California State University, Stanislaus

Aggregate Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) 2004/05

Student Evaluations of Courses: Summary of Findings

Purpose

Since 1993, CSU Stanislaus has used a course evaluation system called the Individual Development and Education Assessment Student Evaluation of Courses (IDEA) developed by Kansas State University. The report is tailored to fit each instructor's teaching objectives. Teaching effectiveness is determined by student ratings of their progress from among 12 learning objectives chosen by the instructor. Items on the IDEA instrument are based on research and results are interpreted using a national database.

Each faculty member is required to evaluate a minimum of two courses annually. The faculty member and department chair jointly determine the classes in which the student evaluations will be conducted. The completed evaluations become part of the retention, promotion, and tenure process. In fall 2007, CSU Stanislaus began using the IDEA diagnostic tool to provide aggregate, institutional, longitudinal information to the faculty about overall teaching and course quality.

Data Collection/Analyses

For overall assessment of teaching and course quality as described in this document, data were analyzed in the aggregate and do not include identifiers for courses, students, faculty members, departments, or colleges. The following analyses were conducted:

FACULTY

A. Faculty Selection of 12 IDEA Learning Objectives

B. Faculty Selection of 10 IDEA Approaches to Teaching

C. Faculty Selection of 7 Course Requirements

D. Faculty Ratings of 9 Circumstances that Impact Learning

STUDENTS

E. Student Ratings of Progress on 12 IDEA Learning Objectives

F. Student Ratings of Instructor

G. Student Ratings of Course

LINKED DATA

H. Student Ratings of Progress on 12 IDEA Objectives Identified as "Essential" by Faculty

I. Student Ratings of 12 IDEA Learning Objectives Linked to Primary Teaching Approach

J. Faculty Selection of Primary Teaching Approaches Linked to Faculty Selection of "Essential" Learning Objectives

Course Characteristics

For each of the above categories, analyses were conducted to determine if results were differentiated by the type of course. Courses included courses overall, general education (lower/upper/ CSU Stanislaus goals), level (undergraduate/graduate), writing proficiency, and distance education.

Findings for the 2004/05 IDEA (short form) are derived from 1,245 course sections and 26,563 student responses. Courses were taught by 582 unduplicated faculty. Figure 1 below displays the frequency and percentages of baccalaureate, master's, general education, writing proficiency, and distance education courses.

Figure 1. Course Section Characteristics

	Frequency	Percentage
TOTAL COURSES	**1245**	**100**
Undergraduate	1114	89.5
Graduate	131	10.5
Undergraduate Course Characteristics		
Lower Division	327	29.4
Upper Division	787	70.6
General Education	237	19.0
Lower Division GE	*163*	*68.8*
Upper Division GE	*74*	*31.2*
Writing Proficiency	24	1.9
Distance Education	38	3.0

Findings

A. Faculty Selection of 12 IDEA Learning Objectives

The 12 IDEA learning objectives and their categories are displayed in Figure 2 below. For each course, faculty identified those learning objectives that they considered *essential, important*, or *minor/not important*.

Figure 2. IDEA Learning Objectives by Category

Basic Cognitive Background
1.Gaining factual knowledge
2.Learning fundamental principles
Application of Learning
3. Learning to apply course material
4. Developing specific skills, competencies and points of view
Team Skills
5. Acquiring skills in working with others
Expressiveness
6. Developing creative capacities
8. Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing
Intellectual Development
7. Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity
10. Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values
11. Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view
Lifelong Learning
9. Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
12. Acquiring interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers

Overall

A.1. Overall, the most frequently selected objective as *essential/important* was gaining factual knowledge, selected by 83% of the faculty.

A.2. Overall, four learning objectives were identified as *essential/important* by 62% or more of the faculty: gaining factual knowledge (83%), learning fundamental principles (77%), learning to apply course materials (73%), and developing specific skills (62%).

A.3. Overall, four learning objectives were rated as *minor* by 69% to 74% of the faculty: skill in working with others, developing creative capacities, appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity, and understanding of personal values.

Undergraduate and Graduate

A.4. 82% of faculty teaching graduate courses selected developing specific skills as *essential/important* in comparison to 59% of the faculty teaching undergraduate courses.

