.0\% |
| $\begin{gathered} 2012- \\ 13 \end{gathered}$ | Fall | 2,880 | 63.0\% | 928 | 20.3\% | 767 | 16.8\% | 4,575 | 100.0\% |

Table BS8. ESL Enrollments by Levels Below Transfer

| Term | Levels Below Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | One |  | Two |  | Three |  | Four |  | Five |  | Six |  | Total |  |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2009-10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fall | 74 | 10.2\% | 138 | 18.9\% | 194 | 26.6\% | 144 | 19.8\% | 94 | 12.9\% | 85 | 11.7\% | 729 | 100.0\% |
| Spring | 68 | 10.1\% | 145 | 21.5\% | 151 | 22.4\% | 152 | 22.5\% | 92 | 13.6\% | 67 | 9.9\% | 675 | 100.0\% |
| 2010-11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fall | 46 | 6.3\% | 177 | 24.1\% | 190 | 25.9\% | 146 | 19.9\% | 101 | 13.8\% | 73 | 10.0\% | 733 | 100.0\% |
| Spring | 70 | 10.1\% | 160 | 23.0\% | 175 | 25.1\% | 145 | 20.8\% | 79 | 11.4\% | 67 | 9.6\% | 696 | 100.0\% |
| 2011-12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fall | 47 | 7.7\% | 162 | 26.4\% | 123 | 20.1\% | 154 | 25.1\% | 127 | 20.7\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 613 | 100.0\% |
| Spring | 69 | 12.7\% | 120 | 22.0\% | 88 | 16.1\% | 153 | 28.1\% | 99 | 18.2\% | 16 | 2.9\% | 545 | 100.0\% |
| 2012-13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fall | 72 | 11.3\% | 154 | 24.1\% | 143 | 22.4\% | 102 | 16.0\% | 148 | 23.2\% | 19 | 3.0\% | 638 | 100.0\% |

Table BS9. MATH Enrollments by Levels Below Transfer

| Term |  | Levels Below Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | None |  | One |  | Two |  | Three |  | Four |  | Total |  |
|  |  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2009- | Fall | 2,470 | 34.0\% | 1,731 | 23.8\% | 1,684 | 23.2\% | 1,243 | 17.1\% | 133 | 1.8\% | 7,261 | 100.0\% |
| 10 | Spring | 2,301 | 37.1\% | 1,558 | 25.1\% | 1,300 | 21.0\% | 1,044 | 16.8\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 6,203 | 100.0\% |
| 2010- | Fall | 2,450 | 34.7\% | 1,789 | 25.3\% | 1,529 | 21.6\% | 1,182 | 16.7\% | 118 | 1.7\% | 7,068 | 100.0\% |
| 11 | Spring | 2,476 | 37.9\% | 1,684 | 25.7\% | 1,429 | 21.9\% | 951 | 14.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 6,540 | 100.0\% |
| 2011- | Fall | 2,649 | 36.4\% | 1,774 | 24.4\% | 1,642 | 22.6\% | 1,133 | 15.6\% | 70 | 1.0\% | 7,268 | 100.0\% |
| 12 | Spring | 2,533 | 37.7\% | 1,761 | 26.2\% | 1,396 | 20.8\% | 1,020 | 15.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 6,710 | 100.0\% |
| $\begin{gathered} 2012- \\ 13 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Fall | 2,743 | 36.7\% | 1,755 | 23.5\% | 1,746 | 23.4\% | 1,157 | 15.5\% | 66 | 0.9\% | 7,467 | 100.0\% |

Table BS10. Reading Enrollments by Levels Below Transfer

| Term |  | Levels Below Transfer |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | None |  | One |  | Two |  | Three |  | Total |  |
|  |  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2009-10 | Fall | 349 | 48.3\% | 213 | 29.5\% | 137 | 19.0\% | 23 | 3.2\% | 722 | 100.0\% |
|  | Spring | 298 | 48.2\% | 154 | 24.9\% | 138 | 22.3\% | 28 | 4.5\% | 618 | 100.0\% |
| 2010-11 | Fall | 347 | 47.1\% | 221 | 30.0\% | 143 | 19.4\% | 25 | 3.4\% | 736 | 100.0\% |
|  | Spring | 327 | 49.5\% | 177 | 26.8\% | 126 | 19.1\% | 30 | 4.5\% | 660 | 100.0\% |
| 2011-12 | Fall | 333 | 42.0\% | 294 | 37.1\% | 142 | 17.9\% | 24 | 3.0\% | 793 | 100.0\% |
|  | Spring | 311 | 49.5\% | 205 | 32.6\% | 93 | 14.8\% | 19 | 3.0\% | 628 | 100.0\% |
| 2012-13 | Fall | 367 | 45.5\% | 301 | 37.3\% | 113 | 14.0\% | 25 | 3.1\% | 806 | 100.0\% |

## Student Characteristics

This section presents some characteristics of those students enrolled in basic skills courses at Palomar College. Table BS11 shows the gender distribution of basic skills and non-basic skills students. Basic skills students were more likely than other students to be female. Table BS12 shows that basic skills students were more likely to be Hispanic and less likely to be white compared to other students. Basic skills students were also much more likely to be first-time students, as indicated in Table BS13.

Table BS11. Gender by Academic Year

| Term |  | Current Basic Skills Student | Gender |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Female | Male | Unknown | Total | Total |
| 2009-10 | Fall |  | No | 45.6\% | 53.8\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% | 20,808 |
|  |  | Yes | 53.8\% | 45.8\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% | 5,921 |
|  |  | No | 46.0\% | 53.5\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% | 20,560 |
|  | Spring | Yes | 52.5\% | 47.0\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% | 5,076 |
| 2010-11 | Fall | No | 44.7\% | 54.7\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% | 19,892 |
|  |  | Yes | 51.9\% | 47.6\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% | 5,775 |
|  | Spring | No | 44.9\% | 54.5\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% | 20,124 |
|  |  | Yes | 51.5\% | 48.1\% | 0.4\% | 100.0\% | 5,343 |
| 2011-12 | Fall | No | 43.9\% | 55.5\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% | 19,065 |
|  |  | Yes | 50.6\% | 48.7\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% | 5,687 |
|  |  | No | 44.1\% | 55.3\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% | 19,085 |
|  | S | Yes | 50.8\% | 48.5\% | 0.7\% | 100.0\% | 5,323 |
| 2012-13 | Fall | No | 43.8\% | 55.7\% | 0.5\% | 100.0\% | 18,758 |
|  |  | Yes | 50.8\% | 48.6\% | 0.6\% | 100.0\% | 5,807 |

Table BS12. Race \& Ethnicity by Academic Year

| Term |  | Current | Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Basic <br> Skills <br> Student | African <br> American |  <br> Pacific <br> Islander | Filipino | Hispanic | Multi <br> Ethnic | Native American | Unknown | White | Total | Total |
| 2009-10 | Fall | No | 3.9\% | 6.1\% | 3.4\% | 27.6\% | 2.4\% | 1.0\% | 8.9\% | 46.8\% | 100.0\% | 20,808 |
|  |  | Yes | 4.4\% | 6.6\% | 3.0\% | 41.3\% | 2.7\% | 0.6\% | 4.9\% | 36.5\% | 100.0\% | 5,921 |
|  | Spring | No | 3.5\% | 6.3\% | 3.3\% | 28.3\% | 2.6\% | 0.9\% | 8.2\% | 47.0\% | 100.0\% | 20,560 |
|  |  | Yes | 4.6\% | 6.9\% | 2.6\% | 42.9\% | 2.6\% | 0.7\% | 4.8\% | 34.8\% | 100.0\% | 5,076 |
| 2010-11 | Fall | No | 3.5\% | 5.9\% | 3.3\% | 28.4\% | 2.9\% | 0.9\% | 7.5\% | 47.6\% | 100.0\% | 19,892 |
|  |  | Yes | 3.9\% | 5.9\% | 2.3\% | 42.9\% | 3.3\% | 0.7\% | 4.1\% | 36.9\% | 100.0\% | 5,775 |
|  | Spring | No | 3.5\% | 5.9\% | 3.0\% | 29.1\% | 3.1\% | 1.0\% | 7.3\% | 47.1\% | 100.0\% | 20,124 |
|  |  | Yes | 4.1\% | 6.0\% | 2.4\% | 43.5\% | 3.0\% | 0.8\% | 4.3\% | 35.9\% | 100.0\% | 5,343 |
| 2011-12 | Fall | No | 3.4\% | 5.6\% | 3.1\% | 30.1\% | 3.4\% | 0.8\% | 6.6\% | 46.9\% | 100.0\% | 19,065 |
|  |  | Yes | 3.5\% | 6.0\% | 2.8\% | 43.5\% | 3.9\% | 0.8\% | 3.7\% | 35.8\% | 100.0\% | 5,687 |
|  | Spring | No | 3.2\% | 5.5\% | 3.1\% | 31.1\% | 3.7\% | 0.9\% | 6.3\% | 46.1\% | 100.0\% | 19,085 |
|  |  | Yes | 3.8\% | 6.0\% | 2.8\% | 45.7\% | 3.8\% | 0.8\% | 3.8\% | 33.2\% | 100.0\% | 5,323 |
| 2012-13 | Fall | No | 3.5\% | 5.6\% | 3.1\% | 31.5\% | 3.8\% | 0.9\% | 6.1\% | 45.6\% | 100.0\% | 18,758 |
|  |  | Yes | 3.5\% | 5.6\% | 2.5\% | 46.6\% | 4.1\% | 0.8\% | 3.2\% | 33.5\% | 100.0\% | 5,807 |

Table BS13. Enrollment Status by Academic Year

| Term |  | Current Basic Skills Student | Enrollment Status |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | First-time Student | First-time <br> Transfer <br> Stud | Returning Student | Continuing Student | Special <br> Admit | Total | Total |
|  | Fall |  | No | 16.5\% | 7.8\% | 14.9\% | 56.8\% | 4.0\% | 100.0\% | 20,808 |
| 2009-10 | Fall | Yes | 45.0\% | 3.0\% | 8.5\% | 42.1\% | 1.4\% | 100.0\% | 5,921 |
| 2009-10 |  | No | 7.6\% | 5.5\% | 12.5\% | 69.2\% | 5.1\% | 100.0\% | 20,560 |
|  | Spring | Yes | 9.9\% | 2.0\% | 9.0\% | 77.1\% | 2.0\% | 100.0\% | 5,076 |
|  | Fall | No | 15.7\% | 7.6\% | 15.7\% | 57.2\% | 3.8\% | 100.0\% | 19,892 |
| 2010-11 | Fall | Yes | 38.4\% | 2.8\% | 9.5\% | 47.8\% | 1.5\% | 100.0\% | 5,775 |
| 2010-11 |  | No | 6.8\% | 5.4\% | 13.2\% | 69.7\% | 4.9\% | 100.0\% | 20,124 |
|  | Spring | Yes | 10.6\% | 2.4\% | 8.8\% | 76.4\% | 1.8\% | 100.0\% | 5,343 |
|  | Fall | No | 14.4\% | 8.0\% | 14.1\% | 59.9\% | 3.6\% | 100.0\% | 19,065 |
| 2011-12 | Fall | Yes | 35.0\% | 3.9\% | 10.1\% | 50.0\% | 1.0\% | 100.0\% | 5,687 |
| 2011-12 |  | No | 6.2\% | 5.6\% | 12.6\% | 71.2\% | 4.3\% | 100.0\% | 19,085 |
|  | Spring | Yes | 9.5\% | 2.8\% | 7.9\% | 78.0\% | 1.7\% | 100.0\% | 5,323 |
|  |  | No | 14.9\% | 7.8\% | 15.0\% | 59.1\% | 3.2\% | 100.0\% | 18,758 |
| 2012-13 | Fall | Yes | 35.6\% | 3.8\% | 8.9\% | 50.6\% | 1.1\% | 100.0\% | 5,807 |

## Progress through Basic Skills Sequences

It is useful to consider the flow of students through the basic skills sequences. ${ }^{1}$ The following figures show, for students starting in Fall 2009, progress through the basic skills sequences as of Spring 2012 - effectively, three academic years. Figure BS1 summarizes progress for students starting at one level below transfer in reading (Reading 50 - Reading Improvement). (Few students started at a level below one level below transfer, so these levels are not examined for this report.) The figure shows that by Spring 2012 four-fifths (81.8\%) of those who had started in the Fall 2009 cohort taking Reading 50 successfully passed Reading 50. That is, of the 209 students who entered the sequence at one level below transfer, 171 were successful at that level by the end of the Spring 2012 term. There were a total of 215 enrollments in Reading 50 from this cohort, so the success rate per enrollment was $171 / 215=79.5 \%$. Only $57(27.3 \%)$ of the students in the cohort enrolled in transfer-level reading (Reading 110, 115, or 120) by Spring 2012, and $21.5 \%$ of the cohort passed a transfer-level reading course successfully by this term.


[^0]The flow through the English sequence is summarized in Figure BS2. In the Fall 2009 term, 790 students entered the English sequence at two levels below transfer (English 10 - English Essentials), and 659 entered the sequence at one level below transfer (English 50 - Introductory Composition). For those students starting at two levels below transfer, less than half ( $46.8 \%$ ) made it to one level below transfer, and only $22.9 \%$ successfully completed transfer-level English by Spring 2012.


A total of 114 students entered the math sequence four levels below transfer (Math 10 Basic Arithmetic); 995 students entered three levels below transfer (Math 15 Prealgebra); 894 entered two levels below transfer (Math 50 - Beginning Algebra); and 812 entered one level below transfer (Math 56 - Beginning/Intermediate Algebra and 60 - Intermediate Algebra).

Figures BS3a-d show the success rates of students beginning in Fall 2009 as they progress through the math basic skills sequence. The figures show that for students starting three or four levels below transfer, about two-thirds of those students successfully pass the level at which they started by the Spring 2012 term, and 4.7\% pass a transfer-level math course. For those starting one level below, three quarters (75.5\%) succeed at their starting level, and $36.2 \%$ succeed at a transfer-level math course. In general, just over a third (35.6\%) of the basic skills students successfully passed a course one level above where they started in the sequence within the time-frame of the study.

Figure BS3a. Math Basic Skills Progress Fall 2009-Spring 2012 (N=114)





## LEARNING COMMUNITIES

Each learning community involves a set of linked courses that provide for a learning environment that fosters cohesion and engagement. This is accomplished by having the students take the set of courses together as a group, and having faculty coordinate their efforts and present material integrated across courses.

## Learning Communities Use

The number of learning communities at Palomar since the Fall 2009 semester has varied from four to ten. The enrollment in these learning communities is displayed in Figure L1. The number of students enrolled by term ranges from 86 to 289.


## Use and Student Demographics

This section examines certain student demographic characteristics of learning communities participants. Table L1 shows that learning communities participants were about evenly split between male and female. Table L2 reveals that in the learning communities, Hispanics were overrepresented while whites were underrepresented. Table L3 shows that learning communities students were considerably younger than the average student.

Table L1. Gender of Learning Communities Students

|  | Previous Terms |  | Fall'12 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LC Member |  | LC Member |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Female | $48.2 \%$ | $51.2 \%$ | $47.4 \%$ | $50.2 \%$ |
| Male | $51.2 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ | $52.0 \%$ | $49.5 \%$ |
| Unknown | $0.6 \%$ | $0.8 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Number | 142,161 | 744 | 22,831 | 289 |

Table L2. Race and Ethnicity of Learning Communities Students

|  | Previous Terms |  | Fall'12 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | LC Member |  | LC Member |  |
| Ethnicity | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| African American, Non-Hispanic | $3.1 \%$ | $4.2 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| Asian | $4.8 \%$ | $3.9 \%$ | $4.7 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |
| Filipino | $2.8 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| Hispanic | $31.1 \%$ | $51.1 \%$ | $34.3 \%$ | $57.8 \%$ |
| Multi Ethnic | $3.5 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |
| Native American | $0.8 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ |
| Pacific Islander | $0.7 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ | $0.6 \%$ | $0.3 \%$ |
| White Non-Hisp | $49.7 \%$ | $30.1 \%$ | $46.1 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ |
| Unknown | $3.5 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ |
| Total | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| Number | 142,161 | 744 | 22,831 | 289 |

Table L3. Age of Learning Communities Students

| LC Member | Previous Terms |  | Fall'12 |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
|  | Age | Number | Age | Number |
| No | 26.1 | 142,161 | 25.7 | 22,831 |
| Yes | 20.7 | 744 | 20.6 | 289 |

## Learning Communities Impact

The impact of the learning communities was assessed, in part, by examining courses that were common to at least a few of the learning communities. Specifically, English 10 (English Essentials), English 50 (Introductory Composition), Math 15 (Pre-algebra), Math 50 (Beginning Algebra), and Reading 50 (Reading Improvement) were commonly included in the learning communities, so outcomes for students in those courses were examined. Three outcomes were of primary interest: success (receiving a grade of A, B, $\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{CR}$, or P ), retention (completing the semester and receiving a grade), and persistence (receiving a grade in the following term).

## Success and Retention

English 10 was included in learning communities in fall terms. The success rates were higher for learning community students than they were for other students in English 10. This is seen in Table L4. Table L5 shows that overall, the retention rate (93\%) for learning community students.

