



Program Review Self-Study Template (Modified)

Academic Unit: Intensive English

College: Fairmount College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

Date of last review: September 2012

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant): Higher Learning Commission: 09/10/2007;
American Association of Intensive English Programs: 09/07/2009

Faculty of the academic unit:

ESL Specialists:

Sherry Ashworth

Andrew Bowman

Stephen Carter

Jean Collins

Aimee Leisy

Barbara Mazza Silhan

William Thomas

Marsha Webb

Academic Lecturers:

Jennifer Beachy

Natasha Calvert

Rebecca Curran

Douglas Miller

Amanda Tomanek

Lecturers:

Michael Poage

Laurel Schunk

Submitted by: *Sally A. Jones*
Sally A. Jones
Director, Intensive English

Date: September 24, 2013

1. Departmental purpose and relationship to the University mission (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information on completing this section.

a. University Mission:

Wichita State University is committed to providing comprehensive education opportunities in an urban setting. Through teaching, scholarship and public service the University seeks to equip both students and the larger community with the educational and cultural tools they need to thrive in a complex world, and to achieve both individual responsibility in their own lives and effective citizenship in the local, national and global community.

b. Program Mission

The Intensive English Language Center (IELC) serves non-native English-speaking students who do not meet WSU's English language proficiency requirements and other individuals who wish to increase their English language skills. For international students seeking admission to the university, it is an intensive pre-academic language and cultural immersion program. Approximately forty to fifty language classes are taught daily at seven levels of instruction.

c. The role of the program and relationship to the University mission:

The mission directly addresses the goal of helping the students achieve the required English proficiency for entrance to the University. In addition, we have international students as well as permanent residents who are not university-bound, but rather want to improve their knowledge of and ability in English for personal or professional reasons. Classes taken in our program for this purpose help them improve their respective life skills.

- d. Has the mission of the Program changed since last review? Yes: No: X
i. If yes, describe in 1-2 concise paragraphs. If no, is there a need to change?

- e. Provide an overall description of your program including a list of the measurable goals and objectives of the program (both programmatic and learner centered). Have they changed since the last review? Yes: No: X

If yes, describe the changes in a concise manner.

Our goal is to help all students, regardless of their purpose for studying, achieve communicative competence by mastery of level-appropriate tasks and/or structures in four specific skill areas – reading, writing, grammar, and speaking & listening – that increase in difficulty and sophistication as they progress through the program. The objectives for university-bound students are: (1) that they can read freshman academic texts at a minimum speed of 250 – 300 words per minute with a 75% - 80% comprehension rate; (2) that they have the grammatical, rhetorical, and research skills needed to write essays and research papers, including knowledge

of documentation styles although they might not have mastery of all these skills at the time they enter the university; (3) that they are able to understand 75% - 80% of an academic lecture covering and expanding on the text materials as well as get the same percentage of information on paper in note form; and (4) have the skills to give oral and Power Point presentations of varying lengths, which may or may not require research. We track the students whose interests are in language skills enrichment in the same manner that we track the university-bound students.

3. Academic Program: Analyze the quality of the program as assessed by its curriculum and impact on students. Complete this section for each program (if more than one). Attach updated program assessment plan(s) as an appendix (refer to instructions in the WSU Program Review document for more information).

- c. Identify the principal learning outcomes (i.e., what skills does your Program expect students to graduate with). Provide aggregate data on how students are meeting those outcomes. Data should relate to the goals and objectives of the program as listed in 1e. Provide an analysis and evaluation of the data by learner outcome with proposed actions based on the results.

Please see 1e above for the principal learning outcomes.

We have three assessment tools to analyze learning outcomes:

Program Outcome: Track students to determine if they exceed, meet or do not meet expectations, and also if they proceed through the program in a timely manner;

Learning Outcomes: Directly measure students' achievement by means of pre- and post-tests each session;

Learning Outcomes: Student perception of their own learning outcomes by means of a self-analysis as part of the Program Evaluations conducted at the end of each semester.