A.5. 30% of the faculty teaching undergraduate courses selected gaining an understanding of intellectual/cultural activity as *essential/important* in comparison to 16% of the faculty teaching graduate courses.

A.6. In approximately 50% of undergraduate and 55% of graduate courses, developing skill in oral and written expression was identified as *essential/important*.

A.7. Significant differences in selection of learning objectives between faculty teaching undergraduate and graduate courses were found for nine of 12 objectives. For two of these nine objectives undergraduate faculty had higher means than graduate faculty: factual knowledge and creative capacities. Three objectives showed no significant differences based on level of course: fundamental principles, working with others, and written/oral communication skills.

General Education

A.8. Overall, three learning objectives for general education were identified as *essential/important* by 68% or more of the faculty: gaining factual knowledge (79%), learning fundamental principles (77%), and applying course materials (68%).

A.9. Overall, the lowest selected learning objectives for general education were developing creative capacities and skill in working with others (78% identified as *minor importance*).

A.10. Overall, developing skill in oral and written expression was identified as *essential/important* by approximately 51% of faculty teaching general education courses.

A.11. The largest percentage of faculty (63% - 80%) teaching lower and upper division general education selected as *essential/important* the same three objectives: gaining factual knowledge, learning fundamental principles, and applying course material.

A.12. While the percentage of faculty selecting *essential/important* was low (12%-27%) for both faculty teaching lower and upper division general education with regard to skill in working with others and developing creative capacities, faculty teaching lower division general education courses selected these two objectives at rates 2-3 times higher than faculty teaching upper division courses, yielding significant difference in means.

A.13. Significant differences were found in selection of learning objectives between faculty teaching lower and upper division general education courses for four of 12 objectives. For three of these four objectives, faculty teaching upper division general education had higher means than those teaching lower division: developing specific skills/points of view, understanding of intellectual/cultural activity, and developing personal values. Faculty teaching lower division general education courses had higher means than those teaching upper division for the objective related to acquiring skills in working with others.

A.14. For CSU Stanislaus general education goal 1, Subject Knowledge, gaining factual knowledge and learning fundamental principles were selected as *essential/important* by 77% or more of the faculty. Developing skills (39%) and gaining understanding of intellectual/cultural activity (40%) were selected by the faculty as *essential/important*.

A.15. For CSU Stanislaus general education goal 2, Communication, developing skills in oral and written expression (51%), working with others (22%), and developing creative capacities (23%) were selected by the faculty as an *essential/important*.

A.16. For CSU Stanislaus general education goal 3, Inquiry and Critical Thinking, faculty overall selected the following as *essential/important*: applying course materials (68%), critical analysis/evaluation (51%), and acquiring interest in learning by asking own questions/seeking answers (45%).

A.17. For CSU Stanislaus general education goal 4, Information Retrieval, 35% of faculty overall selected learning how to find/use resources to solve problems as *essential/important*.

A.18. For CSU Stanislaus general education goal 7, Social Responsibility, 30% of the faculty overall selected as *essential/important* developing a clearer understanding/commitment to personal values.

A.19. Significant differences in percentages of faculty responses were found between lower and upper division general education as related to CSU Stanislaus general education goals and selection of learning objectives for goal 2, Communication: working with others and creative capacities. Faculty teaching lower division general education courses selected these two objectives at rates 2-3 times higher than faculty teaching upper division courses.

A.20 Significant differences in selection of learning objectives for general education courses in comparison to non-general education courses were found for 4 objectives. For three of these objectives, general education courses had lower means: applying course material, developing specific skills, and working with others. The mean was higher for faculty teaching general education courses than non-general education courses for gaining understanding/appreciation of intellectual and cultural activity.

Writing Proficiency

A.21. For writing proficiency courses, 100% of faculty selected written/oral communication skills as *essential/important*. Seventy seven percent selected this learning objective as *essential* and 23% as *important* in comparison to 49% of non-writing proficiency courses.