Table L4. Success for Learning Community Students in English 10 by Term

| Learning <br> Community <br> Member |  | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ | $2011-12$ | $2011-12$ | $2012-13$ |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| No | Number | Fall | Fall | Fall | Spring | Fall | Total |
| Nes | Percent | $51 \%$ | 432 | 422 | 312 | 424 | 1,995 |
|  | Number | 60 | 39 | $56 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $55 \%$ |
|  | Percent | $63 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $83 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $68 \%$ |

Table L5. Retention for Learning Community Students in English 10 by Term

| Learning <br> Community <br> Member |  | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Fall | Fall | Spring | Fall |  |
| No | Number | 730 | 697 | 709 | 572 | 634 | 3,342 |
|  | Percent | 92\% | 93\% | 94\% | 95\% | 91\% | 93\% |
| Yes | Number | 93 | 59 | 26 | 29 | 62 | 269 |
|  | Percent | 98\% | 92\% | 96\% | 97\% | 86\% | 93\% |

Table L6 shows the success rates for English 50 students. Learning community students had a higher success rate than other English 50 students only in the Fall 2010 and Fall 2011 terms. Table L7 shows that learning-community students had comparable retention rates to other English 50 students.

Table L6. Success for Learning Community Students in English 50 by Term

| Learning <br> Community <br> Member |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall |  |
| No | Number | 612 | 451 | 649 | 580 | 594 | 615 | 665 | 4,166 |
|  | Percent | 70\% | 65\% | 74\% | 71\% | 72\% | 69\% | 72\% | 71\% |
| Yes | Number | 12 | 25 | 13 | 45 | 47 | 15 | 8 | 165 |
|  | Percent | 60\% | 44\% | 93\% | 52\% | 80\% | 58\% | 53\% | 60\% |

Table L7. Retention for Learning Community Students in English 50 by Term

| Learning Community Member |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall |  |
| No | Number | 828 | 635 | 831 | 757 | 774 | 852 | 860 | 5,537 |
|  | Percent | 95\% | 92\% | 95\% | 93\% | 94\% | 96\% | 94\% | 94\% |
| Yes | Number | 19 | 51 | 14 | 77 | 57 | 25 | 14 | 257 |
|  | Percent | 95\% | 89\% | 100\% | 90\% | 97\% | 96\% | 93\% | 93\% |

The success and retention rates for students taking Math 15 are displayed in Tables L8 and L9. Generally, success was lower while retention was similar for learning community students compared to other Math 15 students.

Table L8. Success for Learning Community Students in Math 15 by Term

| Learning <br> Community <br> Member |  | 2009-10 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2010-11 \\ \text { Fall } \end{gathered}$ | 2011-12 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2012-13 \\ \text { Fall } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring |  | Fall | Spring |  |  |
| No | Number | 690 | 549 | 659 | 654 | 553 | 647 | 3,752 |
|  | Percent | 61\% | 54\% | 59\% | 61\% | 55\% | 60\% | 58\% |
| Yes | Number | 40 | 7 | 26 | 29 | 10 | 38 | 150 |
|  | Percent | 45\% | 23\% | 53\% | 74\% | 56\% | 68\% | 53\% |

Table L9. Retention for Leaming Community Students in Math 15 by Term

| Learning <br> Community Member |  | 2009-10 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2010-11 } \\ \text { Fall } \end{gathered}$ | 2011-12 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-13 } \\ \text { Fall } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring |  | Fall | Spring |  |  |
| No | Number | 1,069 | 940 | 1,042 | 1,014 | 911 | 979 | 5,955 |
|  | Percent | 94\% | 93\% | 94\% | 94\% | 91\% | 91\% | 93\% |
| Yes | Number | 88 | 30 | 44 | 35 | 16 | 52 | 265 |
|  | Percent | 99\% | 97\% | 90\% | 90\% | 89\% | 93\% | 94\% |

Table L10 shows that the success rate for Math 50 was at $53 \%$ for learning communities students as well as other Math 50 students. Table L11 shows that retention in Math 50 was similar between learning community and other Math 50 students.

Table L10. Success for Learning Community Students in Math 50 by Term

| Learning <br> Community <br> Member |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | $\begin{gathered} 2012-13 \\ \text { Fall } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring |  |  |
| No | Number | 871 | 651 | 784 | 671 | 866 | 702 | 821 | 5,366 |
|  | Percent | 54\% | 53\% | 54\% | 49\% | 56\% | 53\% | 51\% | 53\% |
| Yes | Number | 12 | 17 | 10 | 25 | 32 | 18 | 50 | 164 |
|  | Percent | 60\% | 40\% | 33\% | 52\% | 68\% | 49\% | 61\% | 53\% |

Table L11. Retention for Leaming Community Students in Math 50 by Term

| Learning <br> Community <br> Member |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring |  |  |
| No | Number | 1451 | 1111 | 1308 | 1223 | 1426 | 1,233 | 1,452 | 9,204 |
|  | Percent | 90\% | 90\% | 91\% | 90\% | 93\% | 92\% | 90\% | 91\% |
| Yes | Number | 19 | 38 | 26 | 42 | 46 | 34 | 76 | 281 |
|  | Percent | 95\% | 88\% | 87\% | 88\% | 98\% | 92\% | 93\% | 92\% |

Student outcomes for Reading 50 students are displayed in Tables L12 and L13. Generally, learning-community students enjoyed a significant advantage both in success rates and retention.

Table L12. Success for Leaming Community Students in Reading 50 by Term

| Learning <br> Community <br> Member |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-13 } \\ \text { Fall } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring |  |  |
| No | Number | 79 | 95 | 120 | 97 | 164 | 86 | 157 | 798 |
|  | Percent | 77\% | 73\% | 75\% | 73\% | 71\% | 64\% | 74\% | 72\% |
| Yes | Number | 91 | 17 | 49 | 30 | 57 | 48 | 61 | 353 |
|  | Percent | 83\% | 74\% | 82\% | 68\% | 90\% | 68\% | 69\% | 77\% |

Table L13. Retention for Learning Community Students in Reading 50 by Term

| Learning <br> Community <br> Member |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-13 } \\ \text { Fall } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring |  |  |
| No | Number | 97 | 126 | 153 | 128 | 164 | 128 | 201 | 997 |
|  | Percent | 94\% | 96\% | 95\% | 96\% | 71\% | 96\% | 94\% | 90\% |
| Yes | Number | 109 | 23 | 56 | 40 | 57 | 70 | 75 | 430 |
|  | Percent | 99\% | 100\% | 93\% | 91\% | 90\% | 99\% | 85\% | 94\% |

## Persistence

Table L14 shows the persistence rates for learning communities students as well as all other credit students. As is generally the case, fall-to-spring persistence was higher than spring-to-fall persistence for all students. The table reveals higher persistence rates for learning-community students compared to other students.

Table L14. Persistence to Next Term

| Learning <br> Community <br> Member | $2009-10$ |  | $2010-11$ |  | $2011-12$ |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Total |
| No | Number | 17,557 | 13,767 | 17,417 | 13,810 | 17,036 | 13,529 | 93,116 |
|  | Percent | $66 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $68 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $69 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $59 \%$ |
| Yes | Number | 118 | 61 | 98 | 54 | 127 | 85 | 543 |
|  | Percent | $79 \%$ | $56 \%$ | $79 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $73 \%$ |

## Learning Communities Student Survey

The learning communities student survey is conducted at the end of each term. The survey is conducted in order to assess student satisfaction with the learning communities.

## Data

Each of the learning communities was invited to participate in the survey. The survey is administered toward the end of the semester. A total of 206 students from the Fall 2012 learning communities completed the survey, and 531 overall. Data from the current term are compared to data from the learning communities of the previous terms.

The questionnaire for the survey was designed to assess the students' satisfaction with the learning communities as well as some other constructs such as engagement, perceived support, and the benefit of participation in a learning community. The questions from the survey are found in Appendix A.

## Results

## Satisfaction

Survey items were aggregated to form scales of (1) satisfaction with the learning communities, (2) engagement at the college, and (3) perceived support. The scales range from zero to ten, with higher numbers indicating more of the construct being measured. The items used to construct the scales are found in Appendix A. The responses are summarized in Figure LS1. Satisfaction with the learning communities was very high, with an average scale score of 8.4 on the 0-to-10 scale for the Fall 2012 term. Perceived support at the college was also very high.


The satisfaction items comprise one general measure of satisfaction along with seven items assessing satisfaction with specific elements of the learning communities. The mean scores for these items are found in Table LS1.

What would you say has been the greatest benefit of participating in a learning community?
"Being around the same group of people. It creates a sense on community and fellowship."

Table LS1. Satisfaction with Learning Communities ( $\mathrm{N}=509$ )

|  | Mean |
| :--- | ---: |
|  | 8.23 |
| Overall Satisfaction | 8.22 |
| Satisfaction with Counseling Received | 7.98 |
| Satisfaction with Tutoring | 8.13 |
| Satisfaction with Faculty Availability | 8.33 |
| Satisfaction with the Educational Experience | 7.81 |
| Satisfaction with the Integration of Material across <br> Courses | 7.89 |
| Satisfaction with Social Activities | 8.60 |
| Satisfaction with Being with the Same Students in All <br> the Classes |  |

Figure LS2 (which displays standardized regression weights) illustrates the relative strength of association between the satisfaction with the various elements and the general satisfaction measure. The figure reveals that satisfaction with the educational experience was by far the most closely associated with general satisfaction. Satisfaction with (a) being with the same students in all the classes and with (b) the integration of material across courses were also related to the general satisfaction measure.

What would you say has been the greatest benefit of participating in a learning community?
"Learning all the different ways of studying. It gave me more options that 1 never knew about for when it comes time for me to really need to study hard."


## Education Plans and Goals

Respondents answered a set of questions regarding education plans and educational goals. Figure LS3 shows that four fifths (81.6\%) of the respondents in Fall 2012 had completed an education plan at the time of the survey, and $12.6 \%$ reported that they had not done so.

Figure LS3. Completed an Education Plan by Term
( $\mathrm{Ns}=204$ \& 325)


Those who had completed an education plan were asked if they had completed it prior to the start of the learning community. Figure LS4 shows that about half of the students who had completed an education plan had done so prior to the start of the learning community.


Those who had not completed their education plan, as well as those who had completed it since they started in the learning community, were asked if participation in the learning community helped them make progress on their education plans. Their responses are summarized in Figure LS5. Four fifths (79.0\%) of the respondents indicated that their participation in the learning community had helped them make progress on their education plan.


Learning communities students were also asked if participation in the learning community helped them make progress on their educational goals. Students responded on a scale of 0 -to- 10 where 0 means strongly disagree and 10 means strongly agree to the statement that participation in the learning community helped them make progress on their educational goals. Figure LS6 shows that respondents gave an average rating of 8.34, suggesting that students perceived the learning communities to be very helpful for them with respect to their educational goals.


## Integrative Learning and Assignments

Respondents were asked about the integration of material across courses in their learning communities. Specifically, they were asked to rate on a 0 -to-10 scale, where 0 means not at all integrated and 10 means completely integrated, to what extent was the material integrated across their learning community courses. The average rating of 7.64 demonstrates that students perceived substantial integration of material across their learning-community courses. This is seen in Figure LS7.


Integrative Learning. Beginning with the Fall 2011 term, respondents were asked a set of questions regarding the extent to which participation in the learning communities resulted in integrative learning. For example, one question asked "How much have your learning community classes helped you become better at pulling different principles together?" These items were combined to form a scale ranging from 1 to 5 , where higher numbers indicate greater integrative learning. Figure LS8 shows that students gave an average score of 3.77 on the 1-to- 5 scale.


Integrative Assignments. Beginning with the Fall 2011 term, students were asked if they had any integrative assignments in their learning communities. In Fall 2012, 59.2\% reported that they had integrative assignments in their learning community, and 22.3\% said they didn't know. This is illustrated in Figure LS9.


Those students who indicated that they had integrative assignments in their learning community were asked about their attitudes regarding those integrative assignments. Each of these attitudes were measured using a 0 -to- 10 scale. Their responses are summarized in Table LS2. Their responses reveal very positive attitudes about these assignments. Table LS3 shows these attitudes are highly correlated.

Table LS2. Attitudes about Integrative Assignments ( $\mathrm{N}=122$ )

| Integrative assignments ... | Current Term |  | Previous Terms |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | Count | Mean | Count |
| Were Enjoyable | 8.03 | 122 | 7.61 | 85 |
| Made Learning Easier | 7.62 | 122 | 7.53 | 85 |
| Were Effective | 7.80 | 122 | 7.50 | 85 |
| Made The Assignments More Meaningful | 7.83 | 122 | 7.54 | 85 |
| Were Interesting | 7.98 | 122 | 7.52 | 85 |

Table LS3. Correlations among Integrative Assignments Attiutudes ( $\mathrm{N}=207$ )

| Integrative <br> assignments ... | Enjoyable | Easier | Effective | Meaningful | Interesting |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Were Enjoyable | 1.000 | .762 | .829 | .810 | .849 |
| Made Learning Easier | .762 | 1.000 | .764 | .807 | .785 |
| Were Effective | .829 | .764 | 1.000 | .794 | .797 |
| Made The Assignments <br> More Meaningful | .810 | .807 | .794 | 1.000 | .812 |
| Were Interesting | .849 | .785 | .797 | .812 | 1.000 |

The perceived benefit of participation in learning communities was also given attention in the survey. Most (66.2\%) of the respondents indicated that their participation was very or extremely beneficial. This is seen in Figure LS10. Figure LS11 shows that over half (57.3\%) of the respondents thought that a second learning community would be very or extremely beneficial.



## Comments

General, open-ended questions were asked of the learning community students regarding the greatest benefits, recommendations, and other comments about the learning communities. The responses from students in the most recent term to these questions are found in Tables LS4 through LS6.

What would you say has been the greatest benefit of participating in a learning community?
"The learning community encouraged me and pushed me because those around me were doing the same things as I was and it was easier to ask for help"

## Table LS4. Greatest Benefit of Learning Community Participation

assinments that helps with your vocabulary, and reading comprehension. being able to be in a higher class in less time

Being able to bounce ideas off of each other because we all have the same assignment.
Being able to communicate with others on how to solve problems i have.
Being able to feel comfortable with others around because we have them in two classes.
Being able to focus in studying
Being able to have a better relationship with peers that I would not have had if I had only seen them in one class.
being able to know our class mates more.
being able to make relationships with the students
Being able to work with the same people has made a lot of assignments easier to work on.
Being around the same group of people. It creates a sense on community and fellowship.
being around the same people in the classes has yhelped me because i can ask them for help and they can help me understand something i hadnt undertood before Better schedule and progress in class.
Building relationships with others.
everyone in the same class
Finguring things out early on.
For the most part,I would say the tutors.
Get to share and help each other
Getting help from other people.
getting help from tutors and also asking for help
Getting help with tutores
getting oto know my classmates and being able to contact them for help if needed.
getting support from instructors and students
getting support from my teachers and my classmates.
getting to know other people in the class and making friends
Getting to know other people that have the same problems as me getting to know some people right away.
have a couselor as a instructor

## Table LS4. Continued

Having a group of students that share the same classes, giving a larger network of people for information and help.
Having food services around campus.
having the one on one time with the teachers.
having the same class mates in other classes
having the same classmates is nice, I also like the interaction and team work between
professors I feel sincere encouragement to gain the most outta what us as student pay for.
Having the same people in both classes
having the same people in both classes gives you more people you can go to for help.
having the same students
having tutors at hand.
helped my reading skill.
Helpful teachers that give you the urge to try your best.
How can i study to my classes.cornell etc.
i BELIEVE THAT THE GREATEST BENEFITS ARE THAT STUDENTS GET
TO INTERACT WITH EACH OTHER AND THEY ARE AWARE OF WHAT RESOURCES THEY HAVE LIKE TUTORING AND COUNSELING AND THE EXTRA HELP THEY CAN OBTAIN FROM THERE PROFESSORS. ALSO THEY FEEL COMFORTABLE.
i believe that working together with the people is the greatest because you feel comftorable around them
I feel more comfortable with all of the students in the classroom and am able to ask questions without feeling ashamed of the question.
i get more than one reminder of test dates
i got to meat people that i would not normally talk to in a normal class
i got to meet new people and i learned alot of new things
I got to meet new people.
I have been exposed to all the different kinds of help and connections available at palomar
I have had the opportunity and guidance to gain more knowledge about my college I have learned alot, and there is always help for me if I need it. The teachers and tudors are always there and ready to help.
I have learned more just because of the fact that we are encourgaed to think and speak on what we think.