Program Outcome

Academic-Bound International Students:

exceeded expectations	24
met expectations	312
did not meet expectations	84

Personal/Professional International Students

exceeded expectations	8
met expectations	159
did not meet expectations	99

Personal/Professional Permanent Residents
 exceeded expectations 0
 met expectations 11
 did not meet expectations 1

Student Timely Progression, Completion of Goal/Program Tally

	Personal/Professional Permanent Residents	Personal/Professional International	Academic-Bound Permanent Residents	Academic-Bound International
Proceeding in a Timely Manner	12	167		336
Not Proceeding in a Timely Manner		99		201
Completed Goal in a Timely Manner		11		16
Completed Goal but not in a Timely Manner				3
Completed Program via IAS or TOEFL		7		56
Completed Program via IAS or TOEFL but Not in a Timely Manner				

Learning Outcomes: Pre-/Post Test Results

A total of 1876 pre-/post-tests were taken by our students.

1656 had improved scores 88.3% (compared to 88.7% in the 2011-2012 academic year)
 169 had lower scores 9.0% (compared to 7.5% in the 2011-2012 academic year)
 51 had no change 2.7% (compared to 3.8% in the 2011-2012 academic year)

Learning Outcomes: Students' Perception of their own learning outcomes

Skill	Nothing	Not Much	Some	A Lot	Very Much
Structure	10 [3 not enrolled]	32	99	153	101

Speaking	13 [8 not enrolled]	44 [5 not enrolled]	112	129	97
Listening	13 [6 not enrolled]	45 [4 not enrolled]	110	122	105
Writing	18 [10 not enrolled]	36	95	145	101
Reading	64 [10 not enrolled]		100	134	97
TOTALS	118 = 6% 81 = 4.1%	157 = 7.9% 148 = 7.5%	516 = 26.1%	683 = 34.6%	502 = 25.4%

Analysis of the “Nothing” and “Not Much” Responses

Skill	Nothing	Not much
Structure	2 from Int. I – 2 not enrolled 1 from Int. I 2 from Int. II – 1 with ATTITUDE 1 from Adv. I 3 from IAS8 – 2 Skill not directly taught; 1 not enrolled 1 from IAS16 – Skill not directly taught	6 from Pre-Int. II 4 from Int. I – 1 with grade of F 3 from Int. II 9 from Adv. I – 4 with ATTITUDE 4 from Adv. II – 1 with ATTITUDE 5 from IAS8 – 5 Skill not directly taught 1 from IAS16 – 1 Skill not directly taught
Speaking	3 from Pre-Int. II – 3 not enrolled 2 from Int. I – 2 not enrolled 2 from Int. II – 2 not enrolled 3 from Adv. I – 1 not enrolled 2 from IAS8 – 2 not enrolled 1 from IAS16 – Skill not directly taught	7 from Pre-Int. I – 2 not enrolled 6 from Pre-Int. II 7 from Int. I – 1 not enrolled; 1 with ATTITUDE 6 from Int. II – 1 not enrolled 7 from Adv. I – 2 with ATTITUDE 5 from Adv. II – 1 not enrolled; 2 with ATTITUDE 2 from IAS8 – 1 Skill not directly taught 1 Skill not directly taught plus ATTITUDE 4 from IAS16 – 4 Skill not directly taught
Listening	1 from Pre-Int. II 3 from Int. I – 2 not enrolled 2 from Int. II – 2 not enrolled 1 from Adv. I – 1 not enrolled 1 from Adv. II 4 from IAS8 – 2 not enrolled; 1 Skill not directly taught; 1 Skill not directly taught plus ATTITUDE 1 from IAS16 – Skill not directly taught	6 from Pre-Int. I – 2 not enrolled 7 from Pre-Int. II 9 from Int. I – 1 with ATTITUDE 8 from Int. II – 1 not enrolled; 1 with ATTITUDE 3 from Adv. I 4 from Adv. II – 1 not enrolled; 1 with ATTITUDE 5 from IAS8 – 5 Skill not directly taught 3 from IAS 16 – 3 Skill not directly taught
Writing	3 from Pre-Int. I – 1 not enrolled 3 from Pre-Int. II – 3 not enrolled 3 from Int. I – 3 not enrolled 1 from Int. II – 1 not enrolled 2 from Adv. I – 2 with ATTITUDE 3 from Adv. II – 1 not enrolled 3 from IAS8 – 1 not enrolled; 2 Skill not directly taught	3 from Pre-Int. I 9 from Pre-Int. II 4 from Int. I 5 from Int. II 9 from Adv. I – 1 with ATTITUDE 2 from Adv. II – 1 with ATTITUDE 3 from IAS8 – 3 Skill not directly taught 1 from IAS16 – 1 Skill not directly taught