A.22. Learning to apply course materials was selected as *essential/important* by 73% of the faculty teaching non-writing proficiency courses and 52% of the faculty teaching writing proficiency courses. The mean scores for this objective were significantly different (On a 5-point scale, 2.46 for writing proficiency versus 1.55 for non-writing proficiency courses).

A.23. Significant differences in selection of learning objectives for writing proficiency courses in comparison to non-writing proficiency courses were found also for two objectives; in each case, writing proficiency course means were higher: developing creative capacities and analyzing and critically evaluating ideas.

Distance Education

A.24. Significant differences in percentages of faculty responses were found between distance education and non-distance education courses in faculty selection of learning objectives for eight of the 12 objectives. In each case, distance learning courses had lower means than non-distance education courses, except for gaining factual knowledge and learning fundamental principles. No differences were found for applying course material, developing oral/written communication skills, analyzing ideas, and asking own questions/seeking answers.

B. Faculty Selection of 10 IDEA Approaches to Teaching

From 10 approaches to teaching, faculty identified those that are *primary* or *secondary*. Figure 3 below identifies the teaching approaches.

Figure 3. Teaching Approaches

a.	Lecture
b.	Field Experience
c.	Discussion/Recitation
d.	Studio
e.	Seminar
f.	Multi-Media
g.	Skill/Activity
h.	Practicum/Clinic
i.	Laboratory
j.	Other/Not Indicated

Overall

B.1. Overall, teaching approaches identified by the faculty as *primary* with the highest percentages are lecture (44%), other (21%), discussion/recitation (10%), seminar (9%) and skill/activity (9%).

B.2. Overall, the dominant teaching approaches, by combining *primary* and *secondary*, were lecture (28%), followed by discussion (16%).

Undergraduate and Graduate

B.3. For undergraduate courses, the largest number of faculty identified lecture (46%), skill/activity (9%), and discussion (9%) as *primary* teaching approaches.

B.4. For graduate courses, the largest number of faculty identified seminar (30%), discussion (16%), and lecturer (25%) as *primary* teaching approaches.

B.5. A comparison of *primary* teaching approaches for undergraduate and graduate programs indicated the following differences for graduate education: significantly less lecture (half as much), more seminars (5 times as many), and more discussion (twice as much).

General Education

B.6. No differences in *primary* teaching approaches were found for general education courses in comparison to non-general education courses. Lecture and discussion are the dominant instructional modes.

B.7. One significant difference was found for *primary* teaching approaches in lower and upper division general education: three times more faculty teaching lower division general education courses reported using skill/activity teaching approach and a higher number of upper division general education courses using a discussion teaching approach.

Writing Proficiency

B.8. Overall, 63% of faculty teaching writing proficiency courses reported lecture as the *primary* teaching approach, followed by other (5%), and seminar (3%).

B.9. A comparison of teaching approaches for writing proficiency and non-proficiency indicated no significant differences for primary teaching approaches.

Distance Education

B.10. Overall, 92% of faculty teaching distance education courses reported lecture as the primary teaching approach, followed by seminar and other (13% each). The selection of the lecture was almost 2.5 times greater for distance learning courses than for non-distance education courses.

C. Faculty Selection of 7 Course Requirements

Faculty selected course requirements indicating *much, some, none* or *little*. Figure 4 below identifies the 7 course requirements.

Figure 4. Course Requirements

a.	Writing
b.	Oral Communication
c.	Computer Applications
d.	Group Work
e.	Mathematical/Quantitative Work
f.	Critical Thinking
g.	Creative/Artistic/Design Endeavor

Overall

C.1. Faculty indicated the highest percentages for three course requirements: critical thinking (46%), writing (38%), and oral communication (34%). *None* or *little* course requirements included mathematical/quantitative work (70%), creative/artistic endeavors (65%), and computer applications (55%).

Undergraduate and Graduate

C.2. Faculty indicated the highest percentages for three course requirements for undergraduate course in the *much* category: critical thinking (44%), writing (37%), and oral communication (31%).

C.3. Faculty indicated the same highest percentages for three course requirements for graduate courses as compared to undergraduate education, although to a larger degree and in a slightly different order: critical thinking (64%), oral communication (59%), and writing (42%). These differences were significant for oral communication and critical thinking.