## Table LS4. Continued

I have picked up very helpful skills that have improved my learning ability and test taking skills.
I learn a lot of good things that are going to help me in the future.
I learned alot of things from my teachers, each one was very helpful and had alot of ideas and helpful hints for studying at Palomar. I liked all the help and resources that were provided, it made learning alot easier.
i learned how to interact with different people
I learned what I had to learn in a short time to reach English 100 faster
I love having the intergrated classes. It was great to develop relationships with people in both classes. I felt part of a community and like there was a support network for me. This class also helped me narrow down what I want to do in my future for my c
I love the on course book, i think it should be taught in high school, it would have helped me so much.
I made use of tutors very often. I had a counselor that I could go to that knew my personal life. I learned a lot about who the person I am and why. I learned a lot about personal responsibility.
i realized that there are a lot of programs that can help me if i need help.
I think counseling helped me a lot.
I think getting to work in groups has helped me a lot to understand how to participate in groups and understand more other people ideas.
I thinkl the greatest benefit was that my teacher is also a counselor. he helped sop much!
i would say having the same students for the two classes
improving on my reading skills
Improving writing and reading skill.
in class totering
In my case, I can understand what I read then write about it academicly.
Increasing my overall ability to read faster and more efficent
interacting with others and learning about what Palomar has to offer. also the material
was great
intructores show they care
it has been a greatto me because i have my mind set on what i want to do in my career
it has been ok
it has been very beneficial to me, it has made me see things from a different point of view.

## Table LS4. Continued

it help me networking every day.
It help with having the same students for both classes.
it helped me get on track for my future
it helped me keep focus in class. and also be more successful because i kept up with my success team or vise versa.
It helps me I learn more and more about my environment
It made learning more enjoyable although the class was somehow difficult but I enjoyed learning.
it made sure i did all the studying i needed to do to pass math 50 with a good grade. it really makes me really analyze myself as a student and helps me to realize how to improve. This learning community has given me a support group so i do not feel as if i am in this alone.
It's easier to keep up with the class because of the students that are in the class with you and its great that you get to have an appointment with a counseler.
Its been a great learning opportunity
Its been a learning opportunity.
its been great knowing in ways i can help my community and the courses i can take
ive improved my comprehension
knowing my class mates and being able to share with them.
knowing the tools you have on campus and tutoring
learing about wht you can do to learn more
learing new words yo
Learning about the resources from the LT 125 class, for instance, the use of easy bib, credo ref., jing, also doing our annotated bibliography was very helpful. I am sure that I will use these resources as I continue on my educational path. As for the reading my vocabulary has improved!! That's very benefitial! For the psych class, I would consider the learning of the science of psychology is of great inportance! Because of my participation in that class I found a new interest in the neuroscience of psych!
Learning all the different ways of studying. It gave me more options that I never knew about for when it comes time for me to really need to study hard.
learning and developing stronger learning skills
learning different ways of talking to people
learning how one class can relate to the other.
learning how to communicate with others
Learning how to work things out.
learning more aout myself

## Table LS4. Continued

learning new skills for a carrer
learning new things about yourself and learning styles that i have never learned before. figuring out more about you that helps you learn and put that towards your knowledge.
Learning of different ways to actually study and learn new material tailored to my personal habits. That and making new friends.
learning ro organize my homework and learning better note-taking skills
Learning various ways to approach studies. It also gave me a lot of information that identified my learning habits and deficienties
make friendship
Meeting new people
Meeting people and learning eaiser.
Meeting with new people , and got to know the best counselour more group work and activities and more involved in class my peers
None
not needing to deal with other students that i do not know.
nothing sorry
o have enjojyed making friends with my classmates
participating in this learning community is learning new things that helped me with lots
of things.
Pretty much just knowing where these beneficial programs are. Also the edu plan but
I made one. The confirmation of the choices I made was nice.
received a great deal of help.
retaining different ways of being
Same people in class
Saving the time to reach ENG 100.
since it was my first of college, having the same students in all 3 classes helped we all
knew each other and intacted all day so made it easier to talk about class and upcoming assingments and topics in class.
staying in a class and learning more on the work that was assigned teachers
that i got to share more ideas and be interdependent that i see the same people and become comfortable that it lets you communicate with other perople and staff.
that the teachers all work together and plan things out

## Table LS4. Continued

That the whole class gets along, and we know just about everyone's names.
That we all students help each other and the intrustor hepls us for our education and plans for next semester/classes
that you can talking to the other students
The ability to participate and help you get closer to better education.
The access to a class tutor
The atmosphere and the opportunities.
The best benefit of being in a participating learning community is getting help to do both classes very well so that i know i have support from both teachers
The biggest benefit of being in a learning community is definitely your classmates. Your surrounded with the same people all the time and you can always socialize with them and they can help you out when you need it. Also, you get free tutoring and the instructors are awesome.
The class meetings that were with the same people helped me make friends i would not have made otherwise. This class also helped me with deciding what i wanted to do after i finish school.
the counseling here is very helpful.
The greatest benefit was that I have known the instructor [NAME REDACTED] since the summer. I was a student of the Summer Bridge program and ever since the summer it has been a great experience I have had. I enjoyed this class for all the topics discussed.
The greatest bebefit would be getting help not just from the instructor but also other students.
The greatest benefit I think is that the students that participated in this learning coomunity work great together and develop great relationships with each other. The greatest benefit in being a learning community has to be that i have the same classmates throughout my other two classes and can help me out with the material i did not understand for that day.
The greatest benefit in participating in a learning community is that the instructors know what assignments are due so that if theres a big assignment due in one class then they make sure they dont assign lots of hw so that we won't stress. The greatest benefit is that you get help not just from your instructor but also you get help from your classmates. Also/ you learn how to comunicate with others and you don't get shy .
The greatest benefit of participating in a learning community is that professors are really willing to help.

## Table LS4. Continued

The greatest benefit of participating in a learning community would have to be preparing me mentally for upcoming test by understanding how my brain works, and how i better comprehend material.
The greatest benefit to me was to get up infront of the class and give my life-line presentaion and really express myself.
the greatest benefit to particfipate here were all the skills that i acquired in English and work in a team.
The greatest benefit was being able to get to know the people around me since I was with them so often.
The greatest benefit was learning new things.
the greatest benefit was the help that was available and learning different ways to help my learning
The greatest benfit would be working with others as a team that have a common goal as you, so you can be successful.
The greatest benifit in this learning community is bieng able to speak with teachers and having them help you with topics you do not understand.
the greatest help that i obtained was that i had two instructors looking after me to encourage me to do good.
The greatest part was the counseling part of it. Keeping me going and my education goals of what i actually want to do with my life. also the people i met and had good connections with.
The help that they offer.
the instructor
the instructors
The learning community encouraged me and pushed me because those around me were doing the same things as I was and it was easier to ask for help
the people around me
the people i go to meet
the professors correspond with one another
the staff is allways there to help
the support of a tutor and knowledge of the library
the teachers
the teachers communicate so they can plan assignments and lectures accordingly and
everything flows very well as long as you are willing to participate.
the things ive learned
there were a lot of group work during the class.
they help you with other work from the other class

## Table LS4. Continued

time management
To work with each other and gain help from your peers and to break down assignments to my understanding.
tools
very well
We could visit various facilities
we get to know all the people very well and it was nice sharing classes
With being in a learning community it makes it more easier to get access to particular things. It makes you aware of all the places where you can get help and also you're not so hesitant to ask for help.
Working as a team makes completing work comfortable.
Working together with some of the same students made classes easier working with people you are comfortable with
yes this class was a very big help to
you are able to socialize with your classmates
you get a lot of extra help.
You get comfortable with the students in the class, and you have the work in both classes go together in a way.
You get help from instructors and tutors.
You get other peoples inputs into discussions
You get reminded about important dates that are coming up so you wont forget to study.
you get to know everyone in your class very well and a lot of friendships form.
you get to really know the people in ur classes
You get to see different points of views.
your with same students

## Table LS5. Recommendations for Improvement of the Leaming Communities

Activities to get to know your classmates because even though they are the same students in every class it gets pretty akward not knowing their names.
Actually involving realted work in all classes instead of just knowing what each class is doing and having the same students
Better integration of the two classes instead of having two classes that do not have much connection with.
by reading the book
Counseling.
Direct more funds to learning communites
Do more assignments that are linked to the classes.
do not make there be group hours outside of class. it is very hard to make good meeting times.
every thing is new for me,so i can't say any thing about this
Everyone should give it a try
everything is great
Everything seems pretty fine to me.
Expand.
For the most part my participation in success groups was not what I envisioned because many students either do not have the time to coordinate time together or just
don't want to communicate together.
getting together and not having all the test on the same day or not such a heavy load
would be nice especially for those not full time students. being a but more considerate.
Group up teams by where they live so it would be easier to meet up to do study groups.
have a better schedule for the communities to meet
have more learning communities with different majors in mind
Having tutors that will help us and know what we need help with
I can not think of much to improve on. I over loaded myself this past semester with classes and wish I woudn't have.
I recommend more activities that are hands on instead of lectures.
I recommend that we do more projects, something that would help integratet the class more.

## Table LS5. Continued

I think it's doing just fine as it is.
I think that students should have more time working in groups because it helped me understand more about the subject.
i think that what is being taught is good
i think the way it is right now is great
i think there should be more then one learning community class because i would love to do a learning community with other classes i am having trouble with but i cannot because there is only one counseling 110 class.
i think this learning community was very well organized and thought out.
I would like to see learning communities be more integrated.
I would recommend and it to to ther students
idk they seem pretty solid to me thus far.
In my opinion I think that professor [NAME REDACTED] did a great job at everything she taught and just everything is awesome.
It would have been better to have integrated the classes more with eachother. Reading and Psychology never really bonded together. In psychology we could have practiced reading faster or in Reading we could have read some Psychological materials.
its fine how it is
just give more time to learm in the english class
keep the assignments simple and short, less paper results in better perforance leanient towards student with less spare time
Let us know where to get tutoring from more ahead of time.
make it seem like actual college. it seems like high school
Make more of them. more classes. more options
make sure all the kids know what they are getting to
make the activitys more fun and entertaining.
materiALS
mix up groups every so often
More assingments that cross both classes
More diverse
more extra credit activities
more forced study groups, a lot of my other class mates are struggling in chicano 101
I wish I could have helped them more so they could better understand the concept of interdependence.
more help with people walking around
more information and workshops

## Table LS5. Continued

more interesting talks
more lab time
MORE PRESENTAIONS!!! and more group work. I feel us kids work better in groups via our comunication skills and also are ability to meet new people and get diffrent perspectives.
more specific in english, that was the hardest class
n/a
N/A
nay
no
No
NO
no ,just keep doing what you are doing. It is a great program that help students improve a lot in writing and reading.
no everthing was fine
No every thing is were it needs to be.
no everything is perfect
no i cant think of any
no i do not
No i dont. he is doing such a good job!
no i loved melinda class as well as katy french's class
no ithink everything is great as it is.
No I think it is good how it is.
no not at all it was perfect how it is.
No not really.
no recomendations
no recommendations
no you guys are doing a wonderful job i attend to take another class.
No, I do not have any recommendations.
no, i think they have it down?
no, i think this communbity the way it is is excellent
No, just keep doing what your doing; it works.
No, not particularly.
no.
No.
none
None

## Table LS5. Continued

none at all
None whatsoever.
None.
nope
Nope, I loved it!
Not really everything was done really great one recommendation can be to explain topics a little more slower and give time to the students to understand well.
Perhaps a bit more integrated class work.
Possibly doing more activities that require more critical thinking. Less group activities.
Schedule more of them
Some classes could be more clear.
THAT THEY MAKE A LEARNING COMMUNITY FOR MATH 56
The onley thing i could think of is to work on all the styles of essays
The teachers all work weel together. I do not have nay improvements for the learning community.
There could have been some more integrated projects.
They should be engaged to each other more.
this class was verry good but more group activities would always help
to encourge more kids to be placed in learning communities.
To stay on top of your work but also socialize a little more to help each other out for that it will benefit you.
we should have group activities
well i like the old fshion turn in your papers to class so less blackboard would be nice. or i just need more practice on the computer and software to cut submitting time in half, since it takes me an hour or so to do it.
yes
Yes, to see more tutores
you can group classes that are more relateable. Also, talk more about the value of each class we're taking.

## Table LS6. Comments

Being in a community class was really helpful i actually improveved in my talking a lot and i am not so shy talking in front of people anymore.
Combining between reading class and writng class must be harmonious and united.
Don't make us confusing between the ways of teaching.
everything in this program help me a lot to be successfuel
Everything was beneficial for me
good job
He is a great teacher overall!!!!!!
I hope more courses at Palomar would intermingle and support eachother like how this learning community has. If the learning communities would add up to a full 12 units that would be great.
I love kaite morris
I love this learning community it taught me alot about mysel and it helped me develop great new relationships with different people.
I think all of the teachers did a great job communicating with one another and made class very enjoyable. I would reccommend a learning community to anyone because of my expierence.
I think some of it was overwhelming having 3 classes combined.
just the above
Keep up the great Work.
n/a
N/A
nay
no
No
NO
no comments at all
no except it was a very good class
No I do not.
No i dont.
no it is straight forward
No it works.
no not at all.
No other comments.
No, all is good
No, everything I answered is the truth and enjoyes taking and got alot from it.

## Table LS6. Continued

No, I do not have any other comments about the topics in this survey.
No, I do not.
no!
no.
No.
no. i love the conseling class
non what so ever
none
None
none at all
None.
nope
Nope.
not at this mmoment
not really
NOTHING.
Thank You.
this is something that works
This was great.
this was one of the most helpful classes i have taken at Palomar and i will forever use the lessons, not only as a student but in all aspects of my life.

> Comments
> "this was one of the most
> helpful classes i have
> taken at palomar and i
> will forever use the
> lessons, not only as a
> student but in all aspects
> of my life."

## Learning Communities Summary

The results for the learning communities were generally positive. Some key points are noted below.

- A total of 1,036 students have participated in the learning communities from fall 2009 to fall 2012.
- Retention and success was enhanced, in some cases, for learning-community students relative to other students taking the same courses.
- Persistence to the next term was clearly higher for learning-community students than it was for others.
- Students were very satisfied with the learning communities, and found it to be beneficial.
- Most (76.5\%) of the students in Fall 2012 had completed an education plan.
- Most (59.2\%) of the students in Fall 2012 reported that they had integrative assignments in their learning community, and rated them quite positively.


## TEACHING AND LEARNING CENTER

The Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) at the Escondido Center is a multi-use space designed to increase student contact with faculty, tutors, counselors, and other students. The TLC services include counseling, instruction, and tutoring, as well as housing workshops and providing space for students to complete homework and interact with other students.

## TLC Use

## Students, Time, and Visits

The numbers of students, visits, and time spent in the TLC are summarized in Table TLC1. The TLC, on average, serves over 1,500 students per term. Since the Fall 2009 term, $15.4 \%$ of the visits were missing departure time, so elapsed time for those visits could not be computed. Therefore, those cases do not contribute to the total number of minutes, and were excluded from the averages in Table T1. The Fall 2012 term saw an increase in the number of visits to the TLC to over 8,000 . The average visit length is well over an hour.

Table TLC1. Use of TLC

| Term | Number of <br> Students | Visits | Number of <br> Minutes | Minutes per <br> Visit $^{*}$ | Minutes per <br> Student $^{*}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fall 09 | 543 | 1,628 | 78,737 | 71.91 | 115.88 |
| Spring 10 | 1,581 | 6,143 | 371,360 | 75.60 | 140.45 |
| Fall 10 | 1,414 | 6,023 | 444,681 | 87.74 | 157.34 |
| Spring 11 | 1,464 | 6,050 | 424,421 | 83.61 | 164.82 |
| Fall 11 | 1,638 | 7,149 | 503,720 | 82.73 | 156.24 |
| Spring 12 | 1,492 | 7,071 | 529,256 | 84.59 | 164.19 |
| Fall 12 | 1,699 | 8,079 | 544,385 | 76.05 | 164.38 |

[^1]The time students spent at the TLC is summarized in Table TLC2. At the time of checkin, students why they are at the TLC by selecting one from a list of reasons. The table shows that nearly half (46.9\%) of the time spent at the TLC in Fall 2009 was for the purpose of doing homework, though this dropped to $36.9 \%$ by Fall 2012. Overall, $32.4 \%$ of the time at the TLC was explicitly for assistance with math.

Table TLC2. Percent of Minutes at TLC by Reason

| TLC Visit | Fall 09 | Spring 10 | Fall 10 | Spring 11 | Fall 11 | Spring 12 | Fall 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reason | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent | Percent |
| Unknown | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.3\% |
| Counseling | 1.3\% | 0.6\% | 0.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.7\% | 0.5\% | 0.7\% |
| Financial Aid | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Homework | 46.9\% | 42.1\% | 32.1\% | 30.6\% | 36.2\% | 28.8\% | 36.9\% |
| Information | 1.3\% | 0.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Lab: ESL | 0.8\% | 2.2\% | 0.8\% | 3.2\% | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 1.7\% |
| Language <br> Lab | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 13.2\% |
| Lab: Math | 30.5\% | 10.7\% | 19.4\% | 9.7\% | 15.2\% | 20.0\% | 12.6\% |
| Lab: Other | 5.3\% | 5.1\% | 3.9\% | 4.9\% | 5.3\% | 8.8\% | 1.0\% |
| Lab: <br> Reading | 0.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.7\% | 0.1\% | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% |
| Other | 1.8\% | 6.9\% | 5.0\% | 6.1\% | 3.2\% | 1.5\% | 2.7\% |
| Tutoring: ESL | 2.4\% | 4.6\% | 5.5\% | 8.0\% | 5.9\% | 7.7\% | 3.4\% |
| Tutoring: Math | 6.3\% | 13.8\% | 16.9\% | 19.3\% | 16.9\% | 20.4\% | 16.8\% |
| Tutoring: Other | 1.2\% | 3.0\% | 2.1\% | 3.2\% | 2.1\% | 1.8\% | 1.8\% |
| Tutoring: Reading | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 1.0\% | 0.8\% | 1.1\% | 0.6\% | 0.7\% |
| Tutoring: Writing | 1.8\% | 8.3\% | 11.3\% | 12.0\% | 11.2\% | 7.9\% | 7.1\% |
| Workshop | 0.3\% | 0.9\% | 0.4\% | 1.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.4\% |
| Total | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

Table TLC3 shows the number of visits by the reason the students gave for their visit to the TLC. Consistent with the amount of time spent, homework was the most common reason given for a visit to the TLC. Just under a quarter (24.6\%) of the visits were explicitly math oriented visits.