Reading	4 from Pre-Int. I – 1 not enrolled 12 from Pre-Int. II – 7 not enrolled 10 from Int. I – 2 not enrolled; 1 with ATTITUDE; 1 with grade of D 9 from Int. II – 2 not enrolled; 3 with ATTITUDE 18 from Adv. I – 11 with ATTITUDE 4 from Adv. II – 3 with ATTITUDE 7 from IAS8 – 1 not enrolled; 5 Skill not directly taught	
---------	---	--

6. Report on the Program's goal(s) from the last review. List the goal(s), data that may have been collected to support the goal, and the outcome.

First Goal: Reduction in cheating via cell phone.

On the day of tests and/or essay writing, all cell phones are turned off and placed on the teacher's desk. When the test/essay is turned in, the student may retrieve his/her phone.

The tests are not returned to students in class. They do receive their grade on the test, but must go to the teacher's office to review the test itself. This new practice is to prevent students from taking pictures of the test with their cell phones, which has happened in the past.

This system is working fairly well, and we have seen some reduction in cheating, but plagiarism continues to be a major issue. Due to our new CRN system, instructors, particularly at the upper levels, will begin to use Blackboard and, hopefully, Safe Assignment, to significantly reduce this problem.

Second Goal: Reduction in absenteeism by early intervention.

Letters are sent out as soon as chronic absenteeism is identified, but not always with successful results. Often students don't pay attention to the letters until we have to inform them that they will be dismissed from the program if they continue this pattern of behavior.

Beginning in the Spring I, 2013 session, we started sending Mid-Term Progress reports to EVERY student so every student knew exactly what his/her grade was at that point. The instructors wrote comments about each student. The Director also wrote comments to those students who had excessive absences or were on contract for dismissal if they didn't make progress urging them to attend more regularly or reminding them of their possible dismissal from the program, respectively. This seems to be helping the absenteeism problem a little. See Third Goal.

Third Goal: Reduction in students' failure to make "normal progress" in the program and repeating a level for two, three or four times.

Students receive a Dismissal Warning Notification, which they sign, and which the director signs and dates. This document states that they will be dismissed at the

end of a particular session or semester if they do not pass the level they are currently in because they are in that level for the third or fourth time. 15 students were dismissed from our program in December, 2011, 5 of whom transferred to another institution.

Two students were dismissed in March, 2012, and 21 were dismissed in May, 2012, 9 of whom transferred to another institution.

21 students were dismissed in July, 2012, 8 of whom transferred to another institution.

10 students were dismissed in December, 2012, 2 of whom transferred to another Institution.

9 students were dismissed in May, 2013, 1 of whom transferred to another institution.

Students seem to be taking the possibility of being dismissed more seriously than previously. We are hopeful this trend will continue.

7. Summary and Recommendations

As this program continues to grow in the number of students enrolled in it (226 Fall I 2012 compared to 194 Fall I 2011, 278 Fall II 2012 compared to 226 Fall II 2011, 222 Spring I 2013 compared to 203 Spring I 2012, 229 Spring II 2013 – a slight decrease from 231 Spring II 2012), the attendance and cheating problems continue as well. While we want to instill in our students a love of learning, we also must be disciplinarians in regard to proper student behavior in the classroom. Thus, our goals will continue to be focused on attendance, reduction of cheating and “normal progress” in the program.

First Goal: Strict adherence to the formal Attendance Policy (implemented in October, 2007) on the part of ALL instructors. The director requests notification when a student has accumulated three unexcused absences so the director can contact the student to try to change his/her attendance behavior.