C.4. A comparison of course requirements for undergraduate and graduate programs indicated the following differences for undergraduate education: generally more creative/artistic endeavor, more computer applications, and more mathematical/quantitative work.

General Education

C.5. Overall, faculty selection of course requirements in the *much* category was similar for general education courses overall: critical thinking (48%), writing (34%), and oral communication (22%).

C.6. Two significant differences in means were found in faculty selection of course requirements for general education in comparison to non-general education courses: general education courses had lower means in course requirements for oral communication and group work.

C.7. A comparison of lower and upper general education course requirements indicated more writing and less creative/artistic endeavor for upper division courses. The largest difference is the selection of course requirements for group work: 25% for lower division general education courses versus 4% for upper division.

Writing Proficiency

C.8. Overall, writing proficiency course requirements paralleled those for non-writing proficiency courses, with the highest three requirements including writing (70%), critical thinking (55%), and oral communication (30%). However, a significant difference was found in the number of faculty selecting writing course requirements: almost twice as high for writing proficiency courses compared to non-writing proficiency courses.

Distance Education

C.9. Overall, the highest percentage of faculty teaching distance education courses selected course requirements in critical thinking (27%) and writing (25%), followed by mathematical/quantitative work (11%).

C.10. Significant differences were found for course requirements related to writing and critical thinking: distance learning courses had higher means for both requirements in comparison to non-distance learning courses.

D. Faculty Ratings of 9 Circumstances that Impact Learning

Faculty rated course circumstances that had an effect on learning, citing one of four categories: a *positive impact*, *neither positive nor negative impact*, or *negative impact*, or *can't judge impact on learning*. Figure 5 identifies the 9 questions concerning course circumstances.

Figure 5. Questions concerning course circumstances

a.	Physical facilities and/or equipment
b.	Substantial changes in teaching approach, course assignments, content
c.	Control over course management (objectives, texts, examinations)
d.	Student enthusiasm for course
e.	Technical/instructional support
f.	Previous experience in teaching this course
g.	Desire to teach course
h.	Adequacy of students' background and preparation for course
i.	Student effort to learn

Overall

D.1. Overall, faculty rated three circumstances as having the greatest *positive* impact on learning: desire to teach course (88%), previous experience in teaching course (86%), and control over course management (79%).

D.2. Overall, faculty rated three circumstances as having the greatest *negative* impact on learning: adequacy of students' background and preparation (23%), physical facilities/equipment (19%), and student enthusiasm for the course (13%).

Undergraduate and Graduate

D.3. For both undergraduate and graduate course, faculty rated the same three circumstances as having the greatest *positive* impact on learning (77% to 88%): desire to teach course, previous experience in teaching course, and control over course management. This finding parallels that for courses overall. For graduate courses, 78% of the faculty also rated student effort to learn as having a positive impact on learning.

D.4. For both undergraduate and graduate courses, faculty rated two circumstances as having the greatest *negative* impact on learning: adequacy of students' background (22% - 11%) and physical facilities/equipment (17%-24%). For undergraduate courses, 13% of faculty cited student enthusiasm for the course as having a negative impact on learning while for graduate courses, 11% of faculty rated technical/instructional support as a circumstance having a negative impact on learning.

General Education

D.5. For general education courses, 85% or more of faculty rated three circumstances as having the greatest *positive* impact on learning: desire to teach course, previous experience in teaching course, and control over course management. This finding parallels that for courses overall.

D.6. For general education courses, 29% of faculty rated four circumstances as having the greatest *negative* impact on learning: adequacy of students' background and preparation, student enthusiasm for the course, student effort to learn, and physical facilities/equipment.

Writing Proficiency

D.7. For writing proficiency courses, 75%-79% of faculty rated ~~student~~ three circumstances as having the greatest *positive* impact on learning: desire to teach course, previous experience in teaching course, and adequacy of students' background and preparation.

D.8. For writing proficiency courses, 33%-40% of faculty indicated the greatest *negative* impact on learning was student background and preparation, student effort to learn, and student enthusiasm for course.