Table TLC3. Visits to the TLC

| TLC Visit <br> Reason | Fall 09 | Spring 10 | Fall 10 | Spring 11 | Fall 11 | Spring 12 | Fall 12 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Counseling | 17 | 63 | 96 | 90 | 93 | 83 | 116 |
| Financial <br> Aid | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 29 | 7 | 16 |
| Homework | 919 | 2,641 | 2,011 | 2,210 | 2,911 | 2,233 | 2,916 |
| Information | 65 | 60 | 22 | 40 | 25 | 17 | 23 |
| Lab: ESL | 11 | 170 | 87 | 174 | 92 | 126 | 157 |
| Language <br> Lab | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,315 |
| Lab: Math | 270 | 436 | 874 | 392 | 737 | 1,173 | 784 |
| Lab: Other | 68 | 406 | 307 | 359 | 412 | 685 | 83 |
| Lab: <br> Reading | 1 | 68 | 53 | 13 | 39 | 18 | 35 |
| Other | 41 | 770 | 547 | 478 | 333 | 232 | 430 |
| Tutoring: <br> ESL | 41 | 271 | 356 | 494 | 458 | 477 | 368 |
| Tutoring: <br> Math | 118 | 594 | 911 | 887 | 1,020 | 1,170 | 985 |
| Tutoring: <br> Other | 24 | 164 | 135 | 143 | 168 | 181 | 138 |
| Tutoring: <br> Reading | 5 | 27 | 46 | 64 | 63 | 52 | 60 |
| Tutoring: <br> Writing | 38 | 396 | 523 | 612 | 686 | 589 | 584 |
| Workshop | 10 | 77 | 55 | 82 | 83 | 28 | 45 |
| Total | 1,628 | 6,143 | 6,023 | 6,050 | 7,149 | 7,071 | 8,079 |

The use of the TLC by students in certain English, ESL, Math, and Reading courses was examined, and the results are displayed in Tables TLC4-TLC7. Table TLC7 shows that one out of five students taking Reading 30 used the TLC.

Table TLC4. TLC Users in English Courses

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { Used } \\ & \text { TLC } \end{aligned}$ |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall |
| ENG 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | Number | 856 | 483 | 747 | 562 | 710 | 582 | 705 |
|  | \% | 76.6\% | 45.5\% | 59.5\% | 66.4\% | 58.7\% | 52.6\% | 54.7\% |
| Yes | Number | 262 | 579 | 508 | 285 | 500 | 525 | 584 |
|  | \% | 23.4\% | 54.5\% | 40.5\% | 33.6\% | 41.3\% | 47.4\% | 45.3\% |
| Total | Number | 1,118 | 1,062 | 1,255 | 847 | 1,210 | 1,107 | 1,289 |
|  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| ENG 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | Number | 870 | 673 | 798 | 812 | 786 | 819 | 853 |
|  | \% | 90.3\% | 53.8\% | 49.3\% | 63.3\% | 61.7\% | 54.2\% | 55.1\% |
| Yes | Number | 93 | 579 | 822 | 471 | 488 | 691 | 696 |
|  | \% | 9.7\% | 46.2\% | 50.7\% | 36.7\% | 38.3\% | 45.8\% | 44.9\% |
| Total | Number | 963 | 1,252 | 1,620 | 1,283 | 1,274 | 1,510 | 1,549 |
|  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

Table TLC5. TLC Users in ESL Courses

| Course | Used TLC |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall |
| ESL 45 | No | Number | 87 | 52 | 59 |
|  |  | \% | 41.6\% | 53.1\% | 31.4\% |
|  | Yes | Number | 122 | 46 | 129 |
|  |  | \% | 58.4\% | 46.9\% | 68.6\% |
|  | Total | Number | 209 | 98 | 188 |
|  |  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| ESL 55 | No | Number | 79 | 69 | 73 |
|  |  | \% | 36.4\% | 25.2\% | 54.1\% |
|  | Yes | Number | 138 | 205 | 62 |
|  |  | \% | 63.6\% | 74.8\% | 45.9\% |
|  | Total | Number | 217 | 274 | 135 |
|  |  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

Table TLC6. TLC Users in Math Courses

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { Used } \\ & \text { TLC } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 2012-13 \\ \text { Fall } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring |  |
| MATH 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | Number | 109 | 0 | 90 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 49 |
|  | \% | 49.1\% |  | 61.6\% |  | 86.2\% |  | 48.0\% |
| Yes | Number | 113 | 0 | 56 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 53 |
|  | \% | 50.9\% |  | 38.4\% |  | 13.8\% |  | 52.0\% |
| Total | Number | 222 | 0 | 146 | 0 | 65 | 0 | 102 |
|  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  | 100.0\% |  | 100.0\% |
| MATH 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | Number | 1,176 | 950 | 1,062 | 855 | 990 | 907 | 1,033 |
|  | \% | 80.2\% | 54.5\% | 57.3\% | 61.6\% | 51.9\% | 52.5\% | 54.9\% |
| Yes | Number | 291 | 792 | 792 | 534 | 918 | 820 | 850 |
|  | \% | 19.8\% | 45.5\% | 42.7\% | 38.4\% | 48.1\% | 47.5\% | 45.1\% |
| Total | Number | 1,467 | 1,742 | 1,854 | 1,389 | 1,908 | 1,727 | 1,883 |
|  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | $100.0 \%$ | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| MATH 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | Number | 1,592 | 1,159 | 1,365 | 1,304 | 1,421 | 1,248 | 1,542 |
|  | \% | 89.8\% | 59.3\% | 62.3\% | 62.9\% | 54.2\% | 55.5\% | 57.5\% |
| Yes | Number | 180 | 794 | 827 | 769 | 1,202 | 1,001 | 1,138 |
|  | \% | 10.2\% | 40.7\% | 37.7\% | 37.1\% | 45.8\% | 44.5\% | 42.5\% |
| Total | Number | 1,772 | 1,953 | 2,192 | 2,073 | 2,623 | 2,249 | 2,680 |
|  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| MATH 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | Number | 299 | 180 | 285 | 167 | 262 | 161 | 267 |
|  | \% | 94.6\% | 77.6\% | 50.8\% | 84.3\% | 79.2\% | 19.5\% | 85.0\% |
| Yes | Number | 17 | 52 | 276 | 31 | 69 | 663 | 47 |
|  | \% | 5.4\% | 22.4\% | 49.2\% | 15.7\% | 20.8\% | 80.5\% | 15.0\% |
| Total | Number | 316 | 232 | 561 | 198 | 331 | 824 | 314 |
|  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| MATH 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | Number | 1,392 | 1,272 | 1,376 | 1,407 | 1,382 | 1,450 | 1,322 |
|  | \% | 86.7\% | 66.0\% | 56.9\% | 73.4\% | 58.8\% | 59.6\% | 50.6\% |
| Yes | Number | 213 | 654 | 1,041 | 510 | 969 | 982 | 1,291 |
|  | \% | 13.3\% | 34.0\% | 43.1\% | 26.6\% | 41.2\% | 40.4\% | 49.4\% |
| Total | Number | 1,605 | 1,926 | 2,417 | 1,917 | 2,351 | 2,432 | 2,613 |
|  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
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Table TLC7. TLC Users in Reading Courses

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { Used } \\ & \text { TLC } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall |
| READ 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | Number | 107 | 95 | 92 | 82 | 91 | 63 | 79 |
|  | \% | 92.2\% | 65.5\% | 35.0\% | 56.9\% | 67.9\% | 62.4\% | 84.0\% |
| Yes | Number | 9 | 50 | 171 | 62 | 43 | 38 | 15 |
|  | \% | 7.8\% | 34.5\% | 65.0\% | 43.1\% | 32.1\% | 37.6\% | 16.0\% |
| Total | Number | 116 | 145 | 263 | 144 | 134 | 101 | 94 |
|  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| READ 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No | Number | 210 | 141 | 208 | 163 | 282 | 195 | 283 |
|  | \% | 85.4\% | 55.1\% | 56.2\% | 61.3\% | 74.2\% | 69.9\% | 56.7\% |
| Yes | Number | 36 | 115 | 162 | 103 | 98 | 84 | 216 |
|  | \% | 14.6\% | 44.9\% | 43.8\% | 38.7\% | 25.8\% | 30.1\% | 43.3\% |
| Total | Number | 246 | 256 | 370 | 266 | 380 | 279 | 499 |
|  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

## Student Characteristics

Certain student characteristics of the TLC users were examined. Table TLC8 shows the gender distribution for TLC users as well as for students who took at least one class at the Escondido center but did not use the TLC, and all other students. The gender distribution appears stable over the terms examined. TLC users were more likely to be female than male, while the rest of the credit student population was evenly split by gender.

Table TLC8. TLC Users by Gender \& Student Category

| Gender | $2009-10$ |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | $2012-13$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall |
|  | 265 | 771 | 709 | 722 | 819 | 740 | 859 |
|  | $56.0 \%$ | $55.7 \%$ | $57.5 \%$ | $56.3 \%$ | $57.5 \%$ | $56.1 \%$ | $55.9 \%$ |
| Male | 200 | 596 | 512 | 551 | 592 | 563 | 663 |
|  | $42.3 \%$ | $43.1 \%$ | $41.5 \%$ | $43.0 \%$ | $41.5 \%$ | $42.7 \%$ | $43.2 \%$ |
| Unknown | 8 | 16 | 13 | 9 | 14 | 16 | 14 |
|  | $1.7 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $1.1 \%$ | $0.7 \%$ | $1.0 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ | $0.9 \%$ |
|  | 473 | 1,383 | 1,234 | 1,282 | 1,425 | 1,319 | 1,536 |
|  | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Escondido Center Student

| Female | 1,794 | 1,415 | 1,462 | 1,335 | 1,284 | 1,311 | 1,187 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 48.8\% | 47.3\% | 46.3\% | 47.6\% | 45.7\% | 47.3\% | 46.5\% |
| Male | 1,862 | 1,564 | 1,679 | 1,452 | 1,514 | 1,441 | 1,349 |
|  | 50.7\% | 52.2\% | 53.2\% | 51.8\% | 53.8\% | 52.0\% | 52.8\% |
| Unknown | 20 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 14 | 17 | 17 |
|  | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.5\% | 0.6\% | 0.7\% |
| Total | 3,676 | 2,994 | 3,157 | 2,804 | 2,812 | 2,769 | 2,553 |
|  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Other Student |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 10,177 | 9,788 | 9,599 | 9,560 | 9,150 | 8,970 | 9,127 |
|  | 48.9\% | 49.5\% | 48.0\% | 47.7\% | 46.6\% | 47.3\% | 47.1\% |
| Male | 10,506 | 9,885 | 10,301 | 10,356 | 10,361 | 9,879 | 10,175 |
|  | 50.5\% | 50.0\% | 51.5\% | 51.7\% | 52.8\% | 52.1\% | 52.5\% |
| Unknown | 118 | 114 | 116 | 113 | 126 | 113 | 95 |
|  | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.5\% |
| Total | 20,801 | 19,787 | 20,016 | 20,029 | 19,637 | 18,962 | 19,397 |
|  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Total | 24,950 | 24,164 | 24,407 | 24,115 | 23,874 | 23,050 | 23,486 |
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Table TLC9 shows the distributions of students by race and ethnicity for (a) TLC users, (b) the Escondido Center, and (c) the rest of the credit students at the college. The distributions of students by race and ethnicity have remained stable over the terms examined. While the Escondido Center population, in general, looks much like the population of Palomar College as a whole, those using the TLC differed in terms of race and ethnicity. Table TLC9 shows that 40-50\% of the TLC users were Hispanic. TLC users were more likely to be Hispanic, and less likely to be white in comparison to Escondido Center and other students in general.

Table TLC9. TLC Users by Ethnicity \& Student Category

| Ethnicity | Fall 2009-10 |  | Fall 2010-11 |  | Fall 2011-12 |  | Fall 2012-13 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TLC User |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afr.Am. Non-Hisp | 15 | 3.2\% | 48 | 3.9\% | 53 | 3.7\% | 64 | 4.2\% |
| Asian | 22 | 4.7\% | 52 | 4.2\% | 61 | 4.3\% | 79 | 5.1\% |
| Filipino | 15 | 3.2\% | 30 | 2.4\% | 28 | 2.0\% | 40 | 2.6\% |
| Hispanic | 197 | 41.6\% | 550 | 44.6\% | 633 | 44.4\% | 776 | 50.5\% |
| Multi Ethnic | 10 | 2.1\% | 29 | 2.4\% | 39 | 2.7\% | 41 | 2.7\% |
| Nat.Am. | 4 | 0.8\% | 13 | 1.1\% | 21 | 1.5\% | 16 | 1.0\% |
| Pacific | 4 | 0.8\% | 17 | 1.4\% | 15 | 1.1\% | 8 | 0.5\% |
| Unknown | 22 | 4.7\% | 62 | 5.0\% | 44 | 3.1\% | 48 | 3.1\% |
| White Non- | 184 | 38.9\% | 433 | 35.1\% | 531 | 37.3\% | 464 | 30.2\% |
| Escondido Center Student |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afr.Am. <br> Non-Hisp | 120 | 3.3\% | 93 | 2.9\% | 64 | 2.3\% | 78 | 3.1\% |
| Asian | 102 | 2.8\% | 91 | 2.9\% | 67 | 2.4\% | 82 | 3.2\% |
| Filipino | 99 | 2.7\% | 82 | 2.6\% | 70 | 2.5\% | 51 | 2.0\% |
| Hispanic | 1,272 | 34.6\% | 1,058 | 33.5\% | 1,043 | 37.1\% | 972 | 38.1\% |
| Multi Ethnic | 95 | 2.6\% | 113 | 3.6\% | 92 | 3.3\% | 106 | 4.2\% |
| Nat.Am. | 43 | 1.2\% | 33 | 1.0\% | 22 | 0.8\% | 17 | 0.7\% |
| Pacific <br> Islander | 19 | 0.5\% | 16 | 0.5\% | 12 | 0.4\% | 12 | 0.5\% |
| Unknown | 150 | 4.1\% | 106 | 3.4\% | 100 | 3.6\% | 84 | 3.3\% |
| White NonHisp | 1,776 | 48.3\% | 1,565 | 49.6\% | 1,342 | 47.7\% | 1,151 | 45.1\% |
| Other Student |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Afr.Am. <br> Non-Hisp | 679 | 3.3\% | 605 | 3.0\% | 629 | 3.2\% | 619 | 3.2\% |
| Asian | 1,124 | 5.4\% | 1,016 | 5.1\% | 991 | 5.0\% | 954 | 4.9\% |
| Filipino | 633 | 3.0\% | 575 | 2.9\% | 598 | 3.0\% | 579 | 3.0\% |
| Hispanic | 5,796 | 27.9\% | 5,950 | 29.7\% | 6,141 | 31.3\% | 6,449 | 33.2\% |
| Multi Ethnic | 607 | 2.9\% | 699 | 3.5\% | 784 | 4.0\% | 854 | 4.4\% |
| Nat.Am. | 155 | 0.7\% | 133 | 0.7\% | 138 | 0.7\% | 147 | 0.8\% |
| Pacific <br> Islander | 172 | 0.8\% | 157 | 0.8\% | 124 | 0.6\% | 116 | 0.6\% |
| Unknown | 893 | 4.3\% | 690 | 3.4\% | 627 | 3.2\% | 611 | 3.1\% |
| White NonHisp | 10,742 | 51.6\% | 10,191 | 50.9\% | 9,605 | 48.9\% | 9,068 | 46.7\% |

Table TLC10 shows that close to half of the TLC users were daytime only students, and more than $10 \%$ were evening only students. Relative to other Escondido Center students, TLC users were much more likely to attend courses during the day.

