

Summary of UNIV 101 Course Evaluation

-- Eleven questions asked

- 9 questions focused on how well the class covered core areas of the course (Numbers in parentheses indicate the percentage of respondents indicating that they strongly agree or agree that the course did a good job on these areas. Figures in red show range of strongly agree/agree responses across all sections.)

Study Skills (66%)

Section Range: 9-93%

Life Skills (50%)

Section Range: 23-72%

Campus Resources (80%)

Section Range: 32-96%

Service Learning (55%)

Section Range: 0-69%

Understanding how the University works (67%)

Section Range: 23-83%

Information Literacy (79%)

Section Range: 52-100%

Book in Common (48%)

Section Range: 7-75%

Sexuality (60%)

Section Range: 41-79%

Personal wellness (47%)

Section Range: 4-72%

- 1 question on satisfaction with texts used (30%)

Section Range: 0-61%

-- In all cases there was considerable variability across sections and instructors in terms of student perceptions of how well the course succeeded in meeting these objectives.

-- Each question also had an open-ended portion that asked about the strengths and ways to improve each area. The final open-ended question was: "Please comment below on the strengths and weaknesses of UNIV 101 generally. Any suggestions you have for improving the course will be appreciated and taken seriously." The responses to this question are discussed in the last of the tables that follow.

Responses to open-ended questions. In these tables “Frequency” refers to the number of respondents choosing that answer, “Percent” refers to the percentage of respondents choosing that answer, *including* those who answered “No Response.” “Valid Percent” eliminates those who did not respond to the question and calculates the percentage of responses only among those who provided an answer. In other words it only calculates the valid responses, which excludes those who did not answer the question at all. Cumulative percent keeps a running total of these valid responses.

Question 1. What Information was helpful in preparing for other classes?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Time management skills	44	15.2	18.9	18.9
	Study and reading skills	76	26.3	32.6	51.5
	Test taking strategies	2	.7	.9	52.4
	How to relate to professors	14	4.8	6.0	58.4
	Information Literacy	37	12.8	15.9	74.2
	Sexuality information	1	15.2	.4	74.7
	Drugs and alcohol information	2	.7	.9	75.5
	Generally positive, non-specific	21	7.3	9.0	84.5
	Generally negative, non-specific	2	.7	.9	85.4
	Nothing, Knew it all already	33	11.4	14.2	99.6
	Personal wellness	1	.3	.4	100.0
	Total	233	80.6	100.0	
Missing	No response	56	19.4		
Total		289	100.0		

Interpretation: Almost 85% of those responding found something positive to say about the class with study skills, time management, information on sexuality and information literacy being mentioned in that order. About 15% -- one out of eight respondents -- had nothing positive to say. The activities highlighted seem to correspond well with areas that we emphasize and spend time on in the course.

Question 2. What information was helpful in preparing for life outside of classes?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Time management skills	20	6.9	10.8	10.8
	Career plannig	14	4.8	7.6	18.4
	resume writing	11	3.8	5.9	24.3
	Housing tips	14	4.8	7.6	31.9
	Information Literacy	13	4.5	7.0	38.9
	Budgeting tips	14	4.8	7.6	46.5
	Sleeping tips	2	.7	1.1	47.6
	Location of campus resources	10	3.5	5.4	53.0
	Generally negative, non-specific	4	1.4	2.2	55.1
	Nothing, Knew it all already	39	13.5	21.1	76.2
	dealing with room mates	6	2.1	3.2	79.5
	Health, personal wellness	25	8.7	13.5	93.0
	Communication, not roomates, general positive	13	4.5	7.0	100.0
	Total	185	64.0	100.0	
Missing	No response	104	36.0		
Total		289	100.0		

Interpretation: This is a case where the question was not particularly well-worded, so results are difficult to interpret. However, if we look at the areas valued by students we can see that personal health and wellness emerges as a topic area that is valued, along with career information and housing/roommate tips. Twenty-three percent of respondents did not find information from the course valuable in preparing for life beyond the classroom. A course in Area E of GE, Lifelong Learning, should score better in this regard.

Question 3. What information was useful on campus resources?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Library, information resources	93	32.2	45.8	45.8
	Where on campus locate resources	52	18.0	25.6	71.4
	Financial aid	1	.3	.5	71.9
	Wellness center	9	3.1	4.4	76.4
	Study Abroad	3	1.0	1.5	77.8
	Career center	17	5.9	8.4	86.2
	Academic Advisor Office	1	.3	.5	86.7
	Computer Lab	4	1.4	2.0	88.7
	Various mentioned	10	3.5	4.9	93.6
	Nothing, knew it all, class worthless	13	4.5	6.4	100.0
	Total	203	70.2	100.0	
Missing	No response	86	29.8		
Total		289	100.0		

Interpretation: Students clearly value the information provided about campus resources. Only 6% of respondents found no useful information in this domain. The library and its resources along with “finding your way around campus” generally were particularly valued.