Distance Education

D.9. For distance education courses, 76%-68% of faculty identified ~~student~~ three circumstances as having the greatest *positive* impact on learning: desire to teach course, previous experience in teaching course, and control over course management.

D.10. For distance education courses, 32% of faculty indicated the greatest *negative* impact on learning was technical/instructional support.

E. Student Ratings of Progress on 12 IDEA Learning Objectives

Students rated their progress on 12 learning objectives, using a 5-point scale ranging from *exceptional progress* to *no apparent progress*. Figure 6 below identifies the 12 learning objectives.

Figure 6. 12 Learning Objectives

1.	Gaining factual knowledge
2.	Learning fundamental principles
3.	Learning to apply course material
4.	Developing specific skills, competencies and points of view
5.	Acquiring skills in working with others
6.	Developing creative capacities
7.	Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity
8.	Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing
9.	Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
10.	Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values
11.	Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view
12.	Acquiring interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers

Overall

E.1. Overall, student ratings of their progress in achieving the 12 course learning objectives ranged from a mean of 4.3 to 3.5, equivalent to a rating of making *substantial progress*.

E.2. The highest overall mean scores, exceeding 4.0, for student progress on the learning objectives were found for the following: gaining factual knowledge, learning fundamental principles, learning to apply course materials, and developing specific skills/competencies/points of view.

E.3. Although means are in the *moderate* to *substantial* progress, overall, students reported the least amount of progress in achieving course learning objectives for the following: creative capacities, appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity, oral/written communication, working with others, and personal values (approximately 12-20% each of students reporting slight or no apparent progress).

Undergraduate and Graduate

E.4. For each of the 12 learning objectives, undergraduate students reported lower mean scores than graduate students, although means are in the range of *substantial* to *exceptional progress* for each objective.

E.5. In comparison to undergraduate students, graduate students reported a significantly higher rating of progress toward learning objectives for critical evaluation/analysis of ideas and learning by asking own questions/seeking answers.

General Education

E.6. Overall, the means for progress on the 12 learning objectives for students in general education courses ranged from 4.1 to 3.4, equivalent to a rating of making *substantial progress*. The highest means were found for gaining factual knowledge (4.1) and learning fundamental principles (4.1), and the lowest means (range of 3.3 to 3.4) for working with others, creative capacities, and oral and written communication.

E.7. For CSU Stanislaus goal 1, Subject Knowledge, overall means for student ratings of progress for general education courses ranged from 4.1 to 3.6, with the highest mean of for gaining factual knowledge.

E.8. For CSU Stanislaus goal 2, Communication, overall means for student ratings of progress for general education courses ranged from 3.4 to 3.3, with the highest mean for written and oral communication.

E.9. For CSU Stanislaus goal 3, Inquiry and Critical Thinking, overall means for student ratings of progress for general education courses ranged from 4.0 to 3.7, with the highest mean for learning to apply course materials.

E.10. For CSU Stanislaus goal 4, Information Retrieval, the overall mean for student ratings of progress for general education courses was 3.6 for finding and using resources for answering questions or solving problems.

E.11. For CSU Stanislaus goal 7, Social Responsibility, the overall mean for student ratings of progress for general education courses was 3.4, for developing understanding and commitment to personal values.

E.12. Comparing mean scores for lower and upper division general education indicated differences for student ratings of progress for general education courses for two objectives: understanding of intellectual/cultural activity and analysis/critical evaluation, with both means significantly higher for upper division.

Writing Proficiency

E.13. Student ratings of progress on 12 IDEA objectives for writing proficiency courses parallel those for courses overall. Mean scores ranged from 4.3 to 3.7 with the highest means exceeding 4.3 for learning to apply material, gaining factual knowledge, developing specific skills/points of view, written and oral expression, and learning fundamental principles.

E.14. The percentage of students rating their progress as *exceptional/substantial* for written and oral communication was 82%. Five percent of students rated this objective as *slight or no progress.*

Distance Education

E.15. Student ratings of progress on 12 IDEA objectives for distance education courses parallel those for courses overall. Mean scores ranged from 4.3 to 3.3 with the highest means exceeding 4.1 for gaining factual knowledge, learning fundamental principles, learning to apply material, and developing specific skills/points of view.

