

Summer Bridge Program

1. For this semester, identify which learning outcome(s) was (were) the focus of assessment.
The outcomes assessed were class performance and retention rate of students who participated in the Fall 2005 Bridge Transition Program. Grades and scores obtained by Fall 2005 Bridge Transition Program students in the classes they were placed were used to compare with the grades and scores obtained by a group of comparable cohort.
2. For each learning outcome, identified in item 1, what direct (performance measures) and indirect (e.g. surveys, exit interviews) information/data were collected, how much, and by whom this Spring 06.

Direct measures were collected for this assessment. The data were collected by the Fall 2005 Bridge Transition Program at the Academic Services department using university PeopleSoft data collected on 60 students who participated in the Fall 2005 Bridge Transition Program and compared with a cohort of 1043 San José State University students who were enrolled in the same classes with the Bridge students.

3. For data collected Fall 05, how and when were the data summarized, analyzed and discussed? (e.g. faculty retreat, assessment/curriculum committee, report to the faculty).

The summary and analysis was prepared by Alice Ting, Acting Director of Academic Services. Preliminary findings were reported to staff during staff meeting at the beginning of the Spring 2006 semester and at various points when data became available. Further discussion of the information will take place in Fall 2006.

4. What findings emerged from departmental analysis of the information/data collected in Fall 05?

Findings emerged from the analysis of data collected:

- Overall, the 2005 Bridge Transition Program participants demonstrated excellent performance in their academic standing in Fall 2005. 76.67% (46 students) were in clear academic standing with 3.33% (2 students) still waiting for grades
- 2005 Bridge Transition Program students also achieved excellent GPA in Fall 2005 semester. 15% (9 students) had GPA over 3.50, 25% (15 students) had GPA between 3.01-3.50, 28.33% (17 students) had GPA between 2.51-3.00, 8.33% (5 students) had GPA between 2.01-2.50 and 20% (12 students) had GPA below 2.00 with 3.33% (2 students) still waiting for grades

- Enrollment status of Fall 2005 Bridge Transition Program participants in Spring 2006 indicated that:
 - Of the 57 full-time students in Fall 2005, 85.96% (49 students) still remain full-time, 1.75% (1 student) became ¾ time, 1.75% (1 student) became half-time with 10.53% (6 students) not yet determined
 - Of the 2 students who were ¾ time in Fall 2005, all (100%) became full-time
 - The only student who was half-time in Fall 2005 also became full-time (100%)
- Grades obtained by Fall 2005 Bridge Transition Program in SCI 2 and sample remedial classes (LLD1 and MATH 3A) appear to be lower than the overall SJSU students enrolled in the same classes:
 - Of the 36 Bridge students enrolled in LLD1, 58.33% (21 students) received CR (Credit), 36.11% (13 students) received NC (No-Credit) and 5.56% (2 students) received W (Withdrawal). In comparison, the 600 SJSU students enrolled in LLD 1 showed 73% (438 students) with CR, 26.50% (159 students) with NC and 0.50% (3 students) with W
 - Of the 22 Bridge students enrolled in MATH 3A, 36.36% (8 students) received CR (Credit), 63.64% (14 students) received NC (No-Credit) with no (0%) W (Withdrawal). In comparison, the 302 SJSU students enrolled in MATH 3A showed 63.91% (193 students) with CR, 34.77% (105 students) with NC and 1.33% (4 students) with W
 - Of the 60 Bridge students enrolled in SCI 2, 50.00% (30 students) received A, 21.66% (13 students) received B, 0% received F, 18.33% (11 students) received I (Incomplete), 0% received RD (Record Delayed), 6.67% (4 students) received WU (Withdrawal Unauthorized) and 3.33% (2 students) received W (Withdrawal). In comparison, the 141 SJSU students enrolled in SCI 2 showed 70.21% (99 students) received A, 11.35% (16 students) received B, 1.42% (2 students) received F, 6.38% (9 students) received I (Incomplete), 1.42% (2 students) received RD (Record Delayed), 8.51% (12 students) received WU (Withdrawal Unauthorized) and 0.71% (1 student) received W(Withdrawal)

5. What actions are planned to address the findings? (e.g. curricular revision, pedagogical changes, student support services, resource management.) Did the degree program revisit/or revise their Student Learning Outcomes based on the findings?

- The sample number of Fall 2005 Bridge Transition Program participants is small. Repetitive data need to be collected over several years to show significant results
- This instrument did not provide information on the type and level of remediation needed by both the Bridge participants and their cohort. Detailed measurement of these specific areas will provide more data for further analysis of the impact of this program

6. Describe plans to collect data on additional learning outcomes next semester.
 - The accumulated results from the assessment reports completed in 2005 and 2006 provided valuable data and information to be used for the strategic planning of the next Bridge Program
 - Additional learning outcomes will be designed in alignment with the Achieving Greater Expectation Institute Initiative, San José State University's mission 2010 and the new Advising Model
7. Did your analysis result in revisiting/revising the Student Learning Outcomes? If the answer is yes, please explain and submit an updated version of the Student Learning Outcomes.

