WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Three-Year Program Review Self-Study Template (Modified)
2015 - 2017

Academic Unit: Intensive English

College: Fairmount College of Liberal Arts & Sciences

Date of last review: September 2017

Date of last accreditation report (if relevant): Higher Learning Commission: 02/02/2017;
American Association of Intensive English Programs: 09/07/2009

Faculty of the academic unit:

ESL Specialists:
Sherry Ashworth
Jean Collins
Aimee Leisy
Barbara Mazza Silhan
Marsha Webb

Computer-Assisted Learning Laboratory Coordinator:
Andrew Bowman

Lecturers:
Tiffany Akers
Jennifer Beachy
Diana Blencoe
Rebecca Curran
Rima Haidar-Duncan
Julie Henderson
Glendy Hoang

Paul Jenlink
Sara Jenlink
Pamela Jerome
Douglas Miller
Nancy Millham
Michael Poage
Colleen Scott

Submitted by: *Sally A. Jones*   Date: April 10, 2018
                      Sally A. Jones
                      Director, Intensive English

> 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:

> The mission of Wichita State University is to be an essential educational, cultural, and economic driver for Kansas and the greater public good.

    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? No.

    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 (Totals from 2014-2015, 2015-2016, and 2016-2017)

Academic-Bound International Students:
     89 exceeded expectations
     624 met expectations
     255 did not meet expectations
Academic-Bound Permanent Residents:
     0 exceeded expectations
     7 met expectations
     0 did not meet expectations
Personal/Professional International Students:
     72 exceeded expectations
     353 met expectations
     160 did not meet expectations

Personal/Professional Permanent Residents:
   6 exceeded expectations
   20 met expectations
   8 did not meet expectations

Student Timely Progression, Completion of Goal/Program Tally (August 2014 – May 2017)

	Personal/Professional Permanent Residents	Personal/Professional International	Academic-Bound Permanent Residents	Academic-Bound International
Proceeding in a Timely Manner	22	395	8	500
Not Proceeding in a Timely Manner	4	156		215
Completed Goal in a Timely Manner	3	101	1	43
Completed Goal but not in a Timely Manner				4
Completed Program via TOEFL/IELTS or IAS (Level 7)	2	12		145
Completed Program via TOEFL/IELTS or IAS (Level 7) but not in a Timely Manner				1

Learning Outcomes: Pre-/Post Test Results

A total of 3649 pre-/post-tests were taken by our students.

3264 had improved scores	89.4%	[92.3% in the 2014-2015 academic year 88.8% in the 2015-2016 academic year 86.4% in the 2016-2017 academic year]
275 had lower scores	7.5%	[6.0% in the 2014-2015 academic year 8.3% in the 2015-2016 academic year 9.9% in the 2016-2017 academic year]
110 had no change	3.0%	[2.7% in the 2014-2015 academic year 2.9% in the 2015-2016 academic year 3.7%in the 2016-2017 academic year]

Learning Outcomes: Students' Perception of their own learning outcomes (August 2014 – May 2017)

Skill	Nothing	Not much	Some	A lot	Very much
Structure	21	34	137	296	189
Speaking	23	46	168	270	170
Listening	23	48	180	251	175
Writing	30	45	152	264	186
Reading	60	2	143	272	200
TOTALS	157 4.6%	175 5.2%	780 23.0%	1,353 40.0%	920 27.w%

Analysis of the "Nothing" and "Not Much" Responses (August 2014 – May 2017)

Skill	Nothing	Not Much
Structure	2 from Pre-Int. I – 1 Not enrolled, 1 Attitude 3 from Pre-Inter. II – 1 Not enrolled 8 from Int. I – 3 Not enrolled, 1 Attitude 1 from Int. II 3 from Adv. I – 1 Not enrolled 2 from Adv. II – 1 Not enrolled, 1 Attitude 2 from IAS – 2 Skill not directly taught	1 from Pre-Int. I 4 from Pre-Int. II 7 from Int. I 9 from Int. II 8 from Adv. I 1 from Adv. II 5 from IAS – 5 Skill not directly taught
Speaking	2 from Pre-Int. I – 1 Not enrolled, 1 Attitude 1 from Pre-Int. II 2 from Int. I – 1 Attitude 5 from Int. II – 1 Not enrolled 2 from Adv. I – 2 Not enrolled 9 from Adv. II – 3 Not enrolled, 2 Attitude 2 from IAS – Skill not directly taught	1 from Pre-Int. I 3 from Pre-Int. II 9 from Int. I 9 from Int. II - 1 Not enrolled 10 from Adv. I – 2 Not enrolled 4 from Adv. II – 2 Not enrolled 4 from IAS – 1 Not enrolled, 3 Skill not directly taught
Listening	2 from Pre-Int. I – 1 Not enrolled, 1 Attitude 2 from Pre-Int. II – 1 Not enrolled 6 from Int. I – 1 Attitude 3 from Int. II – 1 Not enrolled 3 from Adv. I – 2 Not enrolled 5 from Adv. II – 3 Not enrolled, 2 Attitude 2 from IAS – Skill not directly taught	1 from Pre-Int. I 4 from Pre-Int. II 18 from Int. I 7 from Int. II – 1 Not enrolled 6 from Adv. I – 1 Not enrolled 7 from Adv. II – 2 Not enrolled 2 from IAS – 1 Not enrolled, 1 Skill not directly taught
Writing	1 from Pre-Int. I – 1 Attitude 5 from Pre-Int. II – 4 Not enrolled	1 from Pre-Int. I 4 from Pre-Int. II – 2 Not enrolled