E.16. Student ratings with the lowest means, although still in the *moderate progress* category, for distance education courses are for working with others and developing creative capacities.

F. Student Ratings of Instructor

Students rated their instructors by answering the question, "Overall, I rate this instructor as an excellent teacher." Students replied using a five-point scale: *definitely false, more false than true, in between more true than false,* and *definitely true.*

Overall

F.1. Overall, of the 26,423 students rating the excellence of the instructor, 63% replied *definitely true* and 85% as *definitely true* or *more true than false.* Six percent rated the quality of the faculty in the lowest two categories. The mean was 4.4.

Undergraduate and Graduate

F.2. For undergraduate courses, 62% replied *definitely true* and 84% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for instructor quality. Six percent rated instructor quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.4.

F.3. For graduate courses, 63% replied *definitely true* and 85% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for instructor quality. Six percent rated instructor quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.4.

General Education

F.4. Overall, for general education courses, 57% replied *definitely true* and 82% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for instructor quality. Eight percent rated instructor quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.3.

Writing Proficiency

F.5. For writing proficiency courses, 71% of students replied *definitely true* and 93% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for instructor quality. Two percent rated instructor quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.6. Compared to courses overall, the percentage of students rating the instructor in the highest categories and the mean tended to be higher for writing proficiency courses.

Distance Education

F.6. For distance education courses, 62% replied *definitely true* and 83% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for instructor quality. Seven percent rated instructor quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.4. Compared to courses overall, the percentage of students rating the instructor in the highest categories and the mean was similar for distance education courses.

G. Student Ratings of Course

Students rated their courses by answering the question, "Overall, I rate this course as an excellent." Students replied using five-point scale: *definitely false, more false than true, in between more true than false,* and *definitely true.*

Overall

G.1. Of the 26,407 students rating the course, 51% replied *definitely true* and 79% as *definitely true* or *more true than false.* Seven percent rated course quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.2.

Undergraduate and Graduate

G.2. For the quality of undergraduate courses, 51% of students replied *definitely true* and 79% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for course quality. Seven percent rated course quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.2.

G.3. For the quality of graduate courses, 54% of students replied *definitely true* and 89% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for course quality. Six percent rated course quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.3.

General Education

G.4. Overall, for the quality of general education courses, 44% of students replied *definitely true* and 75% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for course quality. Eight percent rated course quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.1. Compared to courses overall, the percentage of students rating the course in the highest categories and the overall mean are somewhat lower for general education courses.

Writing Proficiency

G.5. For the quality of writing proficiency courses, 50% replied *definitely true* and 83% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for course quality. Five percent rated course quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.3.

Distance Education

G.6. For the quality of distance education courses, slightly 53% replied *definitely true* and 79% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for course quality. Seven percent rated course quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.2.

H. Student Ratings of Progress on 12 IDEA Objectives Identified as "Essential" by Faculty

Using a 5-point scale ranging from *exceptional progress* to *no apparent progress*, students rated their progress on learning objectives identified by the faculty as *essential*. Figure 6 below identifies the 12 learning objectives.

Figure 6. 12 Learning Objectives

1.	Gaining factual knowledge
2.	Learning fundamental principles
3.	Learning to apply course material
4.	Developing specific skills, competencies and points of view
5.	Acquiring skills in working with others
6.	Developing creative capacities
7.	Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity
8.	Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing
9.	Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
10.	Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values
11.	Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view
12.	Acquiring interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers

Overall

H.1. Overall, the largest percentage of students reported either *substantial or exceptional progress* for those objectives identified by the faculty as *essential*. Mean scores ranged from 4.3.to 4.1 and percentages from approximately 85% to 73%.

Undergraduate and Graduate

H.2. The mean scores for student ratings of their progress on the 12 IDEA objectives identified by faculty as *essential* were similar for undergraduate and graduate courses, except for the objective related to understanding of intellectual/cultural activity. Students in undergraduate courses had a significantly higher mean rating than graduate students (4.2 vs. 3.5).