Table TLC10. TLC Users by Day Eve \& Student Category

| Student <br> Category | P Day <br> Eve |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2012-13 } \\ \text { Fall } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring |  |
| TLC User | D/E | Number | 193 | 575 | 504 | 518 | 538 | 518 | 683 |
|  |  | \% | 40.8\% | 41.6\% | 40.8\% | 40.4\% | 37.8\% | 39.3\% | 44.5\% |
|  | Day | Number | 234 | 634 | 600 | 617 | 691 | 591 | 643 |
|  |  | \% | 49.5\% | 45.8\% | 48.6\% | 48.1\% | 48.5\% | 44.8\% | 41.9\% |
|  | Eve | Number | 46 | 174 | 130 | 147 | 196 | 210 | 210 |
|  |  | \% | 9.7\% | 12.6\% | 10.5\% | 11.5\% | 13.8\% | 15.9\% | 13.7\% |
|  | Total | Number | 473 | 1,383 | 1,234 | 1,282 | 1,425 | 1,319 | 1,536 |
|  |  | \% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Escondido <br> Center <br> Student | D/E | Number | 1,443 | 1,120 | 1,242 | 1,098 | 1,090 | 1,113 | 1,055 |
|  |  | \% | 39.3\% | 37.4\% | 39.3\% | 39.2\% | 38.8\% | 40.2\% | 41.3\% |
|  | Day | Number | 1,325 | 1,058 | 1,135 | 1,038 | 1,009 | 1,044 | 888 |
|  |  | \% | 36.0\% | 35.3\% | 36.0\% | 37.0\% | 35.9\% | 37.7\% | 34.8\% |
|  | Eve | Number | 908 | 801 | 780 | 668 | 713 | 612 | 610 |
|  |  | \% | 24.7\% | 26.8\% | 24.7\% | 23.8\% | 25.4\% | 22.1\% | 23.9\% |
|  | Ukn | Number | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | \% | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  | Total | Number | 3,676 | 2,994 | 3,157 | 2,804 | 2,812 | 2,769 | 2,553 |
|  |  | \% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Other <br> Student | D/E | Number | 5,537 | 5,203 | 5,451 | 5,445 | 5,309 | 5,077 | 4,955 |
|  |  | \% | 26.6\% | 26.3\% | 27.2\% | 27.2\% | 27.0\% | 26.8\% | 25.5\% |
|  | Day | Number | 12,066 | 11,733 | 11,625 | 11,699 | 11,653 | 11,385 | 11,744 |
|  |  | \% | 58.0\% | 59.3\% | 58.1\% | 58.4\% | 59.3\% | 60.0\% | 60.5\% |
|  | Eve | Number | 3,198 | 2,851 | 2,940 | 2,872 | 2,671 | 2,500 | 2,698 |
|  |  | \% | 15.4\% | 14.4\% | 14.7\% | 14.3\% | 13.6\% | 13.2\% | 13.9\% |
|  | Ukn | Number | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | \% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  | Total | Number | 20,801 | 19,787 | 20,016 | 20,029 | 19,637 | 18,962 | 19,397 |
|  |  | \% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% | 100\% |
| Total |  | Number | 24,950 | 24,164 | 24,407 | 24,115 | 23,874 | 23,050 | 23,486 |

Institutional Research \& Planning;
BSI-HSI Activity Evaluation Report 2013

For the purposes of this analysis, students were classified (based on the lowest level class they were enrolled in for the given term) as (a) basic skills, (b) AA, or (c) transfer level students. TLC users were more likely to be basic skills students than were Escondido Center students, and other students in general. This is illustrated in Table TLC11, which also shows that TLC users were also more likely to be AA level students compared to others.

Table TLC11. TLC Users by Student Level \& Student Category

| Student |  | 2009-10 | 2009-10 | 2010-11 | 2010-11 | 2011-12 | 2011-12 | 2012-13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Level |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall |
|  |  |  |  | TLC User |  |  |  |  |
| Basic | Number | 129 | 281 | 269 | 247 | 286 | 251 | 249 |
| Skills | \% | 27.3\% | 20.3\% | 21.8\% | 19.3\% | 20.1\% | 19.0\% | 16.2\% |
|  | Number | 109 | 315 | 344 | 325 | 427 | 390 | 460 |
|  | \% | 23.0\% | 22.8\% | 27.9\% | 25.4\% | 30.0\% | 29.6\% | 29.9\% |
| Transfer | Number | 235 | 787 | 621 | 710 | 712 | 678 | 827 |
| Transfer | \% | 49.7\% | 56.9\% | 50.3\% | 55.4\% | 50.0\% | 51.4\% | 53.8\% |
| Total | Number | 473 | 1,383 | 1,234 | 1,282 | 1,425 | 1,319 | 1,536 |
| Total | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  | Escond | ido Cente | r Student |  |  |  |
| Basic | Number | 517 | 315 | 416 | 315 | 306 | 274 | 300 |
| Skills | \% | 14.1\% | 10.5\% | 13.2\% | 11.2\% | 10.9\% | 9.9\% | 11.8\% |
|  | Number | 604 | 461 | 536 | 513 | 501 | 490 | 494 |
|  | \% | 16.4\% | 15.4\% | 17.0\% | 18.3\% | 17.8\% | 17.7\% | 19.3\% |
| Transfer | Number | 2,555 | 2,218 | 2,205 | 1,976 | 2,005 | 2,005 | 1,759 |
| Transfer | \% | 69.5\% | 74.1\% | 69.8\% | 70.5\% | 71.3\% | 72.4\% | 68.9\% |
| Total | Number | 3,676 | 2,994 | 3,157 | 2,804 | 2,812 | 2,769 | 2,553 |
| Total | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | Other Stud |  |  |  |  |
| Basic | Number | 1,671 | 1,311 | 1,645 | 1,282 | 1,471 | 1,232 | 1,500 |
| Skills | \% | 8.0\% | 6.6\% | 8.2\% | 6.4\% | 7.5\% | 6.5\% | 7.7\% |
| AA | Number | 2,501 | 2,354 | 2,590 | 2,600 | 2,729 | 2,644 | 2,825 |
| AA | \% | 12.0\% | 11.9\% | 12.9\% | 13.0\% | 13.9\% | 13.9\% | 14.6\% |
| Transfer | Number | 16,629 | 16,122 | 15,781 | 16,147 | 15,437 | 15,086 | 15,072 |
| Transfer | \% | 79.9\% | 81.5\% | 78.8\% | 80.6\% | 78.6\% | 79.6\% | 77.7\% |
|  | Number | 20,801 | 19,787 | 20,016 | 20,029 | 19,637 | 18,962 | 19,397 |
|  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Total | Number | 24,950 | 24,164 | 24,407 | 24,115 | 23,874 | 23,050 | 23,486 |
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## TLC Impact

The impact of the TLC was assessed, in a limited way, by examining course success (receiving a grade of $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{CR}$, or P ) and retention (completing the semester and receiving a transcript grade) rates for specific math classes. These courses were selected because of the relatively higher number of students in these courses who used the TLC. The impact of TLC use was also examined in terms of persistence.

Table TLC12 shows the success rates for students in Math $10,15,50,56$, and 60 who visited the TLC explicitly for the purpose of getting help in math. The table also shows this information for the other students in these courses. While these two categories of students cannot be assumed to have been equivalent, the other students taking these courses are included in this table because they may provide a useful point of reference. The success rates in these math courses for TLC users ranged from 48\% (Fall 2010) to 73\% (Fall 2009).

Table TLC12. Success for TLC Users in Math 10, 15, 50, or 60 Who Visited the TLC for Math Help

| Visited the TLC for Math Help | Success |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall |  |
| No | No | Number | 2,247 | 2,584 | 2,650 | 2,339 | 2,474 | 2,545 | 2,821 | 17,660 |
|  |  | \% | 43.9\% | 47.2\% | 41.6\% | 44.0\% | 37.4\% | 41.6\% | 41.0\% | 42.2\% |
|  | Yes | Number | 2,872 | 2,888 | 3,722 | 2,974 | 4,133 | 3,572 | 4,052 | 24,213 |
|  |  | \% | 56.1\% | 52.8\% | 58.4\% | 56.0\% | 62.6\% | 58.4\% | 59.0\% | 57.8\% |
|  | Total | Number | 5,119 | 5,472 | 6,372 | 5,313 | 6,607 | 6,117 | 6,873 | 41,873 |
|  |  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Yes | No | Number | 71 | 143 | 413 | 117 | 299 | 356 | 313 | 1,712 |
|  |  | \% | 27.0\% | 37.5\% | 51.8\% | 44.3\% | 44.6\% | 31.9\% | 43.5\% | 40.7\% |
|  | Yes | Number | 192 | 238 | 385 | 147 | 372 | 759 | 406 | 2,499 |
|  |  | \% | 73.0\% | 62.5\% | 48.2\% | 55.7\% | 55.4\% | 68.1\% | 56.5\% | 59.3\% |
|  | Total | Number | 263 | 381 | 798 | 264 | 671 | 1,115 | 719 | 4,211 |
|  |  |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

Table TLC13 shows the success rates for students in Math 10, 15, 50, 56, and 60 who visited the TLC for any reason, not just help in math. Those who visited the TLC had a success rate of about $69 \%$.

Table TLC13. Success for TLC Users in Math 10, 15, 50, or 60 Who Visited the TLC for Any Reason

| Visited the TLC for Any Reason | Success |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 <br> Fall | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring |  |  |
| No | No | Number | 2,048 | 1,806 | 1,861 | 1,851 | 1,678 | 1,821 | 1,971 | 1,821 |
|  |  | \% | 44.8\% | 50.7\% | 44.5\% | 49.6\% | 40.8\% | 48.4\% | 46.8\% | 48.4\% |
|  | Yes | Number | 2,520 | 1,755 | 2,317 | 1,882 | 2,433 | 1,945 | 2,242 | 1,945 |
|  |  | \% | 55.2\% | 49.3\% | 55.5\% | 50.4\% | 59.2\% | 51.6\% | 53.2\% | 51.6\% |
|  | Total | Number | 4,568 | 3,561 | 4,178 | 3,733 | 4,111 | 3,766 | 4,213 | 3,766 |
|  |  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Yes | No | Number | 270 | 921 | 1,202 | 605 | 1,095 | 1,080 | 1,163 | 1,080 |
|  |  | \% | 33.2\% | 40.2\% | 40.2\% | 32.8\% | 34.6\% | 31.2\% | 34.4\% | 31.2\% |
|  | Yes | Number | 544 | 1,371 | 1,790 | 1,239 | 2,072 | 2,386 | 2,216 | 2,386 |
|  |  | \% | 66.8\% | 59.8\% | 59.8\% | 67.2\% | 65.4\% | 68.8\% | 65.6\% | 68.8\% |
|  | Total | Number | 814 | 2,292 | 2,992 | 1,844 | 3,167 | 3,466 | 3,379 | 3,466 |
|  |  |  | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

The retention rates in these same math courses are displayed in Table TLC13. The retention rate for those who used the TLC for math assistance was $90.7 \%$.

Table TLC14. Retention for TLC Users in Math 10, 15, 50, or 60 Who Visited the TLC for Math Help

| Visited the TLC for Math Help | Retained |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall |  |
| No | No | Number | 448 | 466 | 418 | 400 | 420 | 395 | 711 | 3,258 |
|  |  | \% | 8.8\% | 8.5\% | 6.6\% | 7.5\% | 6.4\% | 6.5\% | 10.3\% | 7.8\% |
|  | Yes | Number | 4,671 | 5,006 | 5,954 | 4,913 | 6,187 | 5,722 | 6,162 | 38,615 |
|  |  | \% | 91.2\% | 91.5\% | 93.4\% | 92.5\% | 93.6\% | 93.5\% | 89.7\% | 92.2\% |
|  | Total | Number | 5,119 | 5,472 | 6,372 | 5,313 | 6,607 | 6,117 | 6,873 | 41,873 |
|  |  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Yes | No | Number | 14 | 23 | 121 | 27 | 84 | 33 | 88 | 390 |
|  |  | \% | 5.3\% | 6.0\% | 15.2\% | 10.2\% | 12.5\% | 3.0\% | 12.2\% | 9.3\% |
|  | Yes | Number | 249 | 358 | 677 | 237 | 587 | 1,082 | 631 | 3,821 |
|  |  | \% | 94.7\% | 94.0\% | 84.8\% | 89.8\% | 87.5\% | 97.0\% | 87.8\% | 90.7\% |
|  | Total | Number | 263 | 381 | 798 | 264 | 671 | 1,115 | 719 | 4,211 |
|  |  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

Retention in these math courses for all TLC users is displayed in Table TLC15. Overall, the retention rate in the select math courses is about 94\%.

Table TLC15. Retention for TLC Users in Math 10, 15, 50, or 60 Who Visited the TLC for Math Help

| Visited the TLC for Math Help | Retained |  | 2009-10 |  | 2010-11 |  | 2011-12 |  | 2012-13 | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall | Spring | Fall |  |
| No | No | Number | 389 | 370 | 351 | 322 | 305 | 333 | 471 | 2,541 |
|  |  | \% | 8.5\% | 10.4\% | 8.4\% | 8.6\% | 7.4\% | 8.8\% | 11.2\% | 9.0\% |
|  | Yes | Number | 4,179 | 3,191 | 3,827 | 3,411 | 3,806 | 3,433 | 3,742 | 25,589 |
|  |  | \% | 91.5\% | 89.6\% | 91.6\% | 91.4\% | 92.6\% | 91.2\% | 88.8\% | 91.0\% |
|  | Total | Number | 4,568 | 3,561 | 4,178 | 3,733 | 4,111 | 3,766 | 4,213 | 28,130 |
|  |  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Yes | No | Number | 73 | 119 | 188 | 105 | 199 | 95 | 328 | 1,107 |
|  |  | \% | 9.0\% | 5.2\% | 6.3\% | 5.7\% | 6.3\% | 2.7\% | 9.7\% | 6.2\% |
|  | Yes | Number | 741 | 2,173 | 2,804 | 1,739 | 2,968 | 3,371 | 3,051 | 16,847 |
|  |  | \% | 91.0\% | 94.8\% | 93.7\% | 94.3\% | 93.7\% | 97.3\% | 90.3\% | 93.8\% |
|  | Total | Number | 814 | 2,292 | 2,992 | 1,844 | 3,167 | 3,466 | 3,379 | 17,954 |
|  |  | \% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% | 100.0\% |

Persistence rates for TLC users and others are found in Table TLC16. The table reveals that for TLC users, fall-to-spring persistence is nearly $80 \%$, and spring-to-fall persistence is over $60 \%$. The TLC users exhibit considerably higher persistence than do other students.

Table TLC16. Persistence by Student Category

| Term |  | Persisted <br> to Next <br> Term | Student Category |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Escondido Center | Other Student |  | TLC User |  |
|  |  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 2009-10 | Fall |  | No | 1,283 | 34.9\% | 7,267 | 34.9\% | 100 | 21.1\% |
|  |  |  | Yes | 2,395 | 65.1\% | 13,550 | 65.1\% | 373 | 78.9\% |
|  |  | No | 1,525 | 50.9\% | 9,483 | 47.9\% | 541 | 39.1\% |
|  |  | Yes | 1,471 | 49.1\% | 10,312 | 52.1\% | 842 | 60.9\% |
| 2010-11 | Fall | No | 1,107 | 35.0\% | 6,673 | 33.3\% | 261 | 21.2\% |
|  |  | Yes | 2,052 | 65.0\% | 13,347 | 66.7\% | 973 | 78.8\% |
|  |  | No | 1,381 | 49.2\% | 9,455 | 47.2\% | 486 | 37.9\% |
|  | Spring | Yes | 1,424 | 50.8\% | 10,576 | 52.8\% | 796 | 62.1\% |
| 2011-12 | Fall | No | 964 | 34.0\% | 6,444 | 33.0\% | 311 | 22.0\% |
|  | Fall | Yes | 1,848 | 66.0\% | 13,193 | 67.0\% | 1,114 | 78.0\% |
|  |  | No | 1,308 | 47.0\% | 8,669 | 46.0\% | 472 | 36.0\% |
|  | Spring | Yes | 1,461 | 53.0\% | 10,293 | 54.0\% | 847 | 64.0\% |

## TLC Summary

Use of the Escondido TLC was significant for a number of students. Some key points are noted below.

- Use of the TLC topped 8,000 visits in the Fall 2012 term.
- The primary reason students went to the TLC was to do homework.
- Compared to other students, TLC users were more likely to be (a) female, (b) Hispanic, and (c) basic skills students.
- The success rate of math students using the TLC was about $69 \%$, while the retention rate was about $94 \%$.
- Persistence was very high for TLC users.


## TUTORING

Tutoring at Palomar College takes a number of forms. The present study focuses on supervised tutoring activity captured in the Writing Center, the Math Learning Center, the TLC, the ESL tutoring, the STAR Center in the library, and the STEM Center.

## Tutoring Use

Table T1 shows the number of students using tutoring. This includes tutoring at the Writing Center, the Math Learning Center, the TLC, the ESL tutoring, the STAR Center, and the STEM Center. The table shows that the number of students utilizing tutoring is climbing each term. The table also shows the number of tutoring hours for each term, as well as the average tutoring hours per tutored student. Spring terms appear to get a little heavier tutor usage compared to fall terms.

Table T1. Number and Hours of Tutoring Students

| Year |  | Students | Hours | Hours per <br> Student |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2009-10$ | Fall | 1,746 | $16,843.90$ | 9.65 |
|  | Spring | 1,825 | $18,597.70$ | 10.19 |
| $2010-11$ | Fall | 1,940 | $17,968.20$ | 9.26 |
|  | Spring | 2,031 | $22,553.50$ | 11.10 |
| $2011-12$ | Fall | 2,290 | $19,899.00$ | 8.69 |
|  | Spring | 2,384 | $21,282.40$ | 8.93 |
| $2012-13$ | Fall | 2,528 | $23,250.60$ | 9.20 |

The use of tutoring by location is summarized in Tables T2 and T3 in terms of students and hours. Tutoring use is highest in the library, and is increasing both at the TLC and the library. Tutoring just got underway in Fall 2011 at the ESL Lab, and in Spring 2012 in the STEM Center.