The analysis did not indicate the need to revise the Student Learning Outcomes.

Learning Assistance Resource Center

1. For this semester, identify which learning outcome(s) was (were) the focus of assessment.

The learning outcomes assessed were the retention rate and the GPA of those students who received academic support services at the Learning Assistance Resource Center (LARC). Comparison of enrollment status and term GPA were made using data collected prior to and after the services were delivered at the Learning Assistance Resource Center.

2. For each learning outcome, identified in item 1, what direct (performance measures) and indirect (e.g. surveys, exit interviews) information/data were collected, how much, and by whom this Spring 06.

Direct measures were collected for this assessment. The data were initially collected by the Learning Assistance Resource Center using the attendance tracking software AccuTrack. The collected data were further extracted to be used in comparison with the university PeopleSoft data on 1652 students who received tutorial services at the Learning Assistance Resource Center in Fall 2005.

3. For data collected Fall 05, how and when were the data summarized, analyzed and discussed? (e.g. faculty retreat, assessment/curriculum committee, report to the faculty).

The summary and analysis of the collected data were prepared by Alice Ting, Acting Director of Academic Services. Preliminary findings was reported to staff during staff meeting at the beginning of the Spring 2006 semester and at various points when data became available. Further discussion of the information will take place in Summer 2006.

4. What findings emerged from departmental analysis of the information/data collected in Fall 05?

Findings emerged from the analysis of data collected:

- Of the 1652 students received services at the Learning Assistance Resource Center in Fall 2005 semester, 1407 are Undergraduate, 39 are Post-Baccalaureate, 152 are Graduate and 54 N/A (Admitted but not enrolled)
- Of all the students who received services in Fall 2005 at the Learning Assistance Resource Center, Undergraduate showed the highest percentage of full-time enrollment (79.1%, 1113 out of 1407 students) while only half of the Post-Baccalaureate and Graduate students showed full-time status (48.72% for Post-Baccalaureate and 57.89% for Graduate)
- Of all the full-time students who received services in Fall 2005, Undergraduate, Post-Baccalaureate and Graduate students showed no significant difference in the percentage of students who remain full-time status in Spring 2006. (Undergraduate - 82.75%, Post-Baccalaureate - 68.42% and Graduate - 70.45%)

- Of all the students who received services in Fall 2005 at the Learning Assistance Resource Center, Undergraduate with less than full-time status also showed the highest percentage change to full-time enrollment in Spring 2006 (55.15% from ¾ time to full-time, 24.24% from half-time to full-time and 36.36% from less than half-time to full-time and 20% from no units to full-time)
- Of the 1407 Undergraduate students who received services at the Learning Assistance Resource Center (LARC), data was also collected for their Spring 2005 term GPA before they received LARC services and compared with their Fall 2005 term GPA after they received LARC services:
 - Of the 130 Undergraduate students with the Spring 2005 GPA between 0.00-2.00, 53.84% showed improvement of their Fall 2005 term GPA (25.38% - GPA 2.00-2.50, 20.00% - GPA 2.51-3.00, 6.15% - GPA 3.00-3.50 and 2.31% - GPA above 3.50)
 - Of the 141 Undergraduate students with the Spring 2005 GPA between 2.01-2.50, 39.72% showed improvement of their Fall 2005 term GPA (25.53% - GPA 2.51-3.00, 12.77% - GPA 3.00-3.50 and 1.42% - GPA above 3.50)
 - Of the 196 Undergraduate students with the Spring 2005 GPA between 2.51-3.00, 27.04% showed improvement of their Fall 2005 term GPA (21.94% - GPA 3.00-3.50 and 5.10% - GPA above 3.50)
 - Of the 180 Undergraduate students with the Spring 2005 GPA between 3.01-3.50, 22.22% showed improvement of their Fall 2005 term GPA to above 3.50
 - Of the 118 Undergraduate students with the Spring 2005 GPA above 3.50, 50.85 % maintained their GPA above 3.50 in Fall 2005
 - Of the 642 students with no Spring 2005 GPA (First Time Freshmen, First Time Transfer and others), 81.77% obtained clear academic standing in Fall 2005 after LARC services with 13.55% - GPA 2.00-2.50, 23.36% - GPA 2.51-3.00, 23.99% - GPA 3.00-3.50 and 20.87% - GPA above 3.50

5. What actions are planned to address the findings? (e.g. curricular revision, pedagogical changes, student support services, resource management.) Did the degree program revisit/or revise their Student Learning Outcomes based on the findings?

- No action is taken at the present time. Discussion plan is made for Fall 2006. Action(s) will be determined following the discussion and analysis
- The data indicated the need to provide support services for Graduate students (9.20% - 152 out of the 1652 students served in Fall 2005 were Graduate students). Currently, LARC is charged with the learning assistance solely for undergraduate students. Graduate students are served only when tutors or workshops have additional space and/or no-shows. Further analysis of service data will be conducted to determine the type and scope of services needed

6. Describe plans to collect data on additional learning outcomes next semester.

Additional learning outcomes will be discussed during Summer 2006 with plan to collect data on specific activities in each of the three components at the Learning Assistance Resource Center.