General Education

H.3. Student ratings of progress on IDEA objectives identified by faculty as *essential* for general education courses parallel those for courses overall. Mean scores ranged from 4.4 to 3.9. Overall, the percentage of students reported either *substantial or exceptional progress* for those objectives identified by faculty as *essential* ranged from 87% to 66%.

H.4. Means and percentages of student ratings of progress as either *substantial or exceptional progress* on *essential* objectives for lower and upper division general education differ on two objectives. Lower division ratings were significantly higher for working with others (4.6 vs. 3.7) and lower for finding/using resources for problem solving (3.8 vs. 4.2)

Writing Proficiency

H.5. Student ratings of progress on IDEA objectives identified by faculty as *essential* for writing proficiency courses parallel those for courses overall, although overall the means are higher for writing proficiency courses. Mean scores ranged from 4.6 to 4.1. Overall, the percentage of students reported either *substantial or exceptional progress* for those objectives identified by faculty as *essential* ranged from 92% to 76%.

H.6. For the objective of written/oral expression, 85% of students rated their progress as exceptional/substantial, with a mean of 4.3.

Distance Education

H.7. Student ratings of progress on IDEA objectives identified by faculty as *essential* for distance education courses are similar for courses overall. Mean scores ranged from 4.5 to 3.8. Overall, the percentage of students reported either *substantial or exceptional progress* for those objectives identified by faculty as *essential* ranged from 96% to 63%. Several objectives were not identified as essential by the faculty and are omitted from this analysis (e.g., working with others, creative capacities, oral/written communication, and personal values).

I. Student Ratings of 12 IDEA Learning Objectives Linked to Primary Teaching Approach

Student ratings of learning objectives (using a 5-point scale ranging from *exceptional progress* to *no apparent progress*) were linked to the faculty's primary teaching approach as a means to discern any possible relationship between these two elements. Figures 3 and 6 below identify the 10 teaching approaches and 12 learning objectives.

Figure 3. Teaching Approaches

a.	Lecture
b.	Field Experience
c.	Discussion/Recitation
d.	Studio
e.	Seminar
f.	Multi-Media
g.	Skill/Activity
h.	Practicum/Clinic
i.	Laboratory
j.	Other/Not Indicated

Figure 6. 12 Learning Objectives

1.	Gaining factual knowledge
2.	Learning fundamental principles
3.	Learning to apply course material
4.	Developing specific skills, competencies and points of view
5.	Acquiring skills in working with others
6.	Developing creative capacities
7.	Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity
8.	Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing
9.	Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
10.	Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values
11.	Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view
12.	Acquiring interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers

Overall

I.1. Overall, there were no discernible relationship between student ratings of their progress in achieving learning objectives and faculty's primary teaching approaches. Mean ratings fell in the *substantial to moderate progress* range for all learning objectives, ranging from 4.4 to 3.6.

I.2. The highest overall student ratings on progress (*substantial and exceptional*) toward learning objectives were reported in courses using practicum as the *primary* teaching approach (mean 4.1), followed by seminar, skill/activity, and discussion,.

I.3. The lowest overall student ratings on progress (3.9 -- *moderate progress*) toward learning objectives were reported in courses using the lecture teaching approach.

I.4. The lecture as the *primary* teaching approach received the lowest overall student ratings also for general education, undergraduate, graduate, general education, writing proficiency, and distance learning courses for 11 of 12 learning objectives. Each overall mean was 3.8 or below. For gaining factual knowledge, means for the lecture method ranged from 4.4 to 4.1.

Undergraduate and Graduate

I.5. For undergraduate courses, the highest overall student ratings on progress (*substantial and exceptional*) toward learning objectives were reported in courses using field experience, practicum, and seminar as the *primary* teaching approach (each mean 4.1), followed by skill/activity and discussion.

I.6. For undergraduate courses, the lowest student ratings for progress toward overall learning objectives based on *primary* teaching approach were in courses using the laboratory method (mean of 3.7).

I.7. For graduate courses, the highest overall student ratings on progress (*substantial and exceptional*) toward learning objectives were reported in courses using multimedia as the *primary* teaching approach (mean of 4.1), followed by skills and seminar.

