

User Satisfaction Survey (2007-2008)

Contents	Page
<u>1. Preamble and Overall Satisfaction</u>	1
<u>2. Overall Registration Process</u>	2
<u>3. LN901-LN903 EAP Foundation Programme</u>	2
<u>4. LN904-LN907 EAP Preessional Programme</u>	3
<u>5. LN701-LN803 MFL Certificate Course Programme</u>	3
<u>6. Forms of Assessment</u>	4
<u>7. LN976-LN990 EAP Workshop Programme</u>	4
<u>8. LN991-LN997 EAP Departmental Programme</u>	4
<u>9. SS101-SS127 Study Skills Programme</u>	5
<u>10. Additional Services and Executive Languages</u>	5
<u>11. Language Centre Reception (service received)</u>	5
<u>12. General Comments</u>	5

1. Preamble and Overall Satisfaction

This is the third year this particular survey has run. Again the survey is web based and we continue with the platform first used last year of Bristol Online Surveys (BOS). With the exception of undergraduate degree courses, which are surveyed by the LSE Teaching Quality Assurance and Review Office (TQARO), all scheduled courses¹ are included in this survey as are Additional Services/Executive Languages².

People who took the survey were asked which service they received or course they took and how they found it. Additionally we asked how they found the registration or service process and any services received at the Language Centre Reception.

Anybody who rated a service as unsatisfactory was given the opportunity to follow up this rating with a free text answer. These comments will be passed onto the relevant Co-ordinator for investigation. If the respondent gave contact details then the Co-ordinator will also have the option to contact the individual who made them. This also applies to the final question where general comments were invited via a free text response. Here respondents were able to expand on issues within the survey or to comment on something that was not covered by the survey.

This exercise serves as an indication of how the services we provide have been received. Constant feedback is received via teachers, Co-ordinators Office hours, the Centre Reception and our online Instant Feedback Form. The survey will also provide a springboard for further, more qualitative, investigation of specific areas should it be deemed necessary.

Many people do receive more than one type of service so the survey was designed to be as much, 'catch all', as possible. Those who did were invited to respond to the survey for each type of service they received. Emails were sent out on 31, January 2008 inviting people to take part. Those invited included everyone who had signed up for a course or service³ including those who, for whatever reason, had withdrawn and not completed or were no longer attending. The survey closed at 12:00 on 15, February 2008.

A total of **331** complete responses were received. As always, when looking at the data for individual courses or aspects of our activities, please bear in mind the number of responses received. All data returned has been included here. There is no cut-off for sections of the survey that received a low return⁴. The actual number of responses received is included in the tables.

Below is the overall rating given for all Language Centre activities. The next section gives an overall rating for the registration process. Subsequent sections give breakdowns for specific programmes and their respective registration process. The MFL Certificate Course programme is also presented language by language.

All Language Centre Programmes and Services					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
12.1%	17.5%	18.7%	28.4%	23.3%	331

These two tables are included as background to the survey. The first table of results when measured against an analysis of what we know about 'where people came from' compares favourably. Therefore, we can be confident that the survey is a representative sample of users of the Language Centre:

¹ The survey includes courses run over the last calendar year. This includes LN903 EAP Foundation Course (2006-07) and the 2007 EAP Pre-sessional Programme.

² This includes services such as 1-2-1 tuition, private group tuition, proofreading, translation services etc. from 1 February 2007 onwards.

³ This includes services such as 1-2-1 tuition, private group tuition, proofreading, translation services etc. from 1 February 2007 onwards.

⁴ Any section that returned no quantitative data is, of course, not included.

LSE undergraduate student	25.2%
LSE graduate student	53.5%
LSE research student	4.5%
LSE staff member (Academic/Teaching/Research)	2.1%
LSE staff member (Support/Administrative)	6.0%
LSE alumni	1.8%
University of London student	1.2%
University of London staff	0.0%
University of London alumni	0.0%
Other	5.7%

It is also interesting to note the response to the question. 'Please tell us how you found out about the Language Centre and the services we provide?'

From a friend or colleague	11.8%
From induction literature my LSE Department sent to me	13.0%
At my Departmental Induction	23.0%
From the 'Welcome' email sent by the LSE Language Centre	6.0%
From my LSE offer letter and information	9.1%
Via the LSE Training web site	0.6%
Via the LSE Language Centre web site	23.6%
From the New Arrivals web site or help desk	4.2%
From an internet search	3.6%
Other	5.1%

2. Overall Registration Process

Registration/Service Process					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
4.5%	17.2%	34.7%	28.1%	15.4%	331

3. LN901-LN903 EAP Foundation Programme

Overall					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	57.1%	7

Registration/Service Process					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
0.0%	14.3%	42.9%	28.6%	14.2%	7

4. LN904-LN907 EAP Preessional Programme

Overall					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
7.7%	15.4%	30.8%	15.4%	30.7%	13

