

EMORY UNIVERSITY

2013-2014 Assessment Report for Administrative and Educational Support Units

Assessment Period Covered: September 1, 2013-August 31, 2014

Unit: Emory College Office for Undergraduate Education Academic Support Programs	Date Submitted: October 1, 2014
Contact Person: Jane O'Connor	Email address: jcoconn@emory.edu

MISSION STATEMENT

Academic Support Programs seeks to develop, implement, and evaluate programs of academic support to supplement those offered through departments and other student resources to engage students more fully in their learning experiences in the College and provide appropriate levels of support to achieve their goals.

Supports School/Division Strategic Goals:

The Office for Undergraduate Education provides quality service to all Emory College of Arts and Sciences undergraduates in the area of academic affairs, from matriculation to graduation; supports faculty throughout the Arts and Sciences as they offer the finest possible liberal arts education; and oversees distinctive college-wide academic programs in the pursuit of educational excellence.

Supports University Strategic Goals:

"Emory enrolls the best and the brightest undergraduate and graduate students and provides exemplary support for them to achieve success. Emory will attract smart, curious, creative, and socially engaged students who will become lifelong learners and responsible citizens. We will prepare students who are fully engaged and literate as citizens of the twenty-first century."

Emory’s social and physical environment enriches the intellectual work and lives of faculty, students, and staff. Our environment will promote and celebrate diversity, build supportive infrastructure and spaces, provide competitive compensation programs, support interdisciplinary and collaborative activities, and nurture respect and accountability.

OUTCOME #1: Satisfaction of ESL Tutors with Selected Training Program Components

<p>Method 1: ESL tutors will complete a survey to evaluate training sessions on a 4-point Likert scale (“strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”) to assess whether training prepared them on the following components: online, onsite, continuing training sessions, and the training website. ESL tutors will be surveyed at the end of the initial training period (four weeks after start of semester) and at the end of the fall semester and spring semester.</p>	<p>Achievement Target: Eighty percent of students completing the surveys will “agree” or “strongly agree” that the training components were helpful.</p>
--	--

Summary of Assessment Results

Fifteen tutors were employed in fall 2013 and 13 in spring 2014. New ESL tutors were surveyed twice during the academic year 2013-2014 about their overall satisfaction with the training program and with specific training components. The first survey was administered immediately following the fall online and onsite training which was completed by 9 tutors (Appendix A), and the second survey was administered at the end of the fall semester (Appendix B); again, this was completed by 9 tutors. The surveys included statements that assessed the helpfulness of the training overall and then asked more specific questions to examine the helpfulness of each component of the training.

At the end of the training when the 9 tutors present were asked how helpful the overall online and onsite trainings were in preparing them to tutor, all rated these as 3 or 4 on a 4-point Likert scale (1 being “strongly disagree” to 4 “strongly agree”). When asked if their expectations for the training were met, all responded positively with a rating of 4. Specifically regarding the onsite training, 9 (100%) agreed or strongly agreed that the training was helpful. Looking at the online training for helpfulness overall, 9 tutors (100%) marked “agree” or “strongly agree” noting that it was helpful (3 or 4). We also broke the onsite and online training into more specific components (see below). Again, in almost all areas, our goal of 80% was met or exceeded. The single exception was on a statement about the usefulness of tips from experienced tutors, which resulted in a rating of 4 or 5 by 78% of those who responded.

Helpfulness Ratings for Specific Components of Onsite Training

ITEM	NUMBER RESPONSES OF 3 or 4 N=9	PERCENTAGE RESPONSES OF 3 or 4
Kronos and TutorTrac	8	89%
Scaffolding techniques and roleplay	9	100%
Administrative Policies and Procedures	9	100%
Overview of resources (English 101/ESL, Blackboard, Tutor Training Website)	9	100%
Tips for experienced tutors	7	78%

Helpfulness Ratings of Specific Components of Online Training

ITEM	NUMBER OF RESPONSES 3 or 4 N=9	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES 3 or 4
Module A:Tutor role & responsibilities	9	100%
Module B: SLA concepts and guiding principles	9	100%
Module C: Cultural Considerations	9	100%
Module D: Helping Students with Grammar and Vocabulary	9	100%
Module E: Tips for Conducting Sessions	9	100%
Tutor Training Website (videos)	9	100%
Quizzes	8	89%

At the end of the fall 2013 semester, tutors responded to statements rating their initial training as well as commented on the ongoing training. Of the 9 tutors who responded when asked a general question about how satisfied they were overall with the ESL training program, all nine rated this at 3 or 4. We then broke the training into more specific components (see below). Again, our goal of 80% was met or exceeded in all but one category.

