Student Academic Services

ASSSESSABLE OUTCOME
Provide high quality Supplemental Instruction program.

OUTCOME SUPPORTS
☑ University: Goal 1
☑ Division: Goal 5
☐ Department: ________________
☐ Other: ________________

DATA COLLECTION TIMEFRAME
July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015

OUTCOME TYPE
☑ Performance Outcome
☐ Student Learning Outcome

ASSESSMENT APPROACH
☑ Direct assessment
☒ Indirect assessment
☐ Both direct and indirect assessment

DATA COLLECTION METHODS
Survey

METHODS AND MEASURES
Provide high quality Supplemental Instruction program.

CRITERIA OF SUCCESS
• 70% of faculty agree that they received quality services.
• 60% of faculty rated the program 8 or above.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS
A qualitative and quantitative survey was sent out to all instructors whose course(s) were supported by Supplemental Instruction at the end of the fall and/or spring semester. SI faculty participants were asked questions regarding their experience and satisfaction with their SI leader, SI staff (department SI faculty liaison or SI Coordinator), as well as the overall SI Program. In asking them if they received quality services, we focused on the following questions: did the instructor find their SI leader to be professional and positive in attitude; was the SI staff accessible, informative, and professional; and did they find SI to be helpful to their students. Moreover we asked for them to rate their overall satisfaction with the SI Program on a scale of 1 to 10.

For fall 2014, we received 18 survey responses (27% of the instructors who had courses linked to SI). However, we did receive an increase for spring 2015 as over half of the SI faculty partners completed the survey; we received 44 survey responses (56% of the instructors whose courses were linked to SI). The survey results reveal the following relevant data about the Supplemental Instruction Program:

The results attached below reveal that the Supplemental Instruction Program has met the 70% “often” or “always” criteria of success when asked about receiving quality services. Faculty
found their SI leaders to be professional and positive in attitude; the SI staff to be accessible, informative, and professional; and SI to be helpful to their students.

- 95% of SI faculty partners responded that their SI leader was “often” or “always” an effective “model student” in class.
- 91% of SI faculty partners responded that their SI leader “always” had a positive attitude about SI (89% of fall faculty; 93% of spring faculty partners).
- 91% of SI faculty partners felt that the department SI faculty liaison and/or the SI Coordinator “often” or “always” set high professional standards for SI leaders (95% of fall faculty; 88% of spring faculty partners).
- 88% of SI faculty partners rated their satisfaction with the SI Program 8 or higher for the 2014-2015 academic year (95% of fall faculty; 82% of spring faculty partners).

Qualitative survey comments also suggested that faculty found the SI Program greatly added in the development of their students’ ability, confidence, study skills, and course grades. Please refer to the complete list of comments attached below

**IMPROVEMENT ACTIONS**

This assessment process made us aware of the quality of some of our questions. We noticed a typo on the fall 2014 survey, where the question (“would you like to work with the SI program again” was asked twice instead of asking a second question regarding “working with the SI leader again.” This typo was corrected in time for us to administer the spring faculty survey.

It was also brought to our attention that an “N/A” option was necessary for the quantitative questions. We additionally found question 19 to be somewhat limiting, as it asked instructors to rate if their SI leader “provided extra time and/or additional SI sessions,” when in fact, faculty do not have access to SI sessions (it is an instructor free zone). Moreover, due to limited availability of classrooms and budget constraints, it is not feasible for us allow 100+ SI leaders to hold extra sessions. As such, question 19 will be omitted from surveys distributed in the future.

Additionally, the question asking whether “SI staff provided info on SI Program” could possibly be rephrased. Faculty are provided with a handbook at the beginning of the semester, invited to the orientation and a faculty mid-semester meeting, and also meet with their faculty liaison or the SI coordinator on occasion. However, not all elect to engage in the SI Program at the same level. New questions may be developed to measure their understanding of the pedagogical theories of SI, as well as their involvement with the SI Program.

All faculty SI survey findings will be discussed with our SI Implementation Team, especially in regards to determining how to emphasize the importance of the survey to faculty to ensure that we collect a larger sample size moving forward for the 2015-2016 academic year. It is crucial that we work on ways to communicate the importance of faculty participation in completing the SI faculty partner survey for program assessment purposes.