Expected Outcome 1: Academic Advising Services

Students who meet with academic advisors in Engineering Student Services will report a high level of satisfaction with advising services.

Assessment Methods:

User data are collected through a student evaluation. The population consists of undergraduate engineering students who meet with an academic advisor. Reasons for meeting with an academic advisor vary widely. Two groups of students are required to meet with an academic advisor and their participation is mandated; those who need a graduation credit check (seniors) and those who need to plan their schedule for the following semester (primarily freshmen and sophomores). Other students present themselves for matters related to schedule adjustment, curriculum questions, concerns about their major, poor grades, or problems in the classroom or with a professor.

Students who were advised in Engineering Student Services were asked to complete the hard copy “Academic Advising Survey”, a seven-question, 5 point, Lickert scale evaluation. This survey was changed during the early summer to electronic form. The items on the survey are:

1) This advisor has thorough knowledge about advising details related to my individual academic needs.
2) This advisor has thorough knowledge of Auburn University policies and procedures regarding academics.
3) If this advisor cannot respond to my concerns or questions, s/he makes the effort to refer me to the appropriate person, office, or resource.
4) This advisor is approachable and is concerned with my overall academic success.
5) This advisor is courteous and professional.
6) This advisor provides timely and accurate information.
7) I am generally satisfied with the services provided by this advisor.

Responses from the hard-copy form were entered into an Excel spread sheet and the newly created electronic form provides student responses weekly or on demand. This evaluation was not mandatory but advisors requested students to complete a form at the conclusion of every visit.

Findings:

Average results of the 7 questions from the hard-copy evaluation (5 pt. scale):
Advisor A: 4.956 with 70 responses
Advisor B: 4.908 with 138 responses
Advisor C: 4.863 with 95 responses
Average among all advisors: 4.909 with 303 responses
Average results of the 7 questions from the electronic evaluation (5 pt. scale):
Advisor A: 4.875 with 15 responses
Advisor B: 4.375 with 17 responses
Advisor C: 4.142 with 9 responses
Office total: 4.464 with 41 responses

The electronic numbers were, as expected, slightly lower. The hard copy form was handed out in the office and students were requested to complete the form at that time. It was observed that a majority of students circled responses quickly and left the office. It determined that the electronic form, though generating fewer responses, provided a more accurate picture of student attitude toward academic advising in Engineering Student Services. There was no significant difference in the ratings on the individual statements/questions between the hard copy and the electronic form.

How did you use findings for improvement?

The results from both modes of survey indicate a relatively high level of student satisfaction; however, they also indicate room for improvement. It was determined that individual items need to be assessed, on both the academic unit and individual academic advisors. Further, to ensure greater consistency, comparisons need to be made between the same modes of delivery, such as electronic form to electronic form. These data will be discussed with each academic advisor and will be part of the annual employee performance review, which is a critical factor in promotion through the University career ladder.

Additional comments:

The new electronic version of student survey responses can now be monitored weekly, allowing for more immediate action in cases where an academic advisor is receiving poor evaluations. This will allow for corrective action throughout the year and will be an improvement over the delayed (annual) reviews of the past.
Expected Outcome 2: Tutoring Services

Engineering Student Services will provide tutoring in high demand classes related to engineering studies.

Assessment Methods:

Method: User data are collected in SARS for all engineering students through the office of Engineering Student Services.

Students make appointments on-line through SARS and checked in at the front desk in Engineering Services upon arrival. Reports are run at the end of the semester to evaluate usage patterns.

Findings:

Tutoring for spring 2013 was offered for 39 courses related to pre-engineering that served as either pre-requisite or supporting courses in engineering. Thirteen undergraduate engineering students tutored all courses. Courses and number of (tutors) assigned to each: CHEM 1030 (3), CHEM 1040 (3), CHEM 1110 (3), CHEM 1120 (3), CHEM 2070 (2), CHEM 2080 (2), CHEM 1117 (1), CHEN 2100 (2), COMP 1210 (1), COMP 2210 (1), ELEC 2110 (2), ELEC 2120 (2), ELEC 2200 (2), ELEC 2210 (2), ELEC 2220 (1), ELEC 3800 (2), ELEC 3810 (2), ENGR 2010 for ChemE (2), ENGR 2010 non-ChemE (2), ENGR 2050 (2), ENGR 2100 (1), ENGR 2200 (1), ENGR 2350 (2), MATH 1000 (8), MATH 1120 (8), MATH 1130 (8), MATH 1150 (8), MATH 1610 (9), MATH 1620 (10), MATH 2630 (9), MATH 2650 (7), MATH 2660 (5), MECH 2110 (3), MECH 2120 (2), MECH 2220 (2), PHYS 1600 (7), PHYS 1610 (4), STAT 3600 (4), STAT 3610 (2).

Courses in highest demand were MATH 1620 (122 sessions/17.9%), PHYS 1600 (113 sessions/16.6%) and MATH 2650 (85 sessions/12.5%). Other courses with relatively high demand were MATH 1610 (56 sessions/8.2%), PHYS 1610 (51 sessions/7.5%), and MATH 2630 (43 sessions/6.3%). Courses with relatively low demand were CHEM 1040 (1 session), ELEC 2210 (1 session), ENGR 2100 (1 session), ENGR 2200 (1 session), and STAT 3610 (1 session).

How did you use findings for improvement?

It was decided to target the two classes in highest demand, MATH 1620 and PHYS 1600, by providing small group sessions to accommodate greater numbers of students. Small group sessions were developed to meet two late afternoons per week, during periods of lowest class activity. To provide greater access to these courses, a live feed of the session is available on the internet and all sessions are video taped for future review, as needed. It was further decided that courses with low demand would be retained for another semester, to determine if the outcome was related to one semester and if the courses should be tutored on alternating semesters.

Additional comments:
Individual tutoring in Engineering Services is in high demand. Appointments for individual tutoring were made by 729 undergraduate engineering students. Among that number, 681 students kept their appointment and 48 failed to show. Students who do not report for their appointment were sent a follow up email to which they are expected to reply. More than 2 unexcused failed appointments during the semester resulted in being ineligible to use the tutorial for the remainder of the semester. There further need for data collect and analysis to determine staffing needs during periods of greatest demand.