Helpfulness Ratings on Overall Components of Online and Onsite Training

ITEM	NUMBER OR RESPONSES 3 or 4 N=9	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES 3 or 4
Online	8	89%
Onsite	9	100%
Training Website (word press)	7	78%
Continuing Training (individual tutor feedback)	9	100%

As these results were so positive, it was decided not to send a further survey asking the same questions at the end of the spring semester. Instead we sent a survey to find out different information, for example, how the new scheduling tool (ASST) was working and to find out about tutor interest in different forms of tutoring. The 13 tutors who responded were all happier with the new scheduling system in general (although some issues such as wanting earlier email notifications of appointments were noted) and 9 (70%) said they would be interested in tutoring online as opposed to tutoring in person.

Use of Assessment Results

The data show that the achievement targets for the tutoring program have been met. As always, some changes to the training will continue to be made and we will be looking into the feasibility of different formats for tutoring and different models of continuing tutor training, which will be a SACs goal for next year.

Outcome 2: Satisfaction of student participants in the services delivered through programs (focusing on quality of individual tutoring, the ESL Lab, English 101 with ESL support and availability of services).

Method of Assessment 1: Students will complete surveys to evaluate ESL services on ESL tutoring quality, ability of tutors to determine tutee needs and	Achievement Target: Eighty percent of students completing the survey will “agree” or “strongly agree” (3 or
---	---

<p>availability of appointments for both individual tutoring and the ESL Lab. Surveys will be distributed at the end of the fall 2013 and spring 2014 semesters.</p>	<p>4 on a 4-point Likert scale) that the services and availability were satisfactory.</p>
<p>Method of Assessment 2: Students enrolled in ENG 101 with ESL Support courses will complete a formative qualitative evaluation on the strengths and weaknesses of the instruction and content of the course.</p> <p>Students will complete a standard summative Emory course evaluation form at the end of the semester.</p>	<p>Achievement Target: Formative evaluations will be used to provide feedback to instructors and consideration will be given to improving course based on feedback.</p> <p>Student ratings of 7.5 or higher for each English 101 with ESL support section</p>

Summary of Assessment Results: ESL Services

During fall 2013, 130 students used at least one ESL tutoring session and, in spring 2013, 141 students attended at least one ESL tutoring session. Tutees using ESL tutors were surveyed at the end of the fall semester 2013 (Appendix C). Fifty-four respondents started the survey, but not all of these answered every question. At the end of the spring semester 2014, 27 respondents started the survey, but not all completed it. Tutees using the ESL lab were given a brief survey after each visit. We first asked tutees: “In general, how helpful did you find your ESL tutoring sessions?” In fall 2013, 42 of 49 students (86%) found the ESL tutoring service “helpful” or “very helpful” (3 or 4 on a 4 point Likert scale). In spring, 23 of 24 (96%) rated the service as “helpful” or “very helpful”.

ESL tutees were then asked to rate their satisfaction with specific aspects of the tutoring program using a 4-point Likert scale. As can be seen from the chart below, the goal of 80% of tutees rating the service as a 3 or 4 on the Likert scale was achieved in all areas.

In the fall, 57 students made use of the ESL lab for a total of 175 visits. One hundred thirty-nine satisfaction surveys were completed. On these, 136 (98%) of these visits were rated at a 3 or 4 on the Likert scale with 4 being “very helpful”. In the spring, 18 students used the lab for a total number of 24 visits and 23 satisfaction forms were completed. Of these, 23 of 23 students (100%) rated this as a 4 or “very helpful”. In the fall 2013 semester, 136 out of 139 surveys (98%) found the time that the lab was available and the location convenient. Similarly, in the spring 2014, 22 out of the 23 students (96%) agreed that the times available and locations were convenient. These data suggest students who used the lab are satisfied with the tutoring services offered through the ESL Lab.

All students in English 101 with ESL support completed a qualitative questionnaire at mid-term, as well as the university class evaluation sheet at the end of the semester. End-of-semester ratings of 7.5 or better on the university course evaluations were reached in 3 of 4 sections in the fall of 2013 and 2 of the 3 sections in the spring of 2014. In fall 2013, Instructor A taught two sections of English 101/ESL and Instructors B and C each taught one section. Each section had 12 students. Instructor A received an overall rating of 7.89 for one section and a 6.26 for the second section. Instructor B received a rating of 8.75 and Instructor C 8.67. In the spring semester Instructor A taught one section of English 101/ESL with 11 students and received a rating of 7.90. Instructor B taught two sections of English 101/ESL with a total of 32 students and received ratings of 6.44 and 7.93. Instructor C did not teach English 101 that semester. The target of a 7.5 overall rating was met in 5 of the 7 sections.

