Bergen Community College

ASSESSMENT REPORT FORM
ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT

Assessment Period: 7/1/13 – 6/30/15

AES Department: Cerullo Learning Assistance Center – English Language Resource Center (ELRC)

Department Head: Khairia Fazal, Managing Director of Learning Assistance Services

Department Assessment Liaison: Marilyn Pongracz, ELRC Supervisor

Date Submitted:

❖ **Mission/goal statement or description of the Department**:

The Cerullo Learning Assistance Center (CLAC) is committed to providing quality academic support accessible to all Bergen Community College (BCC) students. The CLAC comprises the Tutoring Center, Math Walk-In Center, Writing Center, English Language Resource Center, and the Tutoring Center at the Meadowlands Campus; all centers offer various avenues of tutorial assistance to address the diverse needs of our student population. A dedicated and trained staff of Peer and Professional Tutors work together in a nurturing environment to foster independent learning while guiding students through their educational journey at BCC.

❖ **Department's Core Objectives/Outcomes**:
   ° Design student-centered academic support services
   ° Develop academic support services
   ° Foster independent learning

SEMESTER 1: CREATING A DEPARTMENT-LEVEL ASSESSMENT PLAN

1. **Department's Goal(s) or Outcome(s) to be assessed (from the above section):**
   To determine if there is a positive correlation between receiving tutoring for writing and/ or attending writing or language learning strategy workshops in the ELRC and improvement in writing scores on standard rubrics used by writing professors in the Level 2 and 3 ESL writing classes.

2. **Means of Assessment:**
   From TutorTrac, obtain a list of students who have had tutoring for writing or attended writing or language learning workshops in the ELRC a minimum of 5 sessions.
   Obtain writing evaluation scores from the beginning and end of the semester from faculty who are using a standard rubric for grading writing tests. Compare the differences between the beginning

and ending scores for students who received a minimum of 5 sessions of writing assistance in the ELRC with those who did not come to the ELRC.

- **Feedback from Vice President:**

SEMESTER 2: DEVELOPING ASSESSMENT TOOL (s) and TIMELINE

3A. Describe or attach assessment tool (s), including sources of data, timeline for data collection and how data will be analyzed.

Collect data from writing teachers from fall 2013, spring 2014, and fall 2014. Determine the average grade for each class for the first and final assessments and the difference between those two assessments for students who did not come for tutoring. Then compare this with the average grade differences of students from those classes who came for tutoring.

3B. Desired results department and Vice President would like to see.

Students who come for tutoring should receive a .3 to .5 better comparative grade result than those students who did not come for tutoring.

- **Feedback from CIE:**

SEMESTER 3: COLLECTING AND ANALYZING DATA

4. Summary of Results (attach aggregated data table, survey tool, etc., to support the summary)

It was more difficult than expected to get the comparative results from faculty because many said that they do not grade in a manner that fits this study. We were able to obtain data from six ALP writing classes for a total of 99 students, but since only a few teachers responded, it was necessary to expand the pool to all writing classes in the ALP program. Of those who responded, there were two ALP Level 2 writing classes that met in the evening, so only a few of these students had time to come for tutoring. Students who attend ALP classes during the day come more frequently for tutoring. Of these there was a Level 3 writing class, a Foundations writing class, a small Level 2 writing class, and a small Level 1 writing class.

Since only five students came for tutoring in writing for five or more sessions, it was necessary to change the criteria to three or more. This raised the number of students to 16. When looking at the data, it also seemed relevant to compare students who came to the ELRC for all types of English practice, not only writing. The results are as follows:

For the 62 students who did not come for tutoring, the average test score difference between the first and last in-class writing test was an improvement of only .24% or from 83.23% to 83.47%.

The 16 students who came for tutoring for writing at least three times improved 1.69% or from 78.69% to 80.38%.

Another 14 students, not included in either of the groups above, who came for additional practice of any kind for at least three sessions improved the most, 2.43% or from 86.64% to 89.07%.

However, there is no indication that a greater quantity of data would produce significantly different results.

Recommendations for Improvement:

These results seem to indicate that all kinds of English practice help students improve. It is not necessary that the practice be focused on a single skill such as writing. However, the sample in this study was too small and the results were inadequate to state this conclusively.

This study also focused only on students who came for tutoring voluntarily. It may be beneficial to conduct a study on the results of required tutoring if faculty participation can be obtained.

Feedback from Vice President:

SEMESTER 4: CLOSING THE LOOP AND SHARING KNOWLEDGE

5.   Use of Results:

It seems that the best practice to help students improve is to offer a wide variety of options for English practice such as tutoring in all English skills, computer practice, workshops, conversation groups, conversation partners, and the lending library, which are all available in the ELRC.

Feedback from CIE: