

California State University, Stanislaus
Aggregate Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) 2005/06
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 students' 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. The IDEA system asks students to rate their progress on 12 course objectives.

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 renewal process. In fall 2007, CSU Stanislaus began using the IDEA diagnostic tool to provide aggregate, institutional, longitudinal information 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 purposefully 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 2005/06 IDEA (short form) are derived from 1,294 course sections and 27,134 student responses. Courses were taught by 636 unduplicated faculty. Figure 1 below displays the frequency and percentages of baccalaureate, graduate, general education, writing proficiency, and distance education courses.

Figure 1. Course Section Characteristics

	Frequency	Percentage*
TOTAL COURSES	1,294	100
Undergraduate	1157	89.4
Graduate	137	10.6

Undergraduate Course Characteristics

Lower Division	381	32.9
Upper Division	776	67.1
General Education	229	17.7
Lower Division GE	161	70.3
Upper Division GE	68	29.7
Writing Proficiency	18	1.4
Distance Education	38	2.9

*Percentage is for overall 1,294 course sections, unless as part of a subcategory such as GE.

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 consider *essential*, *important*, or *minor*.

Figure 2. IDEA Learning Objectives by Category

<i>Basic Cognitive Background</i>
1. Gaining factual knowledge
2. Learning fundamental principles
<i>Application of Learning</i>
3. Learning to apply course material
4. Developing specific skills, competencies and points of view
<i>Team Skills</i>
5. Acquiring skills in working with others
<i>Expressiveness</i>
6. Developing creative capacities
8. Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing
<i>Intellectual Development</i>
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
<i>Lifelong Learning</i>
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 *essential/important* objective was gaining factual knowledge, selected by 83% of the faculty.
- A.2. Overall, four learning objectives were identified as *essential/important* by 64% or more of the faculty: gaining factual knowledge, learning fundamental principles, learning to apply course materials, and developing skills.
- A.3. Overall, four learning objectives were rated as *minor* by 62% to 74% of the faculty: skill in working with others, understanding of personal values, appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity, and creative capacities.

Undergraduate and Graduate

- A.4. 73% or more of the faculty teaching undergraduate and graduate courses identified three learning objectives as *essential/important*: gaining factual knowledge, learning fundamental principles, and learning to apply course materials.

- A.5. While 53% or less of the faculty teaching graduate courses selected developing personal values as *essential/important*, they did so at almost twice the rate than undergraduate faculty.
- A.6. 52% to 90% of faculty teaching undergraduate and graduate courses identified four learning objectives as *minor*: skills in working with others, developing creative capacities, appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity, and understanding of personal values.
- A.7. In 48% of undergraduate and 64% of graduate courses, developing skill in oral and written expression was identified as *essential/important*.
- A.8. Significant differences in *essential/important* objectives were found between faculty teaching undergraduate and graduate courses for four objectives. For 3 of these objectives graduate faculty had higher means for developing specific skills/points of view, developing personal values, and learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas/points of view. Undergraduate faculty had higher means for developing an appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity.

General Education

- A.9. Three learning objectives for general education overall were identified as *essential/important* by 66% or more of faculty: gaining factual knowledge, learning fundamental principles, and learning to apply course materials.
- A.10. Overall, developing creative capacities was the lowest selected learning objective for general education (73% identified as *minor/no importance*).
- A.11. Faculty teaching upper division general education selected as *essential/important* an understanding/commitment to personal values and critical analysis/evaluation at significantly higher percentages as did faculty teaching lower division general education courses. Faculty teaching lower division general education courses selected as *essential* applying course materials and working with others at twice the rate than faculty teaching upper division general education courses.
- A.12. For CSU Stanislaus general education goal 1, Subject Knowledge, gaining factual knowledge and learning fundamental principles were selected as *essential/important* by 79% or more of the faculty. Developing specific skills (43%) and gaining understanding of intellectual/cultural activity (39%) were selected as *essential/important*.
- A.13. For CSU Stanislaus general education goal 2, Communication, developing skills in oral and written expression (52%), working with others (33%), and developing creative capacities (24%) were selected by the faculty overall as an *essential/important*:
- A.14. For CSU Stanislaus general education goal 3, Inquiry and Critical Thinking, faculty selected the following as *essential/important*: applying course materials (73%), critical analysis/evaluation (55%), and acquiring interest in learning by asking own questions/seeking answers (47%).

- A.15. For CSU Stanislaus general education goal 4, Information Retrieval, 37% of faculty selected learning how to find/use resources to solve problems as *essential/important*.
- A.16. For CSU Stanislaus general education goal 7, Social Responsibility, 31% of the faculty selected as *essential/important* developing a clearer understanding/commitment to personal values.
- A.17. 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.18. 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.19. For writing proficiency courses, 100% of faculty selected written/oral communication skills as *essential/important*. 72% selected this learning objective as *essential* and 28% as *important*.
- A.20. For non-writing proficiency courses, 49% selected written/oral communication skills as *essential/important*.

Distance Education

- A.21. No differences in percentages of faculty responses were found between distance education and non-distance education courses and selection of learning goals. Three learning objectives received the highest percentages as *essential/important*: factual knowledge, fundamental principles, and applying course materials.

B. Faculty Selection of 10 IDEA Approaches to Teaching

From 10 approaches to teaching, faculty identify those that are *primary* or *secondary*. Figure 3 below identifies the teaching approaches. 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. The teaching approaches identified by the faculty overall as *primary* with the highest percentages are: lecture (55%), other (13%), seminar (12%), and discussion/recitation (10.4%). These percentages were followed by skill/activity (10%), laboratory (4%), studio (2%), and practicum (2%). Field experience and multi-media were less than 1% each.

Undergraduate and Graduate

B.2. A comparison of *primary* teaching approaches for undergraduate and graduate programs indicate the following differences for graduate education: significantly less lecture, more discussion/recitation. The largest difference was in use of multi-media approaches (67% compared to 10% undergraduate).

General Education

B.3. No differences in *primary* teaching approaches were found for general education courses in comparison to non-general education courses and between lower and upper division general education.

Writing Proficiency

B.4. Overall, 44% of faculty teaching writing proficiency courses reported lecture as the *primary* teaching approach, followed discussion (22%).

B.5. A comparison of teaching approaches for writing proficiency and non-proficiency indicated significant differences for primary teaching approaches with writing proficiency courses employing less lecture, more discussion, and more skill building.

Distance Education

B.6. Overall, 81% of faculty teaching distance education courses reported lecture as the *primary* teaching approach, followed by discussion (11%). The selection of the lecture was almost 1.5 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 seven course requirements. 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. Overall, faculty indicated the highest percentages for three course requirements: critical thinking (45%), writing (36%), and oral communication (32%). *None* or *little* course requirements include mathematical/quantitative work (70%), creative/artistic endeavors (66%), and computer applications (55%).

Undergraduate and Graduate

C.2. Faculty indicated the highest percentages for two course requirements for undergraduate courses: critical thinking (43%) and writing (35%).

C.3. Faculty indicated the highest percentages for three course requirements for graduate courses: critical thinking (65%), oral communication (59%), and writing (49%).

C.4. A comparison of course requirements for undergraduate and graduate programs indicate the following differences for graduate education: more writing, more oral communication, more group work, and more critical thinking. The largest difference was in use of more mathematical/quantitative and computer application requirements (3 times greater for undergraduate compared to graduate).

General Education

C.5. Overall, for general education courses, faculty selection of course requirements in the *much* category was similar to courses overall: critical thinking (43%), writing (27%), and oral communication (23%).

C.6. A comparison of lower and upper general education course requirements indicate less group work, less mathematical/quantitative work, and more creative/artistic endeavor for upper division courses.

C.7. A significant difference was found in faculty selection of the creative/artistic/design endeavor course requirement between lower and upper general education. Five times as many faculty teaching lower division courses selected this requirement as did faculty teaching upper division.

Writing Proficiency

- C.8. Overall, writing proficiency course requirements parallel indicate two highest related to writing (88%) and critical thinking (44%). The percentage of faculty selecting writing course requirements for writing proficiency courses are 2.5 times as high as those for non-writing proficiency courses.

Distance Education

- C.9. Overall, the highest percentage of faculty teaching distance education courses selected course requirements in critical thinking (49%) and writing (34%), followed by computer applications (17%).
- C.10. Significant differences were found for course requirements related to oral communication, with non- distance education courses 4 times as high as distance education courses.

D. Faculty Ratings of 9 Circumstances that Impact Learning

Faculty rated course circumstances that had an effect on learning, citing one of 3 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 3 circumstances as having the greatest *positive* impact on learning: desire to teach course (89%), previous experience in teaching course (87%), and control over course management (77%).
- D.2. Overall, faculty rated 3 circumstances as having the greatest *negative* impact on learning: adequacy of students' background and preparation (21%), physical facilities/equipment (21%), and student enthusiasm for the course (12%).

Undergraduate and Graduate

- D.3. For both undergraduate and graduate course, faculty rated the same 3 circumstances as having the greatest *positive* impact on learning (74% to 89%): desire to teach course, previous experience in teaching course, and control over course management. This finding parallels that for courses overall. For graduate courses, 71% 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 2 circumstances as having the greatest *negative* impact on learning (16% to 27%): adequacy of students' background and physical facilities/equipment.

General Education

- D.5. For general education courses, 83% or more of faculty rated three circumstances as having the greatest *positive* impact on learning: previous experience in teaching course, desire to teach course, and control over course management. This finding parallels that for courses overall.

- D.6. For general education courses, 34% or fewer of the faculty rated two circumstances as having the greatest *negative* impact on learning: adequacy of students' background and preparation and physical facilities/equipment.
- D.7. No differences were found between faculty ratings of circumstances having a positive or negative impact on learning on upper and lower division general education.