Question 4. What information was useful on Service Learning?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Enjoyed Scour and Devour	10	3.5	8.2	8.2
	Enjoyed Up Till Dawn	4	1.4	3.3	11.5
	Information on CAVE	21	7.3	17.2	28.7
	Where to find volunteer opportunities	23	8.0	18.9	47.5
	Importance/advantages of community service	20	6.9	16.4	63.9
	General information on service learning (what it is)	10	3.5	8.2	72.1
	Personal importance of volunteering	2	.7	1.6	73.8
	Absent, did not talk about it	16	5.5	13.1	86.9
	Nothing, knew it all, class worthless	16	5.5	13.1	100.0
	Total	122	42.2	100.0	
Missing	No response	167	57.8		
Total		289	100.0		

Interpretation: Students valued information on Service Learning. While it is always dangerous to interpret non-responses, I highlight the large number of non-responses because this may indicate

that the topic was not discussed as much as it might have been in some sections. If you go back to the information on pg 1, there were sections with very low scores on this measure, which to me indicates that some instructors did not discuss SL or did so in only a cursory way. We recognize that SL has not been well-integrated into UNIV 101 and are actively taking steps to support students and instructor efforts to raise the profile of SL in UNIV 101.

What did you have a hard time with this semester that might have been avoided if you had more info on the subject?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	More practice on academic writing	6	2.1	4.2	4.2
	Information literacy	24	8.3	16.9	21.1
	Study skills (note taking, test prep, etc...)	26	9.0	18.3	39.4
	Time management	14	4.8	9.9	49.3
	Registering for classes	8	2.8	5.6	54.9
	Major advising, staying on track for major	7	2.4	4.9	59.9
	Other advising	14	4.8	9.9	69.7
	Dealing with professors	2	.7	1.4	71.1
	Nothing, course covered everything ok	11	3.8	7.7	78.9
	Nothing, knew it all, class worthless	30	10.4	21.1	100.0
	Total	142	49.1	100.0	
Missing	No response	147	50.9		
Total		289	100.0		

Interpretation: Another somewhat ambiguous question, difficult to interpret. There was a high non-response rate. Those areas highlighted by students (information literacy, study skills, time management, advising) are areas we already emphasize heavily. The large number of “know it alls” (21%) is a bit unsettling and seems to indicate that we need to work on making the course more clearly relevant to students’ lives.” As with all of these questions, we can consider this in more detail during a future meeting/training session.

What were the strong points of the information literacy portion of the course?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	All good, change nothing	19	6.6	11.9	11.9
	Orientation to library	48	16.6	30.2	42.1
	Distinguishing good vs. bad sources	7	2.4	4.4	46.5
	Internet research skills	38	13.1	23.9	70.4
	Citation Information	3	1.0	1.9	72.3
	Orientation to computer labs	5	1.7	3.1	75.5
	Hand-on work	1	.3	.6	76.1
	Specific Projects	3	1.0	1.9	78.0
	Overall informative	11	3.8	6.9	84.9
	Nothing, knew it all, class worthless	24	8.3	15.1	100.0
	Total	159	55.0	100.0	
Missing	No response	130	45.0		
Total		289	100.0		

Interpretation: Largely positive responses that seem to be in line with current emphases of our information literacy efforts.

Did you enjoy the book in common?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Enjoyed it	156	54.0	78.0	78.0
	OK	4	1.4	2.0	80.0
	Not sure	29	10.0	14.5	94.5
	No, not really	11	3.8	5.5	100.0
	Total	200	69.2	100.0	
Missing	No response	89	30.8		
Total		289	100.0		

Did the book in common enhance the academic value of UNIV 101?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes, very much	49	17.0	38.3	38.3
	Not sure	6	2.1	4.7	43.0
	No, not really	70	24.2	54.7	97.7
	No worthless, did not learn anything from book	3	1.0	2.3	100.0
	Total	128	44.3	100.0	
Missing	No response	161	55.7		
Total		289	100.0		

Interpretation: Strong positive response to *True Notebooks*, but not a strong sentiment that it enhanced the academic value of the course. High variability in these responses across sections

(see pg. 1) indicates to me that some instructors used the book effectively, while others chose not to emphasize the book. We are working on strategies to support instructor efforts to make effective use of the BIC.

What information on sexuality was new, difficult or especially useful?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Talk was good (non-specific)	63	21.8	38.4	38.4
	Talk told truth on sexuality	4	1.4	2.4	40.9
	Geared to college students	3	1.0	1.8	42.7
	Importance of safe sex	2	.7	1.2	43.9
	Increased awareness generally	13	4.5	7.9	51.8
	Statistical data valuable	22	7.6	13.4	65.2
	did not like talk, made me uncomfortable	5	1.7	3.0	68.3
	Did not like, other	7	2.4	4.3	72.6
	Absent	6	2.1	3.7	76.2
	Nothing, knew it all, class worthless	39	13.5	23.8	100.0
	Total	164	56.7	100.0	
Missing	No response	125	43.3		
Total		289	100.0		

Interpretation: This question focuses on the Diana Flannery presentation plus whatever follow-up was supplied by instructors. There is great variability across sections. Taking the positive responses together, about 65% of students appreciated the information while about 30% did not. These results will be shared with Dr. Flannery. Any suggestions UNIV 101 instructors have for enhancing the value of this work will be welcome.