	5 from Int. I – 2 Not enrolled, 1 Attitude 6 from Int. II – 2 Not enrolled 8 from Adv. I – 6 Not enrolled 4 from Adv. II – 1 Not enrolled, 1 Attitude 1 from IAS – Skill not directly taught	12 from Int. I – 1 Not enrolled 4 from Int. II 16 from Adv. I – 1 Not enrolled 11 from Adv. II – 1 Not enrolled, 1 Attitude 5 from IAS – 5 Skill not directly taught
Reading	3 from Pre-Int. I – 1 Attitude 9 from Pre-Int. II – 5 Not enrolled 11 from Int. I – 1 Attitude 11 from Int. II – 2 Not enrolled 14 from Adv. I – 4 Not enrolled, 1 Attitude 9 from Adv. II – 1 Not enrolled, 1 Attitude 3 from IAS – 3 Skill not directly taught	2 from Adv. II

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.

Since the fall of 2012, the tests have not been 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 practice is to prevent students from taking pictures of the test with their cell phones, which has happened in the past.

This system continues to work fairly well, and we have seen some reduction in cheating via cell phone. Additionally, we are now asking students to use their phones to create videos on various topics to be presented in class, to watch TED Talks, and other internet activities, providing students with positive use of cell phones in and for class rather than negative (cheating) use.

Plagiarism continues to be a major issue. Due to our new CRN system, instructors, particularly at the upper levels, will need to use Blackboard and Safe Assignment to significantly reduce this problem. Two upper level teachers are learning the Blackboard system for purposes of creating online ESL classes to begin in Fall 2018.

Plagiarism at the upper levels has reduced somewhat, but there are still some students who try to get away with it. In fact, in December 2016, one student was dismissed from the program for consistent plagiarism/academic dishonesty issues.

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, as well as his/her attendance. The instructors wrote comments to 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.
Beginning in the Spring I, 2017 session, we started using an electronic system of reporting grades and attendance, which system allows access to students 24/7 so they can see their up-to-date grades and attendance on a daily basis. At Mid-Term, the teachers added comments to encourage students to work harder or to compliment them on their good work. If they are doing poorly or there are a lot of absences, the director sends them an email to encourage them to attend more regularly.

We have had a lot of students that are sponsored by King Abdullah Scholarships, which are administered/maintained by the Saudi Arabia Cultural Mission (SACM) in Washington, D.C. Their sponsored students are held to a 90% attendance rate, which means they cannot miss more than 17 out of 171 class hours. These students' attendance is closely monitored, and most scholarship students honor SACM's attendance requirement. 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.

SACM now requires that a sponsored student not be in a single level more than two times, which has helped lower the number of students repeating a level more than once. However, there were some dismissals:

Four students were dismissed at the end of the Fall I 2014 session, and 11 students were dismissed at the end of the Fall II session, one of whom transferred to another institution. Two students were dismissed at the end of the Spring I 2015 session, and 12 students were dismissed at the end of the Spring II session, 2 of whom transferred to another institution, and 7 of whom were SACM-sponsored students. *A total of 29 students were dismissed during the 2014-2015 academic year.*
No students were dismissed at the end of the Fall I 2015 session. However, 10 were dismissed at the end of the Fall II session: 1 student transferred and 3 of the dismissed students were SACM-sponsored students. One student was dismissed at the end of the Spring I 2016 session; and no students were dismissed at the end of the Spring II session.

Eleven students dismissed during the 2015-2016 Assessment period is quite a bit lower than in previous assessment periods.

No students were dismissed at the end of the Fall I 2016 session. However, 2 were dismissed at the end of the Fall II session, both of whom transferred to another institution. No students were dismissed at the end of the Spring I or the Spring II 2017 session.

Having to dismiss only 2 students during the 2016-2017 academic year is a significant improvement in both attendance and the reduction of repeating levels.

7. Summary and Recommendations

This program now averages 100 or fewer students enrolled in it during the Fall and Spring semesters, the attendance and cheating problems continue as well although we have seen improvement in both of these issues=. 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, 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, all students who fail a level will be notified that they MUST 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. If a student has extenuating circumstances, that will, of course, be taken into consideration, but generally speaking, we will hold all students to the SACM standard of only being in a single level for two sessions.