Satisfaction Ratings for Specific Components of ESL Tutoring Sessions

ITEM	NUMBER OR RESPONSES 3 or 4 Fall 2013 N=45	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES 3 or 4 Fall 2012	NUMBER OR RESPONSES 3 or 4 Spring 2013 N=21	PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES 3 OR 4 Spring 2013
Availability of appointments	39	87%	19	90%
Times of appointments	42	93%	20	95%
Locations of appointments	43	96%	18	86%
Arrival of tutors to appointments on time	43	96%	19	90%
How well the tutors understood your needs	41	91%	19	90%
How well the tutors communicated with you during sessions	43	96%	19	90%
How efficiently the tutors used the time in sessions	41	91%	19	90%

How knowledgeable the tutors were about language	41	91%	19	90%
How knowledgeable the tutors were about writing	43	96%	19	90%

Use of Assessment Results

These data show the tutoring system is consistently seen as “helpful” or “very helpful”. Every effort will be made to maintain this in the future as well as further develop the skills of our tutors. A SACs goal for next year is to explore different models of continuing tutor training at peer institutions with this in mind.

Based on the course evaluations of Instructor A after the fall 2012 semester, Instructor A sought outside support to improve her performance in the classroom. The ESL director, teaching support personnel from the Center for Faculty Development and Excellence and two other faculty teaching mentors observed the instructor in class and provided feedback. Teaching feedback continued in fall 2013 and spring 14, as well as self-study and reconsideration of some components of the course structure. Instructor A has now left Emory to pursue other interests. Instructor B has been observed and shows great skill in the classroom. The lower rated section is far outside the rating the instructor has received in over ten years of teaching. The environment in the class was complicated by a group of students who had pushed to get into this section together, which the instructor went to pains to support. This group of students undermined the authority of the instructor and impeded the progress of the class. The instructor, with the director’s support, is planning possible responses to situations like this one, if a similar situation were to occur in the future. In the future the ESL team will add more readings and discussion on various aspects of teaching into our weekly staff meetings. In addition, conference attendance on ESL specific issues will be encouraged.

OUTCOME #3: Increase the use of the ESL Skills Lab

Method: Develop a structured sign in process to the lab and monitor its use. Tabulate the number of students who sign-in to the ESL Skills Lab.	Achievement Target: Increase in the number of students using the ESL Skills Lab by 30% from the previous academic year.
---	---

Summary of Assessment Results:

Due to the positive LAB feedback from the year 2012-2013, it was decided to increase the LAB usage. To recap on the satisfaction responses received in fall 2012: of the 36 responses received, 31 of 36 (86%) rated the ESL lab sessions as 4 or 5 on the 5-point Likert scale. In spring 2013, of the 26 satisfaction responses, 24 of 26 students (92%) rated this as a 4 or 5. In

the fall 2012 semester, 34 of 36 of the responses (94%) found the time that the lab was available and the location convenient. Similarly, in the spring 2013, 25 out of the 26 responses (96%) agreed that the times available and locations were convenient. In the fall semester 2013, we increased advertising of the service to students and faculty; for example, via flyers and the website. In addition, we increased the LAB hours from 6 to 8 each week and made the times it was open consistent (each evening 6-8 pm Monday through Thursday). In addition, we increased the number of tutors in the LAB from one to two. This yielded positive results for the fall semester but more disappointing results for the spring semester as seen below. The number of students served nearly doubled between fall 2012 (30) and fall 2013 (57) and the number of visits these students made more than tripled from 51 in fall 2012 to 175 in fall 2013. However, when comparing the two spring semesters, although nearly the same number of students were served in spring 2014 and in spring 2013, the actual number of hours used decreased from 16 to 9.5.

Number of Students Served:

	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
Lab	30	16	57	18

Lab Hours & Visits:

	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014
Lab hours (student contact time)	29	16	74	9.5
Lab visits	51	27	175	24

Use of Assessment Results:

We were very pleased with this increased usage in the fall but disappointed by the spring. The difference is probably due to the fact that our online scheduling system experienced significant problems in the fall making it difficult for students to book appointments with regular tutors. We are continuing the LAB this year with eight hours weekly but we will have a new SACs goal this year (2014-15) of exploring drop-in tutoring systems used at other institutions to include online methods in an attempt to reach more students.

OUTCOME #4 Determine the need for sequential levels of writing classes for ESL students.

<p>Method: Administer Emory English Assessment (EEA) to qualified individuals during orientation and assess individual student’s writing using a scale of 1 to 5 (5 = “Native-Like Fluency”). Reassess those students who have completed their ENG 101 with ESL Support course using EEA format at the end of their course using the same criteria.</p>	<p>Achievement Target: Students who score a 3.5 or below will be flagged as a student who would benefit from an additional writing course with ESL support.</p>
--	--

Summary of Assessment Results:

The 48 students who took English 101/ESL fall 2013 were retested at the end of the semester using the same criteria as during orientation (the Emory English Assessment, EEA). The goal was to look at writing performance improvement, and to see how many would benefit from a continued writing class (CWRT) with ESL support. The goal we had set in the SACS report was that any student receiving 3.5 or less on the holistic rubric (with 5.0 being the maximum) would be seen as someone needing another class.