What information on personal wellness was especially useful to you?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Overall useful (non-specific positive response)	47	16.3	30.9	30.9
	Diet	18	6.2	11.8	42.8
	Exercise	5	1.7	3.3	46.1
	Sleep	3	1.0	2.0	48.0
	Time management	1	.3	.7	48.7
	Stress Management	2	.7	1.3	50.0
	Diet and exercise	5	1.7	3.3	53.3
	Multiple positive response	5	1.7	3.3	56.6
	Did not discuss	26	9.0	17.1	73.7
	Nothing, knew it all, class worthless	40	13.8	26.3	100.0
	Total	152	52.6	100.0	
Missing	No response	137	47.4		
Total		289	100.0		

Interpretation: The relatively large number of overall positive responses is encouraging. The large number of “did not discuss” responses is a concern. There is a module developed for personal wellness that I thought would be distributed to instructors, but never was. This is an aspect of the course that is considered valuable by the Presidential Task Force on Student Life that recommended that all incoming students to take this course. If we’re going to include this in UNIV 101, we have to do it very well. I’d like to work with instructors to more prominently integrate this sort of information in the course.

What did you like about the textbooks?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Generally good (Non-specific positive response)	53	18.3	28.3	28.3
	Nothing (did not like text books)	43	14.9	23.0	51.3
	Good resource	17	5.9	9.1	60.4
	Easy to read	5	1.7	2.7	63.1
	Well organized	2	.7	1.1	64.2
	Didn't use text much	54	18.7	28.9	93.0
	Nothing, knew it all, class worthless	13	4.5	7.0	100.0
	Total	187	64.7	100.0	
Missing	No response	102	35.3		
Total		289	100.0		

Interpretation: This and the following table validates our ongoing efforts to find alternative texts for UNIV 101.

Would you recommend using the same texts again?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	21	7.3	29.2	29.2
	Maybe	2	.7	2.8	31.9
	Yes to Investing, no to Readings	16	5.5	22.2	54.2
	Yes to Readings, no to investing	5	1.7	6.9	61.1
	No, not useful	28	9.7	38.9	100.0
	Total	72	24.9	100.0	
Missing	No response	217	75.1		
Total		289	100.0		

Other comments

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Everything about the course is good, would recommend	15	5.2	12.0	12.0
	Generally favorable	14	4.8	11.2	23.2
	Good on study skills (note taking, test taking, etc)	3	1.0	2.4	25.6
	Good on information literacy	7	2.4	5.6	31.2
	Good on campus resources	1	.3	.8	32.0
	Good on service learning	2	.7	1.6	33.6
	Improve teaching (interaction, active, make more fun)	9	3.1	7.2	40.8
	Too long, too much "busy work"	21	7.3	16.8	57.6
	Nothing, knew it all, class worthless, would not recommend	23	8.0	18.4	76.0
	Course boring, good teacher	16	5.5	12.8	88.8
	Helped with transition to college life	14	4.8	11.2	100.0
	Total	125	43.3	100.0	
Missing	No response	164	56.7		
Total		289	100.0		

Interpretation: Another interpretive challenge here. About half of the students who took the survey answered this question. About half of those who responded found positive things to say about the course. About half had largely negative things to say. Most of the positives, were general statements: “good course,” “glad I took it,” etc. Of the negatives, about one in five students did not like anything about the course and found it a waste of time. Another 17% complained about “busy work” associated with the course. About 13% took pains to point out that their instructor was good, but the course was boring, while seven percent criticized the instruction in the course.

Summary and Personal Observations: We have no way of “norming” these or any of the other responses to this course evaluation. In other words, we don’t know how the evaluation responses to UNIV 101 compare to similar evaluations of other courses on campus. I am sure that in all courses there will be an irreducible number of hard core students who do not like that particular course. However, I am concerned by the persistent finding that 15-20% of the students in UNIV 101 are generally dissatisfied. This is a course we keep small (25 per section) in order to offer our students a quality educational experience. The fact that we are not reaching 15-20% of our students is problematic.

I recognize that instructors of this course have not been well-supported, particularly last fall. It was my hope that Tonya Emerson would work closely with UNIV 101 instructors to strengthen the course; her absence was sorely felt. (This is not a personal criticism of Tonya, her absence was due to circumstances beyond her control.) I could not step in to fill that role due to the overwhelming number of other tasks crossing my desk daily. Hence, the course and instructors were neglected. Thia Wolf is working diligently to provide instructors with more support. Hopefully we are opening up more channels of communication between and among instructors and providing additional support such that the course will build on what is a generally successful foundation.

I view the course evaluation information as a point of departure for discussions of how to improve the course. We are piloting a number of innovations in UNIV 101 in Fall 06 ranging from the Faculty Support Fellows, to special Book in Common sections, a section exclusively for Business majors and a couple of sections focused on film and video. We will continue to carefully assess UNIV 101 to try to make this the best introduction to university life that this campus is capable of providing. I view this challenge as a joint and collaborative endeavor and look forward to working with Thia Wolf, instructors, students and anyone else who has an interest in enhancing the prospects for student success in the course and at CSU, Chico.