



## Tutoring Committee Minutes

### October 1, 2020

**MEETING TYPE:**

- |                                     |                        |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <b>Staff</b>           |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <b>Product/Project</b> |
| <input type="checkbox"/>            | <b>Special</b>         |

**Date:** October 1, 2020  
**Start Time:** 2:30 p.m.  
**End Time:** 4:00 p.m.  
**Location:** Zoom

**Facilitator:** Nimoli Madan

**Recorder:** Mario Martinez

**Voting Members Present:** Barnaba, Ruth; Chauderlot, Fabienne; Farrell, Katy; Gutierrez-Aguero, Mireya; Horn, Jessica; Jenkins, Jerry; Madan, Nimoli; Manneh, Beatrice; Nguyen, Duy; Towfiq, Fariheh; Van Dyke, Leigh Ann

**Voting Members Absent:** Cassoni, Mary

**Advisory Members Present:** Avila, Debra; DeFreitas, Amber; Garceau, Jeannette; Hudson, Aaron; Lecca, Diego; Marquez, Judith; Martinez, Mario; Sangrit, Tanya

**Guests Present:** Anfinson, Cindy; Chakkanakuzhi, Mathews; Fung, Tracy; Maunu, Leanne; Murillo, Leticia; Salvatierra, Andrea

Agenda Item
1. Announcements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1. Introductions</li> <li>1.2. List of voting members               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.2.1. remove athletics and faculty resource coordinator</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2. Action Items <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1. Approve September 3<sup>rd</sup> minutes               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1.1. Motioned by Fari</li> <li>2.1.2. Second by Ruth</li> <li>2.1.3. Motion carried                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1.3.1. No abstentions</li> <li>2.1.3.2. Corrections:                       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1.3.2.1. Line 3.2.7.8: CSIT tutoring being covered by <u>Aaron</u></li> <li>2.1.3.2.2. Line 3.2.1.5 change to Writing Center <u>Director</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3. Reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1. L &amp; L co-location, 3 models (Erin, Tracy, Rafiki, Nimoli, &amp; Leanne) The following is the content/text directly from their presentation:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1.1. Model 1 (Recommended Model): Two Centers-Literary and Writing Center &amp; STAR Center                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1.1.1. Pros: Accessible: all resources in one building (H building) thus best option for marginalized students</li> <li>3.1.1.2. Resources - departments, faculty offices, classes, tutoring, ADA, staff,</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- etc.
- 3.1.1.3. Equitable Tutoring: supportive of AB 705 and Guided Pathways
- 3.1.1.4. Instructors in H building with Center; not able to oversee tutors in STAR as they would in H building.
- 3.1.1.5. Trained tutors who work with faculty in a direct and connected way can help students build foundational knowledge and skills necessary to be successful in the courses the students are taking. This has a positive impact on persistence, retention, and completion.
- 3.1.1.6. Line of sight provided by discipline faculty in Literacy and Writing Center
- 3.1.1.7. Allows for focused and connected discipline-specific oversight
- 3.1.1.8. Encourages students to use tutoring services
- 3.1.1.9. Cross-trained Languages and Literature staff to help students with specific coursework, programs, classes, careers, etc.
- 3.1.1.10. Space in Humanities tutoring for two classrooms and several rooms for other purposes
- 3.1.1.11. Classrooms in the current Reading Center are appropriately sized for our L&L classes
- 3.1.1.12. More tutoring hours available due to shared staff in the ENG/ESL/READ location
- 3.1.1.13. More opportunity for Puente and Umoja students to connect with tutors and services
  - 3.1.1.13.1.1. Dedicated tutors and faculty teaching in the center
- 3.1.1.14. Model 1 Literacy and writing center will be a small, safe space that includes integrated learning including labs, book clubs, speaking and listening rooms, etc.
- 3.1.1.15. English, Reading, and ESL already share students across our areas; this will allow better integration of tutoring
- 3.1.1.16. Easier for faculty to bring students to Center in H Building where classes and offices are located
- 3.1.1.17. Informational visits and small group tutoring easily available for classes
- 3.1.1.18. Lab connected to classes will allow for flexible teaching
- 3.1.1.19. SI sessions with ESL will be able to use rooms available for group tutoring in an area close to the classroom
- 3.1.1.20. Faculty can easily connect students with one-on-one tutoring
- 3.1.2. Model 2: Two Centers in Three Locations: English, ESL, and Reading would share the current Writing Center and Reading Lab spaces, and STAR would exist in its current location
  - 3.1.2.1. Pros: Same pros as Model 1
  - 3.1.2.2. Additional space available – ESL Tutoring Center, Writing Center, and Reading Center would all be combined into two physical locations (currently the Writing Center and the Reading Center), but would function as one center for ESL, writing, and reading tutoring
  - 3.1.2.3. Cons: Requires careful coordination of staff and faculty line-of-sight
  - 3.1.2.4. Requires careful identification/presentation of where to locate specific services.
- 3.1.3. Model 3: One Center (STAR)
  - 3.1.3.1. Pros: Single center and location
  - 3.1.3.2. Cons: Less connection between tutoring and instruction which may