Table T2. Number of Tutoring Students by Location

| Year | Term | Location |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ESL <br> Center | Math <br> Center | STAR <br> Center | STEM <br> Center | TLC <br> Escondido | Writing Center |
| 2009-10 | Fall | 0 | 508 | 852 | 0 | 52 | 652 |
|  | Spring | 0 | 514 | 805 | 0 | 337 | 594 |
| 2010-11 | Fall | 0 | 606 | 794 | 0 | 371 | 628 |
|  | Spring | 0 | 734 | 868 | 0 | 430 | 528 |
| 2011-12 | Fall | 147 | 622 | 934 | 0 | 538 | 563 |
|  | Spring | 192 | 610 | 993 | 57 | 564 | 567 |
| 2012-13 | Fall | 206 | 742 | 859 | 236 | 547 | 666 |

Table T3. Hours of Tutoring by Location

| Year | Term | Location |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ESL <br> Center | Math <br> Center | STAR <br> Center | STEM <br> Center | TLC <br> Escondido | Writing Center |
| 2009-10 | Fall | 0.0 | 7,292.8 | 6,120.0 | 0.0 | 153.3 | 3,277.8 |
|  | Spring | 0.0 | 7,046.2 | 6,851.2 | 0.0 | 1,837.1 | 2,863.2 |
| 2010-11 | Fall | 0.0 | 8,418.5 | 4,167.0 | 0.0 | 2,710.7 | 2,672.0 |
|  | Spring | 0.0 | 11,532.1 | 5,847.9 | 0.0 | 3,041.9 | 2,131.6 |
| 2011-12 | Fall | 423.7 | 8,185.5 | 5,310.6 | 0.0 | 3,140.8 | 2,838.4 |
|  | Spring | 524.4 | 8,433.2 | 5,713.0 | 177.4 | 3,368.4 | 3,066.0 |
| 2012-13 | Fall | 852.6 | 10,404.4 | 4,917.4 | 1,097.9 | 2,702.5 | 3,275.8 |

Tables T4 and T5 display the number of students or hours of tutoring by the type of tutoring service requested. Generic tutoring was the most common, followed by math and writing.

Table T4. Number of Tutoring Students by Type

| Year | Term | Tutoring Students by Type of Service |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ESL | Generic | Math | Reading | Writing |
| 2009-10 | Fall | 11 | 858 | 531 | 3 | 661 |
|  | Spring | 60 | 868 | 626 | 15 | 681 |
| 2010-11 | Fall | 63 | 834 | 743 | 22 | 737 |
|  | Spring | 89 | 915 | 890 | 10 | 656 |
| 2011-12 | Fall | 238 | 995 | 823 | 22 | 726 |
|  | Spring | 290 | 1,111 | 816 | 18 | 748 |
| 2012-13 | Fall | 277 | 1,145 | 959 | 27 | 848 |

Table T5. Hours of Tutoring by Type

|  |  | Tutoring Hours by Type of Service |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | Term | ESL | Generic | Math | Reading | Writing |
| $2009-10$ | Fall | 31.5 | $6,135.4$ | $7,373.9$ | 2.5 | $3,300.6$ |
|  | Spring | 279.2 | $7,033.5$ | $7,895.7$ | 17.8 | $3,371.5$ |
| $2010-11$ | Fall | 403.8 | $4,321.7$ | $9,664.7$ | 73.2 | $3,504.8$ |
|  | Spring | 560.0 | $6,074.5$ | $12,889.4$ | 58.0 | $2,971.6$ |
| $2011-12$ | Fall | 922.8 | $5,491.8$ | $9,607.2$ | 92.2 | $3,785.0$ |
|  | Spring | $1,197.4$ | $6,049.5$ | $10,223.4$ | 56.3 | $3,755.8$ |
| $2012-13$ | Fall | $1,161.6$ | $6,178.8$ | $11,927.0$ | 66.8 | $3,916.4$ |

## Student Characteristics

A number of student characteristics were examined for both those who received tutoring and those who did not. Each of these characteristics showed differences between students receiving tutoring and the other credit students.

Gender. Table T6 shows the tutoring students by gender. Those receiving tutoring were more likely to be female than male.

Table T6. Tutoring Students by Gender

| Year | Term | Used <br> Tutoring | Gender |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Female | Male | Unknown |
| 2009-10 | Fall | No | 46.6\% | 52.7\% | 0.7\% |
|  |  | Yes | 57.8\% | 41.2\% | 1.0\% |
|  | Spring | No | 46.5\% | 52.8\% | 0.7\% |
|  |  | Yes | 55.7\% | 43.0\% | 1.3\% |
| 2010-11 | Fall | No | 45.3\% | 54.0\% | 0.7\% |
|  |  | Yes | 57.0\% | 41.7\% | 1.3\% |
|  | Spring | No | 45.5\% | 53.8\% | 0.7\% |
|  |  | Yes | 53.7\% | 45.1\% | 1.2\% |
| 2011-12 | Fall | No | 44.4\% | 54.9\% | 0.7\% |
|  |  | Yes | 55.4\% | 43.4\% | 1.1\% |
|  | Spring | No | 44.1\% | 55.2\% | 0.7\% |
|  |  | Yes | 57.2\% | 41.5\% | 1.3\% |
| 2012-13 | Fall | No | 44.3\% | 55.1\% | 0.6\% |
|  |  | Yes | 55.1\% | 44.2\% | 0.7\% |

Race and Ethnicity. About 40\% of the tutoring students were white, non-Hispanic. This is revealed in Table T7. The table also shows that over a third of the tutoring students were Hispanic.

Table T7. Percent of Students Using Tutoring by Ethnicity

| Year | Fall | UsedTutoring | Ethnicity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | African <br> American | Asian | Filipino | Hispanic | Multi <br> Ethnic | Native <br> American | Pacific <br> Islander | Unknown | White |
| 2009-10 | Fall | No | 3.0\% | 3.7\% | 2.6\% | 25.9\% | 2.1\% | 0.8\% | 0.9\% | 5.7\% | 55.3\% |
|  |  | Yes | 3.5\% | 9.2\% | 2.6\% | 32.8\% | 1.4\% | 0.6\% | 0.8\% | 8.0\% | 41.1\% |
|  | Spring | No | 2.7\% | 4.0\% | 2.5\% | 26.6\% | 2.4\% | 0.8\% | 0.9\% | 5.5\% | 54.5\% |
|  |  | Yes | 3.4\% | 8.9\% | 2.4\% | 33.3\% | 1.2\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 6.7\% | 42.5\% |
| 2010-11 | Fall | No | 2.8\% | 3.8\% | 2.6\% | 27.6\% | 2.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 5.2\% | 53.8\% |
|  |  | Yes | 3.5\% | 7.9\% | 2.7\% | 32.2\% | 2.3\% | 0.8\% | 1.2\% | 7.6\% | 41.8\% |
|  | Spring | No | 2.9\% | 4.0\% | 2.5\% | 28.4\% | 2.9\% | 0.9\% | 0.8\% | 5.0\% | 52.7\% |
|  |  | Yes | 3.9\% | 7.7\% | 2.6\% | 33.8\% | 2.1\% | 0.9\% | 0.9\% | 7.3\% | 40.8\% |
| 2011-12 | Fall | No | 2.9\% | 3.7\% | 2.7\% | 29.5\% | 3.3\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 4.8\% | 51.7\% |
|  |  | Yes | 2.6\% | 8.3\% | 2.6\% | 35.1\% | 3.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.7\% | 6.5\% | 40.2\% |
|  | Spring | No | 2.8\% | 3.8\% | 2.7\% | 31.0\% | 3.6\% | 0.9\% | 0.8\% | 4.5\% | 50.0\% |
|  |  | Yes | 3.2\% | 8.8\% | 2.5\% | 36.7\% | 2.3\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 7.0\% | 38.4\% |
| 2012-13 | Fall | No | 3.1\% | 3.9\% | 2.6\% | 31.7\% | 3.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.7\% | 4.5\% | 48.9\% |
|  |  | Yes | 2.6\% | 8.2\% | 3.1\% | 39.2\% | 3.2\% | 1.0\% | 0.9\% | 5.5\% | 36.3\% |

Age. Table T8 summarizes the ages of both tutored and non-tutored students. Students receiving tutoring averaged 25.8 years of age across the five terms studied. Students who made use of tutoring were, on average, about a year younger than were other students.

Table T8. Percent of Students Using Tutoring by Age Category

| Year | Term | Used <br> Tutoring | Age Category |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 19 and <br> Under | 20 to 24 | 25 to 49 | 50 and <br> Over | Unknown |
| 2009-10 | Fall | No | 29.9\% | 33.2\% | 29.7\% | 7.3\% | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Yes | 30.7\% | 34.9\% | 30.0\% | 4.4\% | 0.0\% |
|  | Spring | No | 20.1\% | 40.9\% | 31.6\% | 7.4\% | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Yes | 14.4\% | 47.5\% | 32.9\% | 5.2\% | 0.0\% |
| 2010-11 | Fall | No | 27.8\% | 34.8\% | 29.8\% | 7.6\% | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Yes | 27.8\% | 36.6\% | 31.7\% | 4.0\% | 0.0\% |
|  | Spring | No | 18.5\% | 41.9\% | 32.0\% | 7.6\% | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Yes | 12.8\% | 48.3\% | 33.8\% | 5.2\% | 0.0\% |
| 2011-12 | Fall | No | 27.2\% | 36.7\% | 29.4\% | 6.7\% | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Yes | 27.9\% | 36.9\% | 30.2\% | 4.9\% | 0.0\% |
|  | Spring | No | 17.5\% | 44.1\% | 31.6\% | 6.7\% | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Yes | 14.6\% | 44.8\% | 35.2\% | 5.4\% | 0.0\% |
| 2012-13 | Fall | No | 27.1\% | 36.7\% | 29.8\% | 6.4\% | 0.0\% |
|  |  | Yes | 27.8\% | 39.5\% | 29.0\% | 3.8\% | 0.0\% |

## Tutoring Impact

The impact of the tutoring was assessed, to an extent, by examining course success (receiving a grade of $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{CR}$, or P ) and retention (completing the semester and receiving a transcript grade) rates for select English and math courses. Success and retention in English courses were examined for those who had made use of English tutoring alongside those who had not used the tutoring for English. Similarly, math course outcomes were examined for those who had, and those who had not, used the math tutoring. Math and English courses were included in the analysis if they were below transfer level and had a significant number of students who used tutoring in that domain.

Overall, tutoring is associated with higher success rates and retention. This is shown in Table T9. For each term, success rates and retention rates were higher for students who received tutoring than for other students.

Table T9. Success and Retention by Used Tutoring

| Year |  | Success |  | Retention |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Term | Used Tutoring |  | Used Tutoring |  |

## English Success and Retention

English Course Success. Table T10 shows the success rates for students in English 10 (English Essentials), English 50 (Introductory Composition), and English 100 (English Composition) courses. While those receiving tutoring cannot be assumed to have been equivalent to the other students taking these courses, the categories are included here because they may provide a useful point of reference. Those receiving tutoring in English had a success rate of 64\% in English 10, 74\% in English 50, and 80\% in English 100.

Table T10. Success Rates in English by Used Tutoring

| Year | Term | English 10 |  | English 50 |  | English 100 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Used Tutoring |  | Used Tutoring |  | Used Tutoring |  |
|  |  | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| 2009-10 | Fall | 51.4\% | 57.5\% | 68.6\% | 79.3\% | 67.6\% | 75.3\% |
|  | Spring | 49.7\% | 63.3\% | 62.6\% | 67.9\% | 63.4\% | 80.2\% |
| 2010-11 | Fall | 58.9\% | 53.5\% | 73.6\% | 79.3\% | 70.6\% | 80.8\% |
|  | Spring | 49.0\% | 68.9\% | 69.5\% | 70.2\% | 65.7\% | 73.6\% |
| 2011-12 | Fall | 54.6\% | 64.3\% | 72.2\% | 73.7\% | 73.0\% | 79.7\% |
|  | Spring | 49.0\% | 73.1\% | 67.1\% | 73.3\% | 63.2\% | 81.1\% |
| 2012-13 | Fall | 60.4\% | 70.8\% | 72.3\% | 74.1\% | 68.3\% | 80.4\% |

English Course Retention. The retention rates in English courses for tutored and nontutored students are displayed in Table T11. The retention rates for those who used English tutoring were very high.

Table T11. Retention Rates in English by Used Tutoring

| Year | Term | English 10 |  | English 50 |  | English 100 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Used Tutoring |  | Used Tutoring |  | Used Tutoring |  |
|  |  | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| 2009-10 | Fall | 92.5\% | 93.8\% | 94.4\% | 98.5\% | 92.4\% | 94.7\% |
|  | Spring | 91.0\% | 96.9\% | 91.0\% | 93.9\% | 89.5\% | 95.5\% |
| 2010-11 | Fall | 92.7\% | 89.9\% | 95.3\% | 95.7\% | 92.2\% | 95.2\% |
|  | Spring | 90.1\% | 94.3\% | 93.2\% | 93.2\% | 93.4\% | 95.9\% |
| 2011-12 | Fall | 92.7\% | 97.1\% | 93.8\% | 95.4\% | 95.2\% | 97.3\% |
|  | Spring | 93.9\% | 98.1\% | 95.4\% | 96.9\% | 93.0\% | 96.2\% |
| 2012-13 | Fall | 89.4\% | 95.8\% | 94.1\% | 94.9\% | 91.2\% | 95.6\% |

English Course Success and Retention for Students Receiving Tutoring on Writing. Tables T12 and T13 Show success and retention rates for students receiving tutoring on writing. These tables cohere with the effects of any tutoring illustrated in Tables T10 and T11.

Table T12. Success Rates in English by Received Tutoring on Writing

| Year | Term | English 10 |  | English 50 |  | English 100 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Received Tutoring on Writing |  | Received Tutoring on Writing |  | Received Tutoring on Writing |  |
|  |  | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| 2009-10 | Fall | 51.6\% | 58.3\% | 69.6\% | 75.6\% | 68.0\% | 78.4\% |
|  | Spring | 50.8\% | 61.5\% | 63.1\% | 67.9\% | 64.8\% | 81.3\% |
| 2010-11 | Fall | 58.0\% | 58.4\% | 74.2\% | 78.1\% | 71.5\% | 80.6\% |
|  | Spring | 51.2\% | 66.0\% | 69.1\% | 72.9\% | 66.1\% | 75.7\% |
| 2011-12 | Fall | 55.5\% | 63.8\% | 72.9\% | 70.8\% | 73.6\% | 79.4\% |
|  | Spring | 50.7\% | 77.2\% | 67.8\% | 73.5\% | 64.5\% | 83.9\% |
| 2012-13 | Fall | 60.9\% | 72.3\% | 73.2\% | 69.4\% | 68.5\% | 86.4\% |

Table T13. Retention Rates in English by Received Tutoring on Writing

| Year | Term | English 10 |  | English 50 |  | English 100 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Received Tutoring on Writing |  | Received Tutoring on Writing |  | Received Tutoring on Writing |  |
|  |  | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| 2009-10 | Fall | 92.4\% | 95.8\% | 94.7\% | 97.8\% | 92.5\% | 95.5\% |
|  | Spring | 91.4\% | 96.9\% | 91.4\% | 93.6\% | 89.9\% | 96.7\% |
| 2010-11 | Fall | 92.6\% | 89.9\% | 95.3\% | 95.6\% | 92.3\% | 96.9\% |
|  | Spring | 90.7\% | 92.5\% | 93.0\% | 94.7\% | 93.6\% | 95.9\% |
| 2011-12 | Fall | 93.0\% | 97.5\% | 94.2\% | 94.4\% | 95.4\% | 97.5\% |
|  | Spring | 94.3\% | 98.2\% | 95.4\% | 97.7\% | 93.0\% | 98.6\% |
| 2012-13 | Fall | 89.7\% | 97.0\% | 94.1\% | 95.5\% | 91.3\% | 97.4\% |

## Math Success and Retention

Math Course Success. Success rates in Math 15 (Pre-algebra), Math 50 (Beginning Algebra), and Math 60 (Intermediate Algebra) courses are displayed in Table T14 for both those who had made use of tutoring and those who had not. The success rate for all students in these math courses tended to be higher in fall compared to spring. However, for tutoring students this variability was reduced. Overall, tutoring students had higher success rates than did other students.