Registration/Service Process					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
0.0%	0.0%	23.1%	38.5%	38.4%	13

5. LN701-LN803 Modern Foreign Language Certificate Course Programme

Overall						
	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Responses
Arabic	15.8%	10.5%	10.5%	36.8%	26.4%	19
Chinese	36.7%	36.7%	6.7%	13.3%	6.6%	30
French	16.7%	26.7%	20.0%	18.3%	18.3%	60
German	9.1%	22.7%	22.7%	27.3%	18.2%	22
Greek	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	2
Italian	7.1%	28.6%	14.3%	42.9%	7.1%	14
Japanese	14.3%	14.3%	14.3%	28.6%	28.5%	7
Portuguese	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	4
Russian	31.3%	12.5%	6.3%	31.3%	18.6%	16
Spanish	2.3%	11.4%	11.4%	36.4%	38.5%	44
Turkish	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	3
ALL	15.4%	20.8%	14.5%	28.5%	20.8%	221

Registration/Service Process						
	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Responses
Arabic	5.3%	21.1%	26.3%	26.3%	21.0%	19
Chinese	6.7%	30.0%	40.0%	10.0%	13.3%	30
French	8.3%	11.7%	36.7%	26.7%	16.6%	60
German	4.5%	13.6%	40.9%	22.7%	18.3%	22
Greek	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	2
Italian	7.1%	0.0%	57.1%	21.4%	14.4%	14
Japanese	0.0%	28.6%	14.3%	42.9%	14.2%	7
Portuguese	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	4
Russian	6.3%	6.3%	62.5%	18.8%	6.1%	16
Spanish	4.5%	15.9%	31.8%	31.8%	16.0%	44
Turkish	0.0%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	0.00%	3
ALL	5.9%	15.8%	37.6%	24.9%	15.8%	221

6. Forms of Assessment

Two additional questions were asked this year concerning assessment on the MFL Certificate Course Programme.

Firstly, a proposal had recently been tabled for MFL Certificate Courses, that currently assess students through a combination of continual assessment and a final examination, to move completely over to 100% continual assessment. Opinion was therefore sought on this issue.

For extra curricular courses (e.g. Modern Foreign Language Certificate Courses) what format would you prefer assessment to take?				
100% final assessment	100% continuous assessment	A combination of both (as we do currently)	No assessment whatsoever	Number of Responses
8.3%	12.4%	73.9%	5.40%	221

Secondly, it was thought a good idea given the range of options currently available to ask whether an externally accredited course, as opposed to the current *LSE Certificate of Proficiency*, was more desirable and if those taking such courses would be willing to pay extra for this.

Would you like any certification of courses to be externally accredited, as standard, as opposed to receiving an LSE Certificate of Proficiency? Currently we only do this for two Russian courses LN773 and LN775 for a higher course fee.			
Yes	No	I have no strong opinion either way	Number of Responses
37.1%	11.5%	51.4%	218

For the purpose of both these questions the results were filtered to only include those taking an MFL Certificate Course.

7. LN976-LN990 EAP Workshop Programme

Overall					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
2.9%	17.6%	29.4%	32.4%	17.6%	34

Registration/Service Process					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
0.0%	23.5%	38.2%	26.5%	11.8%	34

8. LN991-LN997 EAP Departmental Programme

Overall					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
4.8%	7.1%	23.8%	33.3%	31.0%	42

Registration/Service Process					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
4.8%	21.4%	26.2%	40.5%	7.1%	42

9. SS101-SS127 Study Skills Programme

Overall					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
0.0%	14.3%	57.1%	28.6%	0.0%	7

Registration/Service Process					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
0.0%	42.9%	14.3%	42.9%	0.0%	7

10. Additional Services and Executive Languages

Overall					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	57.1%	7

Registration/Service Process					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
0.0%	14.3%	14.3%	28.6%	42.8%	7

11. Language Centre Reception (service received)

Overall					
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Number of Responses
2.1%	16.9%	34.1%	29.9%	17.0%	331

12. General Comments

At the end of the survey an open response was invited for any general comments about the Language Centre.

Throughout the survey any question that provoked 'unsatisfactory' as a response a follow up question was then asked to ascertain why a service was deemed to be so. The questions where this was a possibility were concerning 'how people found the course/service they received', 'how people found the registration process' and finally 'how people found the service they received from the Language Centre Reception.

These comments, along with the general ones, have been passed onto Co-ordinators and the Director of the Language Centre. If the respondent gave contact details then the relevant Co-

ordinator will also have the option to contact the individual who made them. This also applies to the final question where more general comments were invited in such cases any contact would be made by the Director of the Language Centre.

Further analysis and filtering of results is also possible for individual language sections on request by Co-ordinators along with the usual information that can sometimes be useful in the planning and preparation of courses such as student origin, language backgrounds and what LSE programme a student is following.

John Heyworth
Monday, 18 February 2008