I.8. For graduate courses, the lowest overall student ratings on progress toward overall learning objectives were in courses using fieldwork as the *primary* teaching approach (mean of 3.6).

I.9. Student ratings for progress toward learning objectives based on teaching approach for undergraduate and graduate courses did not yield significant differences.

General Education

I.10. Student ratings for progress toward learning objectives based on *primary* teaching approaches for general education courses, lower division general education courses, upper division courses, and a comparison of lower and upper division did not yield significant differences.

I.11. For lower division courses, the highest overall student ratings linked to *primary* teaching approach was found for multimedia courses (mean of 4.2); for upper division, laboratory and skills courses had the highest student ratings for progress (means of 4.4 and 4.3).

I.12. No significant differences were found in student ratings of progress on learning objectives for general education courses in comparison to non-general education courses for any of the 12 objectives.

Writing Proficiency

I.13. Student ratings for progress toward learning objectives based on teaching approach for writing proficiency courses did not yield significant differences.

I.14. For writing proficiency courses, the highest overall student ratings linked to *primary* teaching approach was found for seminar and discussion courses (mean of 4.3 each).

I.15. No significant differences were found in student ratings of progress on learning objectives linked to primary teaching approach for writing proficiency courses in comparison to non-writing proficiency courses.

Distance Education

I.16. Student ratings for progress toward learning objectives based on teaching approach for distance education courses versus non-distance education courses did not yield any significant differences.

J. Faculty Selection of Primary Teaching Approaches Linked to Faculty Selection of "Essential" Learning Objectives

Faculty selection of primary teaching approaches were linked to the faculty's selection of *essential* learning objectives as a means to discern possible relationships between these two elements. Figures 3 and 6 below identify the 10 teaching approaches and 12 learning objectives.

Figure 3. Teaching Approaches

a.	Lecture
b.	Field Experience
c.	Discussion/Recitation
d.	Studio
e.	Seminar
f.	Multi-Media
g.	Skill/Activity
h.	Practicum/Clinic
i.	Laboratory
j.	Other/Not Indicated

Figure 6. 12 Learning Objectives

1.	Gaining factual knowledge
2.	Learning fundamental principles
3.	Learning to apply course material
4.	Developing specific skills, competencies and points of view
5.	Acquiring skills in working with others
6.	Developing creative capacities
7.	Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity
8.	Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing
9.	Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
10.	Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values
11.	Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view
12.	Acquiring interest in learning more by asking my own questions and seeking answers

Overall

J.1. Overall, there was no discernible relationship between faculty selection of *primary* teaching approaches and faculty selection of essential learning objectives. The lecture was most often selected *primary* teaching approach as linked to 11 of the 12 essential learning objectives (21% to 57%). The exception was for developing creative capacities in which faculty selected skill/activity (25%) and studio (21%) as *primary* teaching approaches compared to lecture at 18%.

Undergraduate and Graduate

J.2. Overall, for undergraduate courses the same pattern for courses overall was found with the highest percentage (59%) for lecture as the *primary* teaching approach linked to *essential* objectives.

J.3. For graduate courses, the seminar was the predominant *primary* teaching approach linked to *essential* objectives (30%), followed by discussion (24%).

J.4. A comparison of undergraduate and graduate courses indicated significant differences between faculty selection of primary teaching approaches and faculty selection of essential learning objectives. For graduate courses, faculty had greater variability in the selection of teaching approaches with regard to four objectives: written communication skills, analytical/critical evaluation, intellectual/cultural appreciation, and developing personal values, Graduate faculty showed greater selection of seminars, discussion, field experience, and practicum to achieve essential objectives.

General Education

J.5. Overall, there was no significant difference between general education courses and non-general education courses in faculty selection of primary teaching approaches and faculty selection of essential learning objectives.

Writing Proficiency

J.6. Overall, there was no significant difference between writing proficiency courses and non-writing proficiency courses in faculty selection of primary teaching approaches and essential learning objectives.

Distance Education

J.7. Overall, there was no significant difference between distance education courses and non-distance education courses in faculty selection of primary teaching approaches and essential learning objectives.

:4/30/08