Table T14. Success Rates in Math by Used Tutoring

|  |  | Math 15 |  | Math 50 |  | Math 60 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Term | Used Tutoring |  | Used Tutoring |  | Used Tutoring |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |  |
| $2009-10$ | Fall | $59.6 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ | $54.2 \%$ | $52.8 \%$ | $50.8 \%$ | $61.5 \%$ |
|  | Spring | $52.8 \%$ | $57.0 \%$ | $51.2 \%$ | $60.3 \%$ | $43.7 \%$ | $54.4 \%$ |
| $2010-11$ | Fall | $59.1 \%$ | $58.3 \%$ | $53.6 \%$ | $56.2 \%$ | $54.1 \%$ | $61.2 \%$ |
|  | Spring | $49.0 \%$ | $53.8 \%$ | $48.8 \%$ | $52.7 \%$ | $51.4 \%$ | $60.2 \%$ |
| $2011-12$ | Fall | $60.0 \%$ | $65.7 \%$ | $56.1 \%$ | $59.0 \%$ | $60.3 \%$ | $67.9 \%$ |
|  | Spring | $52.8 \%$ | $66.1 \%$ | $51.0 \%$ | $57.9 \%$ | $49.8 \%$ | $57.4 \%$ |
| $2012-13$ | Fall | $58.3 \%$ | $70.5 \%$ | $49.0 \%$ | $61.0 \%$ | $50.7 \%$ | $59.6 \%$ |

Math Course Retention. The retention rates of students in Math 15, Math 50, and Math 60 are displayed in Table T15. Overall, retention rates were a little higher for those who made use of the tutoring services than for those who had not. This advantage was higher for Math 60 and lower for Math 15.

Table T15. Retention Rates in Math by Used Tutoring

|  |  | Math 15 |  | Math 50 |  | Math 60 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Term | Used Tutoring |  | Used Tutoring |  | Used Tutoring |  |
|  |  | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |  |
| $2009-10$ | Fall | $94.4 \%$ | $94.8 \%$ | $90.1 \%$ | $88.6 \%$ | $89.4 \%$ | $95.5 \%$ |
|  | Spring | $93.0 \%$ | $91.9 \%$ | $90.1 \%$ | $90.7 \%$ | $87.7 \%$ | $92.1 \%$ |
| $2010-11$ | Fall | $93.3 \%$ | $92.8 \%$ | $89.7 \%$ | $92.8 \%$ | $92.6 \%$ | $91.8 \%$ |
|  | Spring | $92.4 \%$ | $91.1 \%$ | $90.3 \%$ | $87.8 \%$ | $92.4 \%$ | $92.2 \%$ |
| $2011-12$ | Fall | $93.7 \%$ | $92.8 \%$ | $92.2 \%$ | $94.4 \%$ | $91.0 \%$ | $96.8 \%$ |
|  | Spring | $90.4 \%$ | $92.7 \%$ | $92.2 \%$ | $93.7 \%$ | $90.9 \%$ | $94.2 \%$ |
| $2012-13$ | Fall | $89.3 \%$ | $96.5 \%$ | $88.7 \%$ | $93.8 \%$ | $84.6 \%$ | $92.0 \%$ |

Math Course Success and Retention for Students Receiving Tutoring on Math. Tables T16 and T17 show success and retention rates for students receiving tutoring on math. As with tutoring in general, tutoring in math was associated with higher success rates and slightly higher retention rates.

Table T16. Success Rates in Math by Received Tutoring on Math

| Year | Term | Math 15 |  | Math 50 |  | Math 60 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Received Tutoring on Math |  | Received Tutoring on Math |  | Received Tutoring on Math |  |
|  |  | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| 2009-10 | Fall | 60.0\% | 47.1\% | 54.1\% | 53.8\% | 51.5\% | 61.6\% |
|  | Spring | 53.3\% | 53.2\% | 51.7\% | 64.0\% | 44.7\% | 51.5\% |
| 2010-11 | Fall | 59.1\% | 57.6\% | 53.6\% | 57.7\% | 54.8\% | 59.3\% |
|  | Spring | 49.0\% | 57.4\% | 49.4\% | 51.0\% | 52.8\% | 53.8\% |
| 2011-12 | Fall | 60.5\% | 67.1\% | 56.4\% | 58.6\% | 61.0\% | 69.3\% |
|  | Spring | 53.8\% | 69.0\% | 51.6\% | 59.0\% | 50.6\% | 58.0\% |
| 2012-13 | Fall | 59.1\% | 75.3\% | 50.5\% | 58.5\% | 51.6\% | 60.8\% |

Table T17. Retention Rates in Math by Received Tutoring on Math

| Year | Term | Math 15 <br> Received Tutoring on Math |  | Math 50Received Tutoring onMath |  | Math 60 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Received Tutoring on Math |
|  |  | No | Yes |  |  | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| 2009-10 | Fall | 94.6\% | 88.2\% | 90.0\% | 88.5\% | 89.8\% | 94.6\% |
|  | Spring | 93.2\% | 87.2\% | 90.2\% | 90.0\% | 87.7\% | 94.7\% |
| 2010-11 | Fall | 93.3\% | 92.4\% | 89.8\% | 94.2\% | 92.6\% | 91.1\% |
|  | Spring | 92.2\% | 92.1\% | 90.2\% | 86.3\% | 92.8\% | 89.3\% |
| 2011-12 | Fall | 93.7\% | 92.4\% | 92.5\% | 93.8\% | 91.7\% | 95.6\% |
|  | Spring | 90.4\% | 95.2\% | 92.4\% | 92.9\% | 91.2\% | 95.0\% |
| 2012-13 | Fall | 90.1\% | 95.9\% | 89.3\% | 93.3\% | 85.7\% | 89.9\% |

## Tutoring Summary

Many students made use of the tutoring services available to Palomar students through the ESL Center, the Math Center, the STAR center, the STEM Center, the TLC in Escondido, and the Writing Center. Some key points are below.

- The student characteristics of tutoring users differed somewhat from other students in terms of gender and race. Tutoring students were more likely to be female and non-white.
- Generally, success and retention rates were higher in the English courses examined for students who used tutoring than they were for students who did not.
- Generally, success rates were higher in the Math courses examined for students who used tutoring than they were for students who did not.


## SUMMER BRIDGE

The Palomar College Summer Bridge program was designed to assist students who tested into Math 15 to achieve greater success in math. This is accomplished by improving their math skills and helping them test into a higher level math.

## Summer Bridge Use

Summer Bridge at Palomar College had 38 participants. Table SB1 shows that these students were more likely to be female than male. Table SB2 shows that most were Hispanic.

Table SB2. Summer Bridge 2011 Student Ethnicity

| Ethnicity | Number |
| :--- | ---: |
| Afr.Am. Non-Hisp | 1 |
| Asian | 1 |
| Hispanic | 29 |
| Multi Ethnic | 1 |
| Nat.Am. | 1 |
| Unknown | 1 |
| White Non-Hisp | 11 |
| Total | 45 |

Table SB2. Summer Bridge 2012

| Ethnicity | Number |
| :--- | ---: |
| Afr.Am. Non-Hisp | 1 |
| Asian | 1 |
| Filipino | 1 |
| Hispanic | 31 |
| Nat.Am. | 1 |
| White Non-Hisp | 3 |
| Total | 38 |

## Summer Bridge Impact

## Fall Enrollment

Enrollment in math in the Fall 2012 term was an important outcome for Summer Bridge 2012 students. Of the 38 Summer Bridge students, 34 enrolled in the fall term. Table SB3 shows the highest level math course taken by the Summer Bridge students that came to Palomar in the fall. Of the 34 enrolled, $97.0 \%$ took a math course in the fall. Over two thirds (71.1\%) of the Summer Bridge students advanced to Math 50 or higher. Of those enrolled in the fall, $79.4 \%$ took a math course higher than Math 15 , and only one of those enrolled in the fall did not take math at all.

Table SB3. Math Course Taken in Fall, 2012 Following Summer Bridge

|  | $2012-13$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Fall Math Course | Fall |  |
| MATH 15 | 6 | $17.6 \%$ |
| MATH 50 | 20 | $58.8 \%$ |
| MATH 60 | 3 | $8.8 \%$ |
| Other Math | 1 | $11.8 \%$ |
| No MATH | 34 | $100.0 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |

## Success and Retention

Course success (receiving a grade of $\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}, \mathrm{CR}$, or P ) and retention (completing the semester and receiving a transcript grade) rates in the fall term were also of interest. Table SB4 shows that $66.7 \%$ (four out of six) of those who took Math 15 succeeded, and a similar percentage ( $65.0 \%$ ) of the 20 who took Math 50 met with success. All of those Summer Bridge students taking Math 56 or 60 succeeded. The very small numbers of Summer Bridge students enrolled in these classes should be considered when evaluating these results.

Table SB4. Success and Retention of Summer Bridge Students in Fall 2012-13 Math Courses

| Course <br> Number | Ns |  | Summer Bridge |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | No | Yes |
| MATH 15 | 1136, 6 | Success | 60.0\% | 66.7\% |
|  |  | Retention | 90.2\% | 100.0\% |
| MATH 50 | 1678, 20 | Success | 51.1\% | 65.0\% |
|  |  | Retention | 89.5\% | 95.0\% |
| MATH 56 | 274, 4 | Success | 51.1\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Retention | 95.6\% | 100.0\% |
| MATH 60 | 1482, 3 | Success | 52.5\% | 100.0\% |
|  |  | Retention | 86.0\% | 100.0\% |

## Summer Bridge Survey

In addition to the use and impact, student satisfaction with Summer Bridge was of interest. This outcome is addressed with a student survey. Beginning with summer 2011, survey data from Summer Bridge students is incorporated into this report.

## Data

A total of 34 students responded to the Summer Bridge survey in the summer of 2012. In the last week of class, students were asked to complete the survey online, during class time.

The Summer Bridge student survey topics included (1) satisfaction, (2) perceived college preparedness, (3) attitudes regarding instruction modalities, and (4) perceived benefit of the Summer Bridge program. The questionnaire items are found in Appendix B.

## Results

## Satisfaction

Survey items were aggregated to a satisfaction scale. The scale ranged from zero to ten, with higher numbers indicating greater satisfaction. The items used to construct the scales are explored below. The satisfaction scale was formed by averaging seven individual satisfaction items to create an overall measure of satisfaction with Summer Bridge. Figure SBS1 shows that students were quite satisfied with the Summer Bridge program, offering, on average, a satisfaction rating between eight-and-a-half and nine on the 0 -to- 10 scale.


Consistent with the average overall satisfaction score, all the individual satisfaction items had high average ratings. This is seen in Figure SBS2. In fact, all of the average ratings were over 8 on the 0 -to- 10 scale. Not all of these items were asked in 2011, but for those items asked in both years, a comparison was made. The satisfaction with the counseling component was the only item to show change, increasing from 8.77 in 2011 to 9.41 in 2012.


Preparedness

Preparedness was assessed with a set of four Likert-type items that used a 0 -to-10 scale where 0 means strongly disagree and 10 means strongly agree. As illustrated in Table SBS3, the students perceived themselves to be very prepared as the result of their participation in Summer Bridge. This is indicated by the average scores of 8.91 and 9.31 on the 0 -to- 10 scale.

The Greatest Benefit of Participating in Summer Bridge:
"I am better prepared for college and I have a backround of what college is going to be like. participating in summer Bridge made me realize that I can be not only a better math student, but a better reader as well."


Figure SBS4 shows the ratings for the preparedness items. All the item ratings were quite high, with none less than 8.5.


```
The Greatest Benefit of
Participating in Summer Bridge:
"I got one on one help with
a tutor and the counselors
really gave us alot of
valuable information that
will help me throughout
my college experience."
```


## Knowledge

Summer Bridge participants were asked about some of the knowledge they had gained about themselves or library resources. Figure SBS5 shows that overwhelmingly students agreed with the statement that "The library component of Summer Bridge helped me know what library resources are available," with an average rating of 9.44 on the 0 -to-10 scale. Students also indicated that they knew their preferred learning style, and that the reading component of Summer Bridge helped them gain a clear understanding of their reading level.


## Instruction Modalities

Instruction was delivered during Summer Bridge in various amounts through three modalities: (1) working with the tutor, (2) computer instruction, and (3) classroom lectures. Students rated how effective they thought these different instruction modalities

The Greatest Benefit of
Participating in Summer Bridge:
"The greatest benefit of participating in summer Bridge program was the chance to get to know the school more and the staff members."
were for each of three components of the Summer Bridge program: math, reading, and library.

Figure SBS6 reveals that working with the math tutor was regarded as very effective. Classroom lectures and computer instruction in math were also regarded as effective, though less so compared to working with the math tutor.


The effectiveness ratings for the reading component are found in Figure SBS7. While all three modes of instruction were regarded by participants as effective, the classroom reading lectures were perceived as more effective than working with the reading tutor.


The student ratings of the effectiveness of the two instruction modalities used for the library component are summarized in Figure SBS8. Library classroom lectures were rated as more effective than instruction on the computer.


Summer Bridge participants were also asked about the amount of time they thought should be allotted in the future to the different modalities for each component of Summer Bridge. The tables that follow reveal that for each modality within each component, a large proportion of the students suggested keeping the time allocation about the same. However, of those recommending a change, overwhelmingly the suggested change was an increase for all elements.

Math. Table SBS1 shows that for math, most (64.7\%) students recommended more classroom lecture time. A bit under half (44.1\%) of the students recommended more time working with the tutor, and a third (35.5\%) called for more math instruction on the computer.

Table SBS1. Recommended Time Allocation for Math
$\left.\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|c|}\hline \hline & & & & \begin{array}{c}\text { A Lot Less }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Keep It } \\ \text { Less }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { bout the } \\ \text { Same }\end{array}\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { A Little } \\ \text { More }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c}\text { A Lot } \\ \text { More }\end{array}\right]$

Reading. Student recommendations for how much time should be spent on the different instruction modalities for the reading component are found in Table SBS2. Most (61.8\%) students recommended more reading time allocated to working with the tutor. As many students (45.5\%) recommended an increase in reading instruction on the computer as recommended keeping it the same (45.5\%). This is interesting in light of the higher average effectiveness rating given to reading classroom lectures.

Table SBS2. Recommended Time Allocation for Reading
$\left.\begin{array}{l|c|c|c|c|c|c}\hline \hline & & & & \begin{array}{c}\text { Keep It } \\ \text { A Little } \\ \text { Less }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { about the } \\ \text { Same }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { A Little } \\ \text { More }\end{array} \\ \hline\end{array} \begin{array}{c}\text { A Lot } \\ \text { More }\end{array}\right]$.

Library. Just over half (52.9\%) of the students favored increased time to library instruction on the computer, and just over half (51.5\%) of the students favored increased time to library classroom lectures. This is seen in Table SBS3.

Table SBS3. Recommended Time Allocation for Library

|  |  |  | A Little <br> Less | Keep It <br> about the <br> Same | A Little <br> More | A Lot <br> More |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Library Instruction <br> on the Computer | Number | 0 | 0 | 16 | 13 | 5 |
| Library Classroom <br> Lectures | Number | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $47.1 \%$ | $38.2 \%$ | $14.7 \%$ |
|  | Percent | $0.0 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $45.5 \%$ | $39.4 \%$ | $12.1 \%$ |

## Benefit

Students overwhelmingly viewed the Summer Bridge program as beneficial. Table SBS4 shows that 94 to $95 \%$ of the students regarded the program as very or extremely beneficial. Respondents were also asked about what they thought was the greatest benefit of participating in Summer Bridge. Their responses are found in Table SBS5.

Table SBS4. Perceived Benefit of Participating in Summer Bridge

| Year | Not At All <br> Beneficial | A Little <br> Beneficial | Moderately <br> Beneficial | Very <br> Beneficial | Extremely <br> Beneficial | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2011 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 25 | 43 |
|  | $2.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ | $37.2 \%$ | $58.1 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |
| 2012 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 23 | 34 |
|  | $0.0 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ | $26.5 \%$ | $67.6 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ |

Table SBS5. Greatest Benefit of Participating in Summer Bridge - 2012
all the math that was done really helped me remember an get back to the lvel that i was at.
evrything that has in the summer bridge
From my point of view one of the best thing participating in Summer Bridge was to meet new people and as well master my skill on math and finaly prepared in the future
getting a better understanding about the different componenets there are in a math problem and how to answer the question effectively.
Getting help from counselors.
GETTING TO KNOW ALL OF THE RESOURCES BRFORE WE BEGIN SCHOOL. AND GIVING US A SECOND CHANCE.
Getting to know the tutors and some of the counselors. And got to know the campas.
Giving up my summer to come to summer bridge has benefited me the most by preparing me for the Fall Semester and giving me a clearer picture of what's coming up next. Also, the tutoring helped me bring back my basic math skills and I feel more comfortable using my math skills outside of class.
I am better prepared for college and I have a backround of what college is going to be like. Participating in Summer Bridge made me realize that I can be not only a better math student, but a better reader as well.
I believe that being a part of the Summer Bridge gave me a big jump start. It not only helped me with math but as well as reading. I did not think it was going to help me progress in those two subjects but it did. It also helped me realize where I am in my reading math levels. All the tutors and [Name Redacted] were very helpful as well as counselors [Name Redacted] and [Name Redacted]. Eventhough the program was about Math, it was very fascinating having [Name Redacted] and [Name Redacted] assists us with our questions.
I got the chance to find out about more programs in the the collge, and I found out about more resources. I really like how I feel ahead of the game already by just entering the Summer Bridge for 2012. I thank everyone who is really willing to help us through out our college experience.
i know how things work in cllege especially with fafsa
I think some of the greatest benefits of participating in the summer bridge are that I now know where the library is located and what it provides i got to know the councelors better and the staff also and now i know thing that other students are not going to know when they come here.