- negatively impact marginalized students who may not get the specific skills needed for individual course success
- 3.1.3.3. Less instructor and program involvement in STAR
- 3.1.3.4. No access to a tutoring space in the primary instructional building for READ/ENG/ESL
- 3.1.3.5. No access to dedicated classrooms and reading lab in STAR, thus losing three classrooms
- 3.1.3.6. More physical distance between tutoring and instruction which may negatively impact use by marginalized students
- 3.1.3.7. Current space in STAR unable to accommodate needs of 3 additional departments (offices, classrooms, class materials, etc.); the current Proctoring Room would not be a good classroom since it's too large and a partition would make it noisy for two classes to be in there
- 3.1.3.8. Current space and location of STAR unlikely to promote community, again impacting
- 3.1.3.9. persistence and retention
- 3.1.3.10. Fewer tutoring space options for students
- 3.1.4. Thoughts on Costs
  - 3.1.4.1. All 3 Models include the following Costs:
    - 3.1.4.1.1. STAR Costs
    - 3.1.4.1.2. ESL Coordinator release time (currently 60% negotiated)
    - 3.1.4.1.3. Writing Center Director release time (currently 60% negotiated).
      - 3.1.4.1.3.1. Please note that release times are negotiated with PFF
    - 3.1.4.1.4. English ISA 3
    - 3.1.4.1.5. ESL BSI Specialist (funded through equity funds)
    - 3.1.4.1.6. Reading ISA 3
    - 3.1.4.1.7. Reading ISA 2
    - 3.1.4.1.8. Peer tutors in English, ESL, Reading (Some ESL tutors are funded through Title V and Noncredit grant funds)
    - 3.1.4.1.9. Supplies
- 3.1.5. Cost Savings & Increased Revenue: Model 1
  - 3.1.5.1. No need to rehire FT staff retirees now or in future (two)
  - 3.1.5.2. No need for 50% short-term hourly employees since multiple staff will be co-locating
  - 3.1.5.3. STM Hourly Tutoring costs reduced as some tutoring can be provided by ISAs in co-located areas
  - 3.1.5.4. Decreased materials/supplies costs due to shared resources
  - 3.1.5.5. Apportionment can be generated by faculty line-of-sight provided by full-and part-time faculty office hours, two Reading faculty doing lab supervision, faculty coordinators
  - 3.1.5.6. Center can possibly be open additional hours with more staff sharing hours since staff are co-locating
  - 3.1.5.7. Increased student use of tutoring center, which would result
  - 3.1.5.8. in increasing apportionment
  - 3.1.5.9. Increased student retention because of strong ties between faculty and students, thus, more FTES generated for the college
- 3.1.6. Tentative Use of Space for Recommended Model 1 in H Building
  - 3.1.6.1. H 114 - lab - area for tutoring, reading lab computers
  - 3.1.6.2. H 112 - classroom - 34 students - dedicated to English

- 3.1.6.3. H 108 - classroom - 32 students - up to four reading classes - dedicated for three f2f Reading classes that have a lab component and possibly Puente and Umoja
- 3.1.6.4. H 119 - Tutor Room
- 3.1.6.5. H 117 - Tutor Room
- 3.1.6.6. H 115 - Workroom – two computers for ISAs, copier, storage
- 3.1.6.7. H 113 - Test Room - line of sight supervision room or small group tutoring; also has floor to ceiling cabinets for storage
- 3.1.6.8. H 119 B - Office - ESL - listening and speaking room
- 3.1.6.9. H 119 C-D - Offices - used for ESL book and conversation clubs, reserved rooms for students and/or faculty
- 3.1.6.10. H 119 - E - English
- 3.1.6.11. H 119 F - Office - Erin
- 3.1.6.12. H 119 G - Office - Katy
- 3.1.6.13. H 119 - H - Office - ESL
- 3.1.6.14. H - 119 I – Storage
- 3.1.7. Final Recommendations:
  - 3.1.7.1. We recommend MODEL 1 for the following reasons:
    - 3.1.7.1.1. This model is the most equitable, accessible co-location option for tutoring that is closely connected to faculty and instruction with positive impacts on persistence, retention, and completion.
    - 3.1.7.1.2. Retaining two centers allows students to have more options as well as focused and connected discipline-specific tutoring.
    - 3.1.7.1.3. A literacy and writing center would provide support for students impacted by AB-705
    - 3.1.7.1.4. This model offers reduced costs and increased apportionment
  - 3.1.7.2. We would like to express deep concerns about Model 3:
    - 3.1.7.2.1. This model presents numerous concerns, particularly
    - 3.1.7.2.2. regarding providing accessible and equitable tutoring options for our most vulnerable and marginalized students.
    - 3.1.7.2.3. Potential impacts may include a drop in student persistence and retention, as well as disconnecting tutoring from instruction.
- 3.1.8. Discussion of above content from their presentation:
  - 3.1.8.1. As mentioned in text of presentation, Leanne is concerned with having 3 areas in STAR center as identities would be lost. Leanne mentioned the reading center has more space and the name can be Literacy and Writing Center
  - 3.1.8.2. Aaron asked where the classes are held for Humanities. Answer: the majority are held in H building.
  - 3.1.8.3. Beatrice asked who makes the decision on these models now. Nimoli said she has presented this to the Dean, right now in our committee, and next to faculty senate, followed by administration.
  - 3.1.8.4. Fari asked if the committee would endorse this plan for when it goes to faculty senate, asking us to endorse model 1.
  - 3.1.8.5. Cost savings would generate apportionment with bringing on peer tutors.
  - 3.1.8.6. Leti mentions seeing a strong reason in favor of the merge into the Library and that pooling resources there makes good sense.
  - 3.1.8.7. Tracy said they did consider that Model, Model 3, but chose to recommend Model 1 as better for the ESL, English, and Reading