7. Did your analysis result in revisiting/revising the Student Learning Outcomes? If the answer is yes, please explain and submit an updated version of the Student Learning Outcomes.

The analysis did not indicate the need to revise the Student Learning Outcomes.

Student Advising Center

1. For this semester, identify which learning outcome(s) was (were) the focus of assessment.

The outcomes assessed were the GPA and the retention data of those students who received services at the Student Advising Center (SAC). Comparison of enrollment status and term GPA were made using data collected prior to and after the services were delivered at the Student Advising Center.

2. For each learning outcome, identified in item 1, what direct (performance measures) and indirect (e.g. surveys, exit interviews) information/data were collected, how much, and by whom this Spring 06.

Direct measures were collected for this assessment. The data were initially collected using intake information entered on the Student Advising Center database. The collected data were further extracted to be used in comparison with the university PeopleSoft data on 2032 students who received advising services at the Student Advising Center in Fall 2005.

3. For data collected Fall 05, how and when were the data summarized, analyzed and discussed? (e.g. faculty retreat, assessment/curriculum committee, report to the faculty).

The summary and analysis of the collected data were prepared by Alice Ting, Acting Director of Academic Services. Preliminary findings were reported to staff during staff meetings in Spring 2006 and at various points when data became available. Further discussion of the information will take place in Fall 2006.

4. What findings emerged from departmental analysis of the information/data collected in Fall 05?

Findings emerged from the analysis of data collected:

- Of the 2032 students received services at the Student Advising Center (SAC) in Fall 2005 semester, 1836 are Undergraduate, 25 are Post-Baccalaureate, 11 are Graduate and 160 N/A (Admitted but not enrolled)
- Of all the students who received services in Fall 2005 at the Student Advising Center, Undergraduate showed the highest percentage of full-time enrollment (75.98 % or 1395 out of 1836 students) with 10.40% enrolled three-quarter time, 8.01% enrolled half-time, 2.12% enrolled less than half-time and 3.49% with no units
- Of all the full-time students who received services in Fall 2005, Undergraduate showed the highest percentage of students who still remained full-time status in Spring 2006 while only about half Post-Baccalaureate and Graduate students remained full-time status in Spring 2006 (Undergraduate - 82.51%, Post-Baccalaureate - 42.86 % and Graduate - 66.67 %)

- Of all the students who were enrolled less than full-time and received SAC services in Fall 2005, the ones with three-quarter enrollment showed the highest percentage change to full-time enrollment in Spring 2006 (54.45 % from three-quarter time to full-time, 34.69 % from half-time to full-time and 30.77 % from less than half-time to full-time and 25 % from no units to full-time)
- Of the 1836 Undergraduate students who received services at the Student Advising Center (SAC), data was also collected for their Spring 2005 term GPA before they received SAC services and compared with their Fall 2005 term GPA after they received SAC services:
 - Of the 298 Undergraduate students with the Spring 2005 GPA between 0.00-2.00, 52.35 % showed improvement of their Fall 2005 term GPA (20.13% - GPA 2.00-2.50, 20.47% - GPA 2.51-3.00, 9.40 % - GPA 3.00-3.50 and 2.35% - GPA above 3.50)
 - Of the 164 Undergraduate students with the Spring 2005 GPA between 2.01-2.50, 46.35 % showed improvement of their Fall 2005 term GPA (32.93 % - GPA 2.51-3.00, 10.98 % - GPA 3.00-3.50 and 2.44 % - GPA above 3.50)
 - Of the 235 Undergraduate students with the Spring 2005 GPA between 2.51-3.00, 40 % showed improvement of their Fall 2005 term GPA (31.06 % - GPA 3.00-3.50 and 8.94 % - GPA above 3.50)
 - Of the 256 Undergraduate students with the Spring 2005 GPA between 3.01-3.50, 23.44 % showed improvement of their Fall 2005 term GPA to above 3.50
 - Of the 194 Undergraduate students with the Spring 2005 GPA above 3.50, 61.34 % maintained their GPA above 3.50 in Fall 2005
 - Of the 689 students with no Spring 2005 GPA (First Time Freshmen, First Time Transfer and others), 78.67 % obtained clear academic standing in Fall 2005 with 11.61 % - GPA 2.00-2.50, 22.50 % - GPA 2.51-3.00, 22.79 % - GPA 3.00-3.50 and 21.77 % - GPA above 3.50

5. What actions are planned to address the findings? (e.g. curricular revision, pedagogical changes, student support services, resource management.) Did the degree program revisit/or revise their Student Learning Outcomes based on the findings?

No action is taken at the present time. Discussion plan is made for Fall 2006. Action(s) will be determined following the discussion and analysis.

6. Describe plans to collect data on additional learning outcomes next semester.

Additional learning outcomes will be discussed during Summer 2006 and in Fall 2006 with plan to collect data on specific activities to be determined after the reorganization of the unit.

7. Did your analysis result in revisiting/revising the Student Learning Outcomes? If the answer is yes, please explain and submit an updated version of the Student Learning Outcomes.

The analysis did not indicate the need to revise the Student Learning Outcomes.