## Table SBS5. Continued

I think that the greatest benifit was getting to know the tutars,counselers and learning more about the college and how it works.
i think the greatest benefit is that you get to kno better all the instalations of the school before everyone one else start learning different things I'm suppossed to know about college and especially math Preparing for college and giving me useful resources, also giving me a chance to improve my math for free.
That i get a chance to better myself by challenging my math,english, and reading scores.
The greatest benefit I gained from participating in the Summer Bridge was that I got one on one help with a tutor and the counselors really gave us alot of valuable information that will help me throughout my college experience.
The greatest benefit I got from the Summer Bridge program was just refreashing my memory and understanding/learning the concepts better. Also, getting more one on one time with a tutor and asking more in depth questions.
The greatest benefit I have recieved being part of Summer bridge is being more hands on in working in math and being able to retake the math placement test. As well as being able to be helped by great people who want the best for the Summer Bridge students. Also you obtain the opportunity of being able to learn where classrooms are and buildings, so the transition of high school to college isn't to extreme but easy going, when we come in fall semister.

The greatest benefit in participating in the summer bridge program other than possibly improving my math placement score would have to be making connections with other staff members on the campus. Now after participating in summer bridge I know where to find Palomar's resourses on campus to become a more successful student and know staff members on a more personal level so if i were to have a conflict or question regarding my classes or any other situtation at school I would feel comfortable enough to reach out for help, as well as know who to go to for help. The greatest benefit of participating in Summer Bridge program was the chance to get to know the school more and the staff members.
The greatest benefit of participating in the Summer Bridge program was that it helped me become more familiar with the school. It taught me to be able to ask for help more often, and It helped me become more familiar about what to expect/do to get ready for the fall.
the greatest benefit that i got from this program wasnt only help with math, wich i really needed. i met counslers, students and i had the opportunity to know more about palomar college and its programs.

## Table SBS5. Continued

The greatest benefit would be that i got to know the campus such as the library and counseling offies. I also got to meet tutors and a math professor.
the gretest benefit of participating in summer bridg was to belive in myself and have the confidence to ask questions..
the learning styles
the summer bridge program has helped me a lot and i feel i am ahead of my frieds that will be coming in the fall because i know a lot of things in terms of financial aid and the librarry resources and everything thats avaliable in college and all difert kinds of resources. It also helped a lot working with tutors and counselors. summer bridge is a awesome program and im thankful for scoring into math 15 the first time because i got the opportunity to get into the program and by this i learn a lot of things that are very important to know.
The summer Bridge program helped me refresh my memory on math. It helped me a lot with my Math,and Reading skills i am more confident now about reading and solving math problems.I am so glad I had the opprtunity to be in the suumer Bridge program.

This years summer bridge has help me get a chance to start the fall semester out right. And geting the chance to interact with counslers/librarians and a math professor. This program has given me the opportunity to become successful in my upcoming years here at palomar, and as well as a four year. To be able to idenify the buildings that I will be using, such as the library, math lab, reading lab etc. This has been a successful program that has refreshed my memory on the basic math skills I will be needing in order to be successful in my later math classes. Continue helping those entering colleg in the fall succeed because i know this has helped $100 \%$ of my peers, even if they didnt take ot seriously it has brought back some skills that I havent reviewed since the ninth grade. Thank you for everything, and most of all helping me succeed.
To finally overcome the fear of math, knowing that i can actually be good at it without me telling myself this is impossible! I enjoyed being able to connect with other students before the fall semester starts.Im confident that college will be great, im very content with my decision to do Summer Bridge. I loved it!
To how much math i had to relearn but to how quickly i picked it back up. Having math tutors there was a big plus and help to the math portion. I didn't know we had the reading also, so that was a huge ganormous help on picking up and finding how fast I can read.
yes my time spent at summer bridge let me get my head in the game again. befor i didnt know math now im ready.

## Improvement

Students offered their recommendations for how to improve the Summer Bridge program. These recommendations are found in Table SBS6.

Table SBS6. Recommendation for Improvement of Summer Bridge - 2012
A recommendation I have would be to increase the reading portion of the program. To also include some math lectures as well.
An improvement they could have is to have a little more time for the reading and english
Everything we did in the program is very helpful. I recommend that the counselors, and or teachers tour us around the campus. Eventhough the program was held for a month of our summer it was all worth it and helpful. What I also believe is very important is for [Name Redacted] to be somewhat involved in the program. She helped a lot with everyones financial situations and she should be held every yeara for the program.

From what I saw, everything was perferctly good. I don't seen any gengative effects.

Have more students get the support from counselors and profesors from the campus. I feel that you should have mor group activites to get to know the classmates better. I only knew and talked to 5 people that i already knew from high school the whole program.
I think every thing was fine I would just like for the instructor to give class lectures more often.
I think it should have more reading sections so in that way we can move up on our English class.
I think less math would be a good thing
i think one of my recomendations is that the teacher give some lectures before everything star everyday
Instead of having video lessons a professor should have A class lecture.
It felt like we jumped way to fast into the reading then we did the math. I felt like I did pick up on my reading a bit, but there was just such a feeling of rush into that I couln't really push myself on it. Maybe you should have a little bit more time to spend in there.

## Table SBS6. Continued

its perfect how you guys work....
Just have more group interaction, and when students have the same questions address it as a group not induviually, and possibly on the white boards. Spend possible a few extra days in the reading lab/library. And tell the students early on about the program and the math chapters and the different chapters it takes to go on to math 50/math 60 etc.
[Name Redacted] should give class instructions on particular math sections which students struggle wtih.
maybe a little more lectures
Mix the groups up once in awhile so everyone can get to know eachother.
No
no not really very satisfied with the overall program
no, for me is good as it is
none
Not as much math back to back. It can be overwhelming :O
Not at all
not really.
people should be in it more
Spend a little more time teaching math and giving us similar problems to practice for the math assenment!
The math videos were not that helpful. I would rather have [Name Redacted] give a lecture on a section i dont really understand.
The only recomendation I have to better improve Summer Bridge is not to focus so much on uniting the students together. Doing group activities seemed like a waste of time for me when I really needed to improve and proceed with my math packets. I understood that the program wanted the students to feel comfortable and connected to others but I didn't care much on making new relationships as I did working and trying to get my math score higher. That would be my only recomendation is to give more time towards math so the students could get further along in a shorter amount of time.
The recommendations would be extending summer bridge to a longer period. Thank you for everything, your time, attention, and patience.

## Table SBS6. Continued

there should be more tutoring with reading like reading textbooks

They told us that by the end of the program we would all know each other (the students) and I only know about a couple so I believe they should work more on the interacting of the students with each other so they can feel a little more comfortable being in the same room. It would of been nice to meet with all my class mates and create a relationship with each one of them so when the Fall comes I will see and know and be able to talk, get help, advice from people I met in summer bridge. TO HAVE A MATH LECTURE CLASS OR SOMETHING ALONG WITH TUTORING.
to learn the math lessons from the teacher not from the computer yoy guys do a great job, like i answered before keep it the same (:

## Summer Bridge Summary

The Summer Bridge program was quite successful in helping to move most of the participants on to Math 50 or higher. Some key points are noted below.

- Thirty four of the 38 Summer Bridge students from 2012 enrolled at Palomar in the fall.
- Just over two thirds (71.1\%) of the Summer Bridge students enrolled in Math 50 or higher in Fall 2011.
- Summer Bridge students expressed high levels of satisfaction, and indicated that participation in Summer Bridge helped them become prepared for college success.
- Students reported that participating in Summer Bridge was of great benefit to them.


## SUMMARY

Overall, the findings of this report were positive. Each of the BSI-HSI activities addressed in this report showed a positive impact on student outcomes. Students using the TLC, and students using tutoring services were retained and succeeded at higher rates than did other students taking the same courses. Learning community students and TLC users persisted at a higher rate than did other students. The survey results suggest that students in the learning communities were satisfied with the learning communities, and they thought the learning communities were very beneficial. Summer Bridge students also demonstrated positive outcomes in terms of entry into math courses above Math 15. Summer Bridge students expressed a great deal of satisfaction with the program, and indicated that it had been very beneficial to them.

# APPENDIX A: LEARNING COMMUNITIES QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS 

## Satisfaction

First we have some questions regarding your satisfaction with different aspects of the learning community. For each question, please use a scale of 0 -to- 10 , where 0 means not at all satisfied and 10 means completely satisfied.

S1. Considering your experience in this learning community as a whole, how satisfied are you with the learning community that you are in?

S2. How satisfied are you with the counseling you have received in your learning community?
$\qquad$

S3. How satisfied are you with the tutoring in your learning community?

S4. How satisfied are you with the availability (outside of class time) of the faculty in your learning community?

S5. How satisfied are you with your educational experience as a member of a learning community?

S6. How satisfied are you with the integration of material across courses in your learning community?

S7. How satisfied are you with the social activities of the learning community?

S8. How satisfied are you with being with the same students in all of the classes in the learning community?

## Activities

This set of questions asks about various activities you might have engaged in during this semester. Please respond to the questions using a 0 -to-10 scale where 0 means never and 10 means very frequently.

During this semester, how often have you ...
E1. participated in class discussions?

E2. worked with other students during class time?

E3. worked with other students outside of class?

E4. discussed assignments, grades, ideas, or other matters with faculty outside the classroom?

E5. talked to faculty about assignments, grades, ideas, or other matters with faculty in class?

E6. made use of student support services such as tutoring and counseling?

## Assignments and Learning

I1. To what extent have the assignments in your learning community classes required you to put different ideas together in new ways?
a. Not at all
b. A little
c. Some
d. A lot
e. A great deal

I2. How much have your learning community classes helped you become better at pulling different principles together?
a. Not at all
b. A little
c. Some
d. A lot
e. A great deal

I3. To what degree would you say that being in this learning community has improved your ability to see relationships between different topics within a class or in different classes?
a. Not at all
b. A little
c. Some
d. A lot
e. A great deal

We would like to ask you about SHARED ASSIGNMENTS in your learning community, that is, assignments that count toward your grades in more than one class, and require you to apply ideas from each of those classes.

I4. Did you have SHARED ASSIGNMENTS in your learning community?
a. Yes
b. No
c. Don't know
[IF I4 <> Yes, GOTO Services \& Support]

Using a 0 -to10 scale where 0 means Strongly disagree and 10 means Strongly agree, please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following:

The integrative assignments in my learning community ...
I5. were enjoyable.
I6. made learning the material easier.
I7. were effective in showing me how different ideas connect to one another.
I8. made the assignments more meaningful.
I9. were interesting.

## Services and Support

For each statement, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree (using a scale of 0 -to-10, where 0 means strongly disagree and 10 means strongly agree).

U1. Being part of a learning community has helped me become aware of the services and support available at Palomar.

U2. Being part of a learning community has made it easier for me get access to support services (advising, counseling, tutoring).

U3. Instructors encourage students to get support on campus when they need it.

## Education Plans and Goals

Now we'd like to ask a few questions about Education Plans and progress toward your educational goals.

P1. Have you completed an Education Plan (that is, a form completed a counselor that outlines a sequence of courses to help you obtain your educational goal)?
a. Yes
b. No
c. Don’t know

## [If P1=yes]

P2. Did you complete the Education Plan prior to starting in the learning community?
[If P1<> yes or P2=no]
P3. Did your participation in the learning community help you make progress on an Education Plan?
a. Yes
b. No
c. Don’t know

P4. For the statement below, using a scale of 0-to-10, where 0 means strongly disagree and 10 means strongly agree, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree.

Participating in a learning community has helped me progress toward my educational goals.

## General

G1. Using a 0 -to-10 scale where 0 means not at all integrated and 10 means completely integrated, to what extent would you say that material was integrated across your learning community courses?

G2. In general, how beneficial has it been for you to participate in this learning community?
a. Not at all beneficial
b. A little beneficial
c. Moderately beneficial
d. Very beneficial
e. Extremely beneficial

G2. How beneficial would you say it would be for you to participate in another learning community after you have completed this one?
a. Not at all beneficial
b. A little beneficial
c. Moderately beneficial
d. Very beneficial
e. Extremely beneficial

G3. What would you say has been the greatest benefit of participating in a learning community?
$\square$

G4. Do you have any recommendations about how to improve the learning communities?
$\square$

G5. Do you have any other comments about the topics addressed in this survey?

## APPENDIX B: SUMMER BRIDGE QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS

## Satisfaction

For each question, please use a scale of 0-to-10, where 0 means not at all satisfied and 10 means completely satisfied.

S1. Considering your experience in this Summer Bridge program as a whole, how satisfied are you with the Summer Bridge program?
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

S2. How satisfied are you with the counseling component of the Summer Bridge program?
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

S3. How satisfied are you with the reading component of the Summer Bridge program?
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

S4. How satisfied are you with the math component of the Summer Bridge program?
$\boxtimes_{0} \quad \boxtimes_{1} \quad \boxtimes_{2} \quad \boxtimes_{3} \quad \boxtimes_{4} \quad \boxtimes_{5} \quad \boxtimes_{6} \quad \boxtimes_{7} \quad \boxtimes_{8} \quad \boxtimes_{9} \boxtimes_{10}$

S5. How satisfied are you with the math tutoring in the Summer Bridge program?
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes)_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

S6. How satisfied are you with the library component of the Summer Bridge program?
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes)_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

S7. How satisfied are you with the reading tutoring in the Summer Bridge program?
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes 9 & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

## College Success

For each of the following statements, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree (using a scale of 0 -to-10, where 0 means strongly disagree and 10 means strongly agree).

P1. I have learned valuable skills in the Summer Bridge program.
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes 9 & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

P2. As a result of Summer Bridge, I am better prepared to be successful in college.
$\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes 9 & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

P3. The Summer Bridge program has helped me feel more comfortable asking tutors for assistance.
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

P4. The Summer Bridge program has helped me become ready to start college in the fall.
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes 9 & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

P5. I know my preferred learning style, and how I learn best.
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes 9 & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

P6. The reading component of Summer Bridge provided me with a clear understanding of my reading level.
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

P7. The library component of Summer Bridge helped me know what library resources are available.
$\boxtimes_{0} \quad \boxtimes_{1} \quad \boxtimes_{2} \quad \boxtimes_{3} \quad \boxtimes_{4} \quad \boxtimes_{5} \quad \boxtimes_{6} \quad \boxtimes_{7} \quad \boxtimes_{8} \quad \boxtimes_{9} \quad \boxtimes_{10}$

## Program Components

For each component, using a scale of 0 -to-10, where 0 means not at all effective and 10 means extremely effective, please indicate how effective the component was for you.

For the math portion of Summer Bridge, how effective the component was ...
C1. working with the tutor
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes & \boxtimes_{9}\end{array} \boxtimes_{10}$

C2. working on the computer (e.g., video instruction, electronic resources)
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

C3. classroom lectures
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

For the reading portion of Summer Bridge, how effective the component was ...
C4. working with the tutor
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

C5. working on the computer (e.g., video instruction, electronic resources)
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

C6. classroom lectures
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

For the library portion of Summer Bridge, how effective the component was ...
C7. working on the computer (e.g., video instruction, electronic resources)

$\boxtimes_{0} \quad \boxtimes_{1} \quad \boxtimes_{2} \quad \boxtimes_{3} \quad \boxtimes_{4} \quad \boxtimes_{5} \quad \boxtimes_{6} \quad \boxtimes_{7} \quad \boxtimes_{8} \quad$|  | $\boxtimes_{10}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

C8. classroom lectures
$\begin{array}{llllllllllll}\boxtimes_{0} & \boxtimes_{1} & \boxtimes_{2} & \boxtimes_{3} & \boxtimes_{4} & \boxtimes_{5} & \boxtimes_{6} & \boxtimes_{7} & \boxtimes_{8} & \boxtimes_{9} & \boxtimes_{10}\end{array}$

In the future, how much time would you say should be spent in Summer Bridge on ...
MT1. working with the math tutor?
a. A lot more
b. A little more
c. Keep it about the same
d. A little less
e. A lot less

MT2. math work on the computer?
a. A lot more
b. A little more
c. Keep it about the same
d. A little less
e. A lot less

MT3. math class lectures?
a. A lot more
b. A little more
c. Keep it about the same
d. A little less
e. A lot less

MT4. working with the reading tutor?
a. A lot more
b. A little more
c. Keep it about the same
d. A little less
e. A lot less

MT5. reading work on the computer?
a. A lot more
b. A little more
c. Keep it about the same
d. A little less
e. A lot less

MT6. reading class lectures?
a. A lot more
b. A little more
c. Keep it about the same
d. A little less
e. A lot less

MT7. library work on the computer?
a. A lot more
b. A little more
c. Keep it about the same
d. A little less
e. A lot less

MT8. library class lectures?
a. A lot more
b. A little more
c. Keep it about the same
d. A little less
e. A lot less

## General

G1. In general, how beneficial has it been for you to participate in the Summer Bridge program?
a. Not at all beneficial
b. A little beneficial
c. Moderately beneficial
d. Very beneficial
e. Extremely beneficial

G2. What would you say has been the greatest benefit of participating in Summer Bridge?
$\square$

G3. Do you have any recommendations about how to improve the Summer Bridge program?


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ These results come from the Basic Skills Cohort Tracker on the Chancellor's Office website (http://datamart.cccco.edu/Outcomes/BasicSkills_Cohort_Tracker.aspx).

[^1]:    * Averages exclude orphans.