Second Goal: Strict adherence to the formal Consequences of Cheating Policy (implemented in September 2007) on the part of ALL instructors. Cheating via cell phone and by plagiarism are the biggest problems. Instructors are asked to take “preventative measures” in regard to these problems by firmly upholding the rule regarding cell phones during tests and essays, and by teaching students how not to plagiarize beginning at the lower levels instead of waiting until the advanced levels.

Third Goal: Encourage students not to get stuck in a level and having to repeat the level several times. With the exception of Pre-Intermediate I and Pre-Intermediate II, students who fail a level will be notified that it is important that they pass the level the second time they take it. They should not be allowed to think they can take a level three or more times. Two sessions to pass a single level should be sufficient.

Learning Outcomes (most programs will have multiple outcomes)	Assessment Tool (e.g., portfolios, rubrics, exams)	Target/Criteria (desired program level achievement)	Results	Analysis
<p>Goal 1: To hone students' writing skills.</p> <p>Students will demonstrate effective control of syntax and mechanics of writing</p> <p>Students will use straight forward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the writing sample has few errors.</p> <p>(Written Communication Rubric from AACU)</p>	<p>Two faculty members selected on a rotating basis will read all (a sampling of) the senior seminar papers for the Fall and Spring semesters every year using a Department rubric to determine if each paper Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, or Does NOT meet expectations.</p>	<p>75% of the papers will Meet or Exceed expectations according to the established rubric.</p>		
<p>Goal 2a: To develop students' research skills with regard to information literacy.</p> <p>Access and use information ethically and legally.</p> <p>Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.</p> <p>(Info Literacy Rubric from AACU)</p>	<p>Two faculty members selected on a rotating basis will read all (a sampling of) the senior seminar papers for the Fall and Spring semesters every year using a Department rubric to determine if each paper Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, or Does NOT meet expectations.</p>	<p>75% of the papers will Meet or Exceed expectations according to the established rubric.</p>		
<p>Goal 2b: To develop students' research skills with regard to information literacy.</p> <p>Students demonstrate</p>	<p>Two faculty members selected on a rotating basis will read all (a sampling of) the senior seminar papers for the</p>	<p>75% of the papers will Meet or Exceed expectations according to the</p>		

<p>a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/ or proprietary information; and will correctly use three of the following strategies: a) use of citations and references; b) choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; c) using information in ways that are true to original context; d) distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution</p> <p>(Info Literacy Rubric from AACU)</p>	<p>Fall and Spring semesters every year using a Department rubric to determine if each paper Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, or Does NOT meet expectations.</p>	<p>established rubric.</p>		
<p>Goal 3a: To promote critical/analytical thinking in our students.</p> <p>Organizes evidence to reveal important patterns, differences, or similarities related to focus.</p> <p>(Inquiry and Analysis Rubric from AACU)</p>	<p>Two faculty members selected on a rotating basis will read all (a sampling of) the senior seminar papers for the Fall and Spring semesters every year using a Department rubric to determine if each paper Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, or Does NOT meet expectations.</p>	<p>75% of the papers will Meet or Exceed expectations according to the established rubric.</p>		
<p>Goal 3b: To promote critical/analytical thinking in our students.</p> <p>States a conclusion focused solely on the inquiry findings. The conclusion arises specifically from and responds specifically to the inquiry findings.</p> <p>(Inquiry and Analysis</p>	<p>Two faculty members selected on a rotating basis will read all (a sampling of) the senior seminar papers for the Fall and Spring semesters every year using a Department rubric to determine if each paper Exceeds expectations, Meets expectations, or Does NOT meet expectations.</p>	<p>75% of the papers will Meet or Exceed expectations according to the established rubric.</p>		

Rubric from AACU)				
Goal 4a: Quantitative Literacy: Interpretation	The instructor of POLS 365 (Political Research Methods) will include a set of four questions in the final exam measuring interpretative skills (frequency, average, correlation, regression). All exams will be assessed using a Department rubric to determine if each student exceeds expectations, meets expectations, or does NOT meet expectations.	75% of students will meet or exceed expectations according to the established rubric.		
Goal 4b: Quantitative Literacy: Application/Analysis	The instructor of POLS 365 (Political Research Methods) will assign and assess an exercise for all enrolled students each semester that asks them to make an analysis based on country-level data.	75% of students will meet or exceed expectations according to the established rubric.		