Writing Proficiency

- D.8. For writing proficiency courses, 78%-81% of faculty rated 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.9. For writing proficiency courses, 31%-43% 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.10. For distance education courses, 61%-74% 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.11. For distance education courses, 28% 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 3.4 to 4.4, equivalent to a rating of making substantial progress.
- E.2. The highest overall mean scores, exceeding 4.2, 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. Approximately 80% of the students rated their progress on these objectives as either *exceptional* or *substantial*.
- E.3. 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 20% each of students reporting *slight* or *no progress*).

Undergraduate and Graduate

- E.4. For each of the 12 learning objectives, undergraduate students reported overall lower mean scores for student progress than did graduate students, although means are in the range of *substantial* to *moderate* progress for each objective.
- E.5. In comparison to undergraduate students, graduate students reported a significantly higher rating for *exceptional/substantial* progress on oral/written communication skills (58% for undergraduate and 74% for graduate).

General Education

- E.6. Overall, the means for progress on the 12 learning objectives for students in general education courses ranged from 4.2 to 3.3, equivalent to a rating of making substantial progress. The highest means were found for gaining factual knowledge (4.2) and learning fundamental principles (4.1), and the lowest means (range of 3.4 to 3.3) 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 4.2 to 3.3, with the highest mean of for gaining factual knowledge.
- E.8. For CSU Stanislaus goal 2, Communication, overall mean for student ratings of progress for general education courses was 3.3, with each of the three learning objectives rated equally: working with others, creative capacities, and oral/written 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 3.8, 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 3.5, for developing understanding/commitment to personal values.
- E.12. Comparing mean scores for lower and upper division general education indicate differences for student ratings of progress for general education courses for three objectives: understanding of intellectual/cultural activity, personal values, and analysis/critical evaluation, with these 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 4.4 to 3.8 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, analysis/critical evaluation, and learning fundamental principles.
- E.14. The percentage of students rating their progress as *exceptional/substantial* for written and oral communication was 84%. 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 4.4 to 3.4 with the highest means exceeding 4.2 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

- F.1. 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.2. Of the 26,951 students responding to this question, slightly more than 62% 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 rating was 4.4.

Undergraduate and Graduate

- F.3. For undergraduate courses, 65% replied *definitely true* and 88% 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.4. For graduate courses, 64% replied *definitely true* and 86% 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.5. Overall, for general education courses, 59% 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.

Writing Proficiency

- F.6. For writing proficiency courses, 63% of students 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 4.3. Compared to courses overall, the percentage of students rating the instructor in the highest categories and the mean writing proficiency courses are comparable.

Distance Education

- F.7. For distance education courses, 63% replied *definitely true* and 86% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for instructor quality. One 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 are 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 26,939 students rating the course, 52% replied *definitely true* and 80% as *definitely true* or *more true than false*. Two 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, 55% of students replied *definitely true* and 86% 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 4.3.

G.3. For the quality of graduate courses, 54% of students replied *definitely true* and 82% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for course quality. Three 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, 46% of students replied *definitely true* and 78% 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 4.1. Compared to courses overall, the percentage of students rating the course in the highest categories and the overall mean are slightly lower for general education courses.

Writing Proficiency

G.5. For the quality of writing proficiency courses, 57% replied *definitely true* and 87% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for course quality. One 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 54% replied *definitely true* and 81% as *definitely true* or *more true than false* for course quality. One percent rated course quality in the lowest two categories. The mean rating was 4.3.

H. Student Ratings of Progress on 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

13. Gaining factual knowledge
14. Learning fundamental principles
15. Learning to apply course material
16. Developing specific skills, competencies and points of view
17. Acquiring skills in working with others
18. Developing creative capacities
19. Gaining a broader understanding and appreciation of intellectual/cultural activity
20. Developing skill in expressing myself orally or in writing
21. Learning how to find and use resources for answering questions or solving problems
22. Developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values
23. Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas, arguments, and points of view
24. 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 4.0 and percentages from approximately 85% to 71%.
- H.2. The highest means (4.2 or above) for student ratings were found for specific skills, working with others, gaining factual knowledge, and learning fundamental principles (4.1), and the lowest mean (4.0) for learning by asking own questions/seeking answers.

Undergraduate and Graduate

- H.3. 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 developing creative capacities, for which undergraduate courses had a significantly higher mean rating than graduate students (4.1 vs. 3.1).

General Education

- H.4. 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 3.6. Overall, the percentage of students reported either *substantial* or *exceptional progress* for those objectives identified by faculty as *essential* ranged from 86% to 60%.
- H.5. 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

one objective. Lower division ratings were significantly higher for developing creative capacities (4.2 vs. 3.2).

Writing Proficiency

- H.6. Student ratings of progress on IDEA objectives identified by faculty as *essential* for writing proficiency courses parallel those for courses overall. Mean scores ranged from 4.3 to 3.4. Overall, the percentage of students reported either