

BYUH Assessment Plan 2006-2007



EIL (English as an International Language)
Mark Wolfersberger (293-3628)

Outcomes	Means of Assessment	Findings	Actions
1. Students will demonstrate understanding of the essential points and most details in an academic reading passage.	70% of the students who complete the reading component of the EIL program will obtain a score of 75% or higher on a locally produced reading test.	144/179 = 81% (EIL329 students with 75%+ on course final)	Goal was met. However, we made some minor adjustments to problematic items in the tests. <u>Action</u> : Observe the effect of these changes to the tests on the pass rates.
	70% of former EIL students taking the University Graduation Survey will rate their level of preparation in reading as good, very good, or excellent.	74/92 = 80% rated their level of preparation in reading as good, very good, or excellent.	Goal was met. No action necessary.
2. Students will demonstrate competence in academic writing on both the rhetorical and syntactic levels, with occasional errors.	70% of the students who complete the writing component of the EIL program will obtain a score of 5/6 or higher on the EIL program writing exam OR will receive a 80% or higher on their writing course final exam.	125/222 = 56% (5+ TWE) 201/229 = 88% (80%+ on course final) 217/229 = 95% (80%+ on one or the other)	Goal was met. However, pass rates are high. This may be due to weak rater training procedures. <u>Action</u> : Focus rater calibration sessions on the pass/fail point to ensure scores are in line with program objectives. Add more essays to the benchmark file to give raters a stronger impression of the essay characteristics that exemplify each score range in the rubric.
	70% of former EIL students taking the University Graduation Survey will rate their level of preparation in writing as good, very good, or excellent.	71/92 = 77% rated their level of preparation in writing as good, very good, or excellent	Goal was met. No action necessary.
3. Students will successfully handle most communicative tasks in academic situations.	70% of the students who complete the listening/speaking component of the EIL program will obtain a score of 3.3 or higher (on a 4-point scale) on the speaking task test.	133/153 = 87% (323 students with 3.3+ on course final) 154/180 = 86% (all listening/speaking students out with 3.3+ on respective course finals)	Wide variance in pass rates across fall and winter semesters suggests inconsistency with scoring. The intense and prolonged time required from raters may be one cause. <u>Action</u> : Begin building a benchmark file based on student test samples. Try to mediate the effect of rater burn-out by reducing the scoring load. Establish criteria for mediating score discrepancies across raters.
	70% of former EIL students taking the University Graduation Survey will rate their level of preparation in speaking as good, very good, or excellent.	68/92 = 74% rated their level of preparation in speaking as good, very good, or excellent.	Goal was met. No action necessary.

Outcomes	Means of Assessment	Findings	Actions
<p>4. Students will comprehend the main ideas and most details of extended academic oral discourse.</p>	<p>70% of the students who complete the listening/speaking component of the EIL program will achieve a score of 65% or higher on a locally produced listening test based on an academic lecture from which students take notes and answer questions.</p>	<p>131/52 = 86% (323 students with 65%+ on course final) 158/179 = 88% (all listening/speaking students out with 65%+ on respective course finals)</p>	<p>The passing test score was lowered from 70% to 65% for the past year; however, 65% appears to be too low given the 25% jump in the pass rate over the year. <u>Action</u>: Identify the factors affecting fluctuations in the passing rates.</p>
	<p>70% of former EIL students taking the University Graduation Survey will rate their level of preparation in listening as good, very good, or excellent.</p>	<p>77/92 = 84% rated their level of preparation in listening as good, very good, or excellent.</p>	<p>Goal was met. No action necessary.</p>
<p>5. Students will recognize that the EIL program was beneficial in assisting them with the English language proficiencies necessary for success at the University.</p>	<p>70% of former EIL students taking the University Graduation Survey will rate their overall experience in EIL, the quality of teaching in EIL, and the level of preparation provided by the EIL program as good, very good, or excellent. 70% will slightly agree, agree, or strongly agree that the length of time spent in the program was appropriate.</p>	<p>68/92 = 74% rated their overall experience in EIL as good, very good, or excellent. 64/92 = 70% rated the quality of teaching in EIL as good, very good, or excellent. 68/92 = 74% rated the level of preparation provided by the EIL program as good, very good, or excellent. 72/92 = 78% slightly agree, agree, or strongly agree that the length of time spent in the program was appropriate.</p>	<p>Objective was met. <u>Action</u>: it is critical for this outcome that we continue to be vigilant with reviewing the EIL curriculum and policies and making adjustments to meet students' needs.</p>
<p>6. Students who complete the EIL program will compare favorably with those entering full-time undergraduate studies across the nation; the EIL program will be able to consistently maintain this standard.</p>	<p>70% of students who complete the EIL program will achieve a score of 530 or higher on the institutional TOEFL.</p>	<p>FA06 23/61 = 38% (530+) 32/61 = 53% (520+) 37/61 = 61% (510+) 45/61 = 74% (500+) '06 average = 523 '04 average = 514 '02 average = 532 31/51 = 61% (students out of L/S with subscore 53+ on TOEFL listening) <u>'04 average = 59%</u>; <u>'02 average = 47%</u> 23/60 = 38% (students out of reading with subscore 53+ on TOEFL reading) <u>'04 average = 23%</u>; <u>'02 average = 36%</u> 17/59 = 29% (students out of writing with subscore 53+ on TOEFL structure) <u>'04 average = 27%</u>; <u>'02 average = 63%</u></p>	<p>Although we have not met this goal after 3 assessment cycles, we feel the means of assessment is worthy of our sustained efforts. <u>Action</u>: Rather than adjust the 70% target downward, we will pursue some ideas for better integrating our curriculum across classes, which will help recycle key vocabulary and grammar and support overall language development.</p>