2026-27 Comprehensive Program Review

Program: The RAW Center

Division: BSSL

Writers: Angelo Bummer

SLO/SAO Point-Person: Angelo Bummer

Email your completed form to Karin Spirn and your dean by November 2, 2026.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts and info for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Discipline Data Packets – institutional research about disciplines and student services
- ★ Course Success Rates Dashboard – allows you to research your program's success rates

Detailed information and instructions appear at the end of this form. For help, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu.

Section 1: Program Reflection and Planning

These questions appear on all Program Reviews including comprehensive and updates.

1. Please describe your program's most important **achievements** in year 25-26.

- *Provided quality tutoring to LPC students in-person, online, and via the paper drop-off service*
- *Established RAW Center tutor meetings at the beginning of each semester to discuss ongoing issues*
- *Major revision of the RAW Center website*
- *Developed AI guidance for students*
- *Developed student feedback survey*
- *While Penji data indicates 561 tutoring sessions were performed during AY 25-26, the actual number is a lot higher due to a Penji software issue that affected drop-off service data in March and April 2026.*

2. Please describe your most important **challenges** in year 25-26

- Ongoing issues with Penji's asynchronous capabilities
- Issues caused by Penji updates has affected accuracy of data
- Funding has been a challenge as weekly tutoring hours available to students continue to decrease

3. What are your upcoming **plans**? Please note any ways that these support student achievement and equity.

- Researching, funding, and implementing a new tutoring platform designed for both synchronous and asynchronous tutoring: The most important issue is the Penji platform, which has had persistent issues with the paper drop-off service; Penji was not initially designed for asynchronous capabilities, and the work arounds to make the drop-off service happen are unnecessarily laborious and affect student access
- Continued development of strategies to offer students guidance with AI, including development of AI self-paced tutorial on the RAW Center website
- Targeted promotion of RAW Center services to classes other than English; marketing emphasis on reading and writing across the curriculum;
- Advocating for more funding, as current budget is insufficient, especially as it does not account for raises within the new contract, and equity funds, which had routinely covered around an additional $7k of tutoring hours per year, are no longer available

Section 2: SLOs/SAOs

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review, with brief annual check-ins on the Program Review Updates. The following resources will be useful when completing this section:

- Three-Year Assessment Template
- Aggregated and Disaggregated Data from the following sources:
  - ELumen (if saved--no longer available online)
  - CurrIQunet
  - Student Success Dashboard

1. During the 2023-2026 three-year assessment cycle that just concluded, what did your program set out to learn through your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessments?

- *We set out to create SAOs for the RAW Center*
  - SAO 1: Students will access RAW Center services for reading and writing support for courses across the curriculum
  - SAO 2: Students will receive effective reading and writing support from RAW Center tutors.
- *We set out to design a student feedback survey to assess SAO 2*
- *We pulled data from Penji to assess SAO 1*

2. Based on your analysis of your PSLO/CSLO/SAO assessment data, what conclusions did you draw about student outcomes and equity in your program?

- *For SAO 2, Student feedback in survey was limited; not enough students filled it out to make the data valuable; the way in which students filled out survey indicates that the survey needs to be revised/simplified. Also, survey only reached students in-person tutoring; facilitating the survey through an online medium needs to be developed*
- *For SAO 1, the data confirms that the RAW Center services are being used for classes across the curriculum and suggests continued efforts to promote RAW services to classes other than English is needed*

3. Explain potential plans to improve student outcomes and close equity gaps.

- *Revise survey and develop online approach to administering survey*
- *Promote RAW services to classes across the curriculum (instructor emails; class presentations)*

4. Describe any obstacles that you encountered in your assessment process and any supports that would be helpful.

- *Getting enough data/students to fill out survey was a challenge*
- *Penji data was inaccurate due to an update effecting data for the paper drop-off service*

Section 3: Data Discussion

This section is completed every three years as part of the Comprehensive Program Review. Workshops and office hours will be offered in Fall 2026 to support Program Review writers.

1. RPIE Data Review: Discuss any significant trends in the data provided by the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (or any other data you use for decision-making and planning).

*(**Note**: Not all Programs have RPIE data available; if your program does not have a data packet or dashboard data, you may note that in the response box and reach out to the RPIE team.)*

Data may come from:

- RPIE Data Packets
- Transfer data
- Succes Rates Dashboard (scroll down on page)
- Requested data from the Office of Research, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness (RPIE)
- SLO/SAO data
- Data from program-created surveys or investigations
- Any other relevant source of quantitative or qualitative data

- *The number of tutoring sessions per AY has decreased, from around 900 in previous years to an estimated 700 in AY 25-26 (actual data indicates 561 session, though data is inaccurate due to issue with Penji data tracking in March/April '26. This decrease in the number of students receiving tutoring in in line with a national trend as more students are relying on AI for learning assistance*

2. Equity: Did your data reveal any patterns of inequity? If so, please explain those patterns and any actions that should be taken at the program or college level.

- *Data reveals that measures need to be taken to collect accurate data*

3. Course Modality (Instructional Programs Only): In reviewing your program's data packet and Succes Rates Dashboard, are there differences in success rates by modality (i.e. face-to-face, asynchronous, synchronous, hybrid, or hyflex)? If so, reflect on what might account for differences and any actions that should be taken. (Non-instructional programs may also choose to reflect on online vs. in-person services if applicable).

- *Write responses here*
- *Add or remove bullets as needed*

4. Program-Set Standard (Instructional Programs Only): The program-set standard is a baseline that alerts programs if their student success rates have dipped suddenly below 95% of the rolling 5-year average. There is no punishment for not meeting the standard, and many valid reasons this may occur. When a program does not meet this standard, they are asked to examine possible reasons and note any actions that should be taken, if appropriate. | Program-set standard data can be found on this page

5a. Did your program meet its program-set standard for successful course completion in AY25-26?

Yes____ No____

5b. If your program did not meet your program-set standard, discuss possible reasons and how this may affect program planning or resource requests. Success rates for individual courses can be found on the Success Rates Dashboard.

- *Write responses here*
- *Add or remove bullets as needed*

Section 4: Special Topics

These questions have been chosen for this year's Comprehensive Program Review to meet reporting mandates (for accreditation, Ed. Code, or other sources).

1. Mission: Describe 1-3 examples of how your program's work has aligned with the college's mission, vision, values, and/or educational master plan over the past three years. (Possibilities might include new initiatives, resource allocation/use, program improvements, or other activities).

- Mission, Vision, and Values
- Educational Master Plan

- *RAW Center services (in-person, online, and paper drop-off service) are directly aligned with LPC's mission to provide support for completion of student goals and lifelong learning*
- *RAW Center's drop-off paper service and development of AI guidance are two features of our work that are in response to the "needs of the ever-changing workplace and society."*

2. Regular Substantive Interaction (Instructional Programs Only)

To meet our college, ACCJC, state, and federal standards, **all online instructors** must demonstrate "**regular and substantive interaction**" (RSI) with students. That is, we must be clearly providing instruction and interacting with our online students, just like we would in an on-campus class. The following reflection questions allow us to capture how RSI is occurring in our classes.

The following documents explain requirements and best practices for RSI:

- ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education
- Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements

2a. If your program offers DE courses, how are Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) requirements met in your area? Examples appear on the DE addendums of your Course Outlines of Record. Place an X next to each method used in your courses.	
	Course materials make clear to students how often and when the instructor will interact with students (e.g. syllabus/home page lists email/office hours/other ways to communicate and typical response times)
	Provides direct instruction over Zoom (e.g. regularly scheduled live online class sessions in synchronous/hybrid/hyflex courses)
	Provides direct instruction through instructor-created videos (e.g. lecture videos created using Studio in asynchronous courses)
	Provides additional information from various sources/mediums to engage students with course content (e.g. instructor-curated content in Canvas pages that help deepen students understanding of course content)
	Facilitates discussions (e.g. through Canvas discussion boards, Pronto, Studio, or Hypothesis)

	Provides feedback on students' coursework (e.g. through detailed rubrics and/or assignment comments in Speedgrader; note: a grade alone does not quality as RSI, nor does auto-graded feedback students may get through completing publisher content)
	Responds to students' questions (e.g. through timely responses to student messages in Canvas Inbox, discussion boards, social annotation assignments)
	Facilitates student success through ongoing outreach (e.g. posts announcements; uses "Message Students Who" to encourage struggling students to attend office hours or access free tutoring)
	Other [explain]:

2b. What challenges if any have you faced in implementing RSI? What additional training or resources might instructors in your program need to increase the quality of RSI in online courses?

- *Write responses here*
- *Add or remove bullets as needed*

Section 5: Program Review Feedback

What questions or suggestions do you have about this year's Program Review forms or process?

- *Write responses here*
- *Add or remove bullets as needed*

Detailed Instructions

Instructions

1. Send an electronic copy of this form to Program Review chair, Karin Spirn, and your Dean by Monday, November 2.
2. Please respond to questions with enough detail to present your information; it doesn't have to be long.
3. If the requested information does not apply to your program, write "Not Applicable."
4. Even if you don't have much to report, we want to hear from you, so your voice is part of the college planning process.
5. Optional/suggested: Communicate with your dean while completing this document.

Sections: There are five sections to the document:

1. Program Reflection and Planning
2. SLO/SAO Review
3. Data analysis
4. Special topics
5. Feedback on the PR template and process

Time Frame: This Program Review should reflect your program status during the 25-26 academic year. It should describe plans starting now and continuing through 2026-27. It is fine to discuss topics beyond these time frames, but please specify the time frame in your responses.

Audience: Deans, Vice Presidents of Student Services and Academic Services, All Planning and Allocation Committees. This document will be available to the public.

Uses: This Program Review will inform the audience about your program. It is also used in creating division summaries, determining college planning priorities, and determining the allocation of resources. The final use is to document the fulfillment of accreditation requirements.

Equity: Here is the LPC definition of equity, which is a guiding principle in reviewing programs: "Equity is parity in student educational outcomes. It places student success and belonging for students of color and disproportionately impacted students at the center of focus."

Please note: Program Review is NOT a vehicle for making requests. All requests should be made through appropriate processes (e.g., Instructional Equipment Request Process) or directed to your dean or supervisor.

Helpful Links:

- ★ Tools for Writers - with contacts for help with specific sections.
- ★ Program Review Glossary - defines key terms you can review when writing.
- ★ Fall 2023 Program Reviews
- ★ Program Review FAQs

For help with your program review, please contact Karin Spirn at kspirn@laspositascollege.edu