Of the 48 students one was a no show so this information is based on 47 students.

All 47 showed improvement in their writing skills. The smallest improvement was .25 of a point and the greatest 1.50. Fourteen students improved by one full point or more. Twelve achieved more than 3.5 meaning 35 could still benefit from another class.

The 44 students who took English 101/ESL in the spring 2014 semester were also retested at the end of the semester. The results of this were not so clear. For 7 of the students we cannot make a comparison as either they did not take the EEA during orientation, or they failed to show for the final assessment. Ten students appeared to show no improvement as their writing was rated the same as during the EEA. Three students scored slightly lower than in the EEA. The remaining 24 students showed improvement the most being 1.13. Twenty-nine that tested show they would still benefit from another class.

Use of Assessment Results:

These data were used to invite students who took English 101/ESL in the fall of 2013, and still showed the need, to English 221/ESL, a new class starting in fall 2014. In addition, those who took English 101/ESL in the spring of 2014 have been invited to take English 221/ESL in spring 2015.

2014-2015 Goals for Academic Support Programs: ESL Services

OUTCOME #1: Develop and implement a continuing training model

<p>Method of Assessment: Method 1: Explore different models of continuing tutor training at peer institutions. Method 2: Determine available resources and usefulness of these for training</p>	<p>Achievement Target: Achievement Target 1: A continuous training plan will be created by the end of the summer 2015. Achievement Target 2: List resources and utility of these by end of summer 2015.</p>
--	--

OUTCOME #2: Investigate alternative methods of engaging students in ESL academic support

<p>Method 1: Explore drop in tutoring systems used at other institutions to include online methods.</p> <p>Method 2: Survey tutors and tutees as to the desire for such a system</p>	<p>Achievement Target: Determine feasibility of a new system by end of fall semester 2015</p>
--	--

OUTCOME #3: Assess progress of students through English 221

<p>Method 1: Students placed in English 221 with ESL support (CWRT) will be further assessed at the beginning and end of that course.</p>	<p>Achievement Target 1: Students who score a 3.5 or below on a writing sample similar to the EEA after English 221/ESL will be flagged as a student who would benefit from additional ESL support.</p>
--	--

OUTCOME #4: Assess satisfaction of student participants in credit bearing classes designed for ESL students

<p>Method 1: Students enrolled in credit bearing classes with ESL support courses will complete a formative qualitative evaluation on the strengths and weaknesses of the instruction and content of the course half-way through the course.</p> <p>Method 2: Students also will complete a standard summative Emory Course and Instructor Evaluation form at the end of the semester as well as the department specific evaluation form.</p>	<p>Achievement Target: Formative evaluations will be used to provide feedback to instructors and consideration will be given to improving course based on feedback.</p> <p>Achievement Target: Student ratings of 7.5 or higher for each course with ESL support section on the Emory Course and Instructor Evaluation form</p>
---	--

OUTCOME #5: Development of revised ESL Writing Workshops/ILA lab coordination plan

<p>Method: Develop a plan for synthesizing writing workshops currently offered in collaboration with ESL, ILA and the First-Year</p>	<p>Achievement Target 1: Plan will be created by end of the fall semester 2014.</p>
---	--

Composition staff within a larger vision of writing across the College.	
---	--

OUTCOME #6 Expand the use of EEA to evaluate the writing skills of international Oxford Continuees.

Method 1: Administer Emory English Assessment (EEA) to international Oxford continuees during spring orientation and assess student’s writing using a scale of 1 to 5 (5 = “Native-Like Fluency”).	Achievement Target: Students who score a 3.5 or below will be flagged as a student who would benefit from information about additional ESL resources and sent information about connections to ESL support.
---	--

V. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Please remember to attach supporting documentation such as surveys, questionnaires, charts, tables, spreadsheets, and detailed descriptions of assessment findings. If you have questions about what should or should not be included with the report, please contact the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness.

Appendices A, B, C and D attached.

VI. REVIEW PROCESS

Please forward your 2012-2013 assessment report to the dean of your college/school or the vice president/vice provost of your administrative division for review and signature. This review will ensure that the information included in this report is accurate and that your unit is engaged in a systematic process of continuous improvement.

Wendy Newby

Associate Dean

October 1, 2014

Date

VII. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS

Please email reports to David Jordan, Director of Institutional Effectiveness
(David.M.Jordan@emory.edu) by October 1, 2014.