

Learning Assistance Resource Center  
Outcomes Assessment Report  
Fall 2006

Summary

1. Program Name:

Learning Assistance Resource Center (LARC)  
Academic Year: 2006-2007  
Date submitted: March 5, 2007

2. The assessment of Student Learning Outcome was conducted using data collected in Fall 2006. The information will be posted on the Learning Assistance Resource Center website at: <http://www.sjsu.edu/larc>

Report completed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Alice Ting \_\_\_\_\_

Date: March 5, 2007

AVP (Signature): \_\_\_\_\_

**Marshall Rose**  
AVP Enrollment & Academic Services

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Learning Assistance Resource Center

1. The Student Learning Outcomes will be posted in Spring 2007 on the LARC website at: <http://www.sjsu.edu/larc>
2. The Student Learning Outcomes assessed for review this fall:
  - The assessment measures student's understanding of a specific topic covered by the workshop presented at the Learning Assistance Resource Center
  - Pre- and Post- test scores for the students who participated in various grammar workshops were compared to determine the mastery of the subject matter and the improvement of student understanding of the topic as the result of the workshop presentation
3. Direct measures collected:
  - Data was collected in Fall 2006 from 126 students who participated in 4 different grammar workshops provided by the Learning Assistance Resource Center
  - Each student was given a test before the workshop and the exact same test after the workshop
  - The workshop discussed only the concept of the subject matter with no review of any of the test questions
4. The data were collected by the Learning Assistance Resource Center through tests administered before and after the workshop presentations. Summary and analysis were prepared by Alice Ting, Director of Learning Assistance Resource Center. Further discussion of the information will take place in Spring 2007.
5. Findings emerged from the analysis of data collected:
  - For the 27 students who participated in the "Pronoun" workshop, the test given has 100 points maximum. Pre-tests showed an average of 74.07 points and the post-test scores averaged 95.07 points. 24 students demonstrated better understanding with improved scores. 2 students showed the same scores and 1 student's score decreased (from 97 to 95 points)
  - For the 34 students who participated in the "Sentence Structure" workshop, the test given has 100 points maximum. Pre-tests showed an average of 32.74 points and the post-test scores averaged 85.41 points. All 34 students demonstrated better understanding with improved scores
  - For the 36 students who participated in the "Sentence Combining and Subject-Verb Agreement" workshop, the test given has 70 points maximum. Pre-tests showed an average of 49.59 points and the post-test scores averaged 76.44 points. 31 students demonstrated better understanding with improved scores. 3 students showed the same scores and 2 students' scores decreased (from 60 to 55 and from 70 to 60 points)

- For the 29 students who participated in the “Verbs” workshop, the test given has 100 points maximum. Pre-tests showed an average of 81.03 points and the post-test scores averaged 91.38 points. 19 students demonstrated better understanding with improved scores. 5 students showed the same scores and 5 students scores decreased (1 student, from 85 to 80; 2 students, from 90 to 85 and 2 students, from 100 to 90)
  - All 4 workshops demonstrated the improvement of student understanding after the presentation. The various degree of success might be closely linked to the subject matter covered by the workshop. Preliminary data also seems to indicate that students at the lower end of the scale benefited the most from the workshop with the highest increase of test scores
6. Actions taken: No action is taken at the present time. Discussion plan is made for Spring 2007. Action(s) will be determined following the discussion and analysis.
7. Following is the description of other assessment in progress:  
The data were collected by the Learning Assistance Resource Center. Summary and analysis were prepared by Dr. Susan Griffin, Tutorial Coordinator of Learning Assistance Resource Center. Further discussion of the information will also take place in Spring 2007.

- Increased understanding of subject matter  
This learning outcome was measured through a question on the tutoring evaluation that students fill out after individual sessions. The question asked students what they learned during the session by filling in the following, “This session helped me learn.....” In response to this question, eighty-five of the ninety-two students (92.3%) who responded were able to name something that they learned during the session. Four respondents (4.3%) gave answers that indicated that they had learned nothing or very little. Three people (3.2%) left the question blank.
- Improvement of specific skills necessary for student to be successful courses  
This outcome was measured with the same question listed above that asked students to describe what they learned in the tutoring session. In addition to eighty-five of the ninety-two students being able to name something that they learned in the session, many were able to name very specific skills or processes that they learned during the session. For example, students mentioned learning “how to write equations in slope point form,” “how to eliminate three variables in a problem” and “how to make a transition in paragraphs.”

In addition, a question added specifically for the writing component asked students “Based on what you learned in today’s tutoring session, the next time you write and proofread a paper, what will you do differently?” The second question is designed to measure whether what they learned is likely to carry over into how they approach a similar situation in the future.

- Increased self-confidence

This outcome was measured by two survey questions—one that appeared on the form that students fill out after individual sessions (“Did the tutor help you feel more confident about the material covered?”) and for writing tutors, (“Did the tutor help you feel more confident about your writing?”) and one question on the “Tutor Performance Evaluation” that students who have come repeatedly for tutoring fill out at the end of the semester (“Did your tutor help you to become more confident?”).

Of the ninety-two students who responded to the individual session survey question asking them if their tutors helped them feel more confident about the material covered, 51.1 % felt their tutors had done an “outstanding” job in this area; 39.1 % felt their tutors had done a “good” job in helping them feel more confident; 7.6 % rated their tutors “adequate,” 0% chose “needs improvement,” and 2.2 % selected “poor.”

In response to the question on the end-of-semester evaluations, “Did your tutor help you to become more confident?” 85.4 % of the eighty-two students who responded said “yes” their sessions had helped them become more confident. Only 1.2 % percent said that the sessions had not made them more confident. The remainder, 13.4%, left this question blank.

- Improved Course Performance

This outcome was measured for tutoring in all areas through three questions on the end-of-the-semester “Tutor Performance Survey.” Two of these questions asked students “Did your tutor help you to pass the course?” and “Did your tutor help you improve your course grade?” The third question asked each student to estimate his or her course grade before he or she began coming for tutoring and then estimate what his or her final grade will be in the course.

In the GE and Science component, LARC began further tracking grades, by asking students who wanted long-term tutoring to estimate their course grade at the time they first begin tutoring, and then comparing this grade to the grade that the students actually received at the end of the semester.

In response to the question asking if students’ tutors helped them to pass their courses, 80.5% of the eighty two students who filled out the form indicated that their tutors had helped them to pass their courses, and 1.2% indicated that their tutors had not helped them pass their courses. The remainder, 18.3% left the question blank.

Of the same eighty two students, 81.7% indicated that tutoring had helped them improve their course grades. Only 1.2 % said that tutoring had not helped them improve their course grades, and 17.1% of those who turned in the survey left this question blank.

- Facilitation of student-directed learning

This outcome was measured with two questions on the evaluations that students filled out after individual tutoring sessions. These questions asked “Did the tutor encourage you to participate?” and “Did the tutor explain your errors and teach you how to fix them rather than correcting them for you?”

In response to the question asking students if their tutors had encouraged them to participate, 72.8% rated their tutors “outstanding” in this category. Of the remainder, 18.5% rated their tutors “good,” 6.5% “adequate,” 1.1% “needs improvement” and 1.1% “poor.”

In response to the question asking if tutors explained students’ errors and taught them how to fix them rather than correcting them for them, 72.8% of the ninety-two students who filled out the form felt their tutors performance was “outstanding” in this area and 18.5% felt it was “good.” The remaining breakdown was 5.4% “adequate,” 1.1% “needs improvement,” and 2.2% poor.

- Overall, more than 90% of the LARC students surveyed are able to describe something that they learned during specific LARC sessions.
8. The next outcomes to be assessed will base upon the six division-wide learning goals developed by the Student Affairs.