Departments. They want to retain discipline-specific tutoring in that building

- 3.1.8.8. Fari asked us to move to endorse model 1.
- 3.1.8.9. Aaron says that we should consider delineated this more. The concerns may be regarding how this affects funding for tutors and that we should advocate for how this new configuration will work in the long term for our students. Nimoli says they don't know about cost. This is agreeing on the models only not necessarily the financial aspects as Aaron mention.
- 3.1.8.10. Nimoli says the pros are having the faculty nearby is an advantage for their students.
- 3.1.8.11. Tanya mentions the consolidation (Model 1) would help pool resources as there are two vacancies that may not be filled. Any extra hourly would help with those interdisciplinary subjects.
- 3.1.8.12. Jeannette mentions that there's a benefit of working with faculty and how it relates to AB705. Jeannette feels this consolidation (Model 1) will help with extra collaboration.
- 3.1.8.13. Fari mentions the various tutoring centers have been there for 30 years and that there's been an investment in cultivating these centers and the financial crisis shouldn't destroy that.
- 3.1.8.14. Mario mentioned how many colleges had centralized tutoring centers within an LRC.
- 3.1.8.15. Years ago, Fari said that funding was set up to create learning centers and labs. Tracy mentions that at an AB705 state conference they discussed the importance of deconsolidating tutoring centers as a way of better meeting the needs of students.
- 3.1.8.16. Jeannette says MiraCosta has a separate WC with full time director that is housed in the same library but is not completely merged with other tutoring.
- 3.1.8.17. Nimoli mentions her center also has SI leaders and funding for off-site instruction in addition to other clubs.
- 3.1.8.18. Ruth mentions that we need to look at the actual amount of money that will be split and spent on tutoring.
- 3.1.8.19. Vote to recommend model 1:
  - 3.1.8.19.1. Motioned by Fari
  - 3.1.8.19.2. Second by Beatrice
  - 3.1.8.19.3. Motion carried
  - 3.1.8.19.4. Abstentions: Ruth & CSIT (Duy/Aaron)

#### 4. Discussion Items

##### 4.1. Online CRLA tutor training 20Fa – Fari

- 4.1.1. Fari came up with the same material as the last training and they used the diversity training video on cultural diversity during plenary. 4-6 were present for the training.
- 4.1.2. Ruth asked to be informed in order to report to CRLA.
- 4.1.3. Fari mentioned we could add some training materials on Canvas for staff to review.

##### 4.2. Helping DRC students - Leigh Ann

- 4.2.1. Leigh Ann and Ruth are working on DRC tutoring. Leigh Ann said she has funding for around 10 hours.

- 4.2.2. Ruth also has funding for the EOPS tutors.
- 4.3. Update on “Net Tutor” - Katy
  - 4.3.1. Questions re: funding. Katy said we will 500 hours’ worth of net tutor paid by the chancellor’s office for this Fall 2020.
  - 4.3.2. Then we have an additional 16k to buy more hours for Spring 2021
  - 4.3.3. NetTutor comes out to \$24 an hour, so from July – Oct students have used 9,285 minutes’ worth of tutoring. We’ve used 155 hours so far.
- 4.4. The posting of Tutoring activity on Teams – Ruth
  - 4.4.1. Checking in to make sure all understand the tracking sheet.
  - 4.4.2. Mario reminded those using the sheet to be mindful with the cells that require certain formatting and/or formulas as the data is used on the summary tab to display various charts, graphs, and figures that Fab, Shayla, and others are using to tracking all things tutoring.
- 4.5. Appointments vs drop-in tutoring – Jeanette
  - 4.5.1. tabled for another meeting

**Next Meeting:  
Thursday, November 5, 2020, from 2:30–4:00 P.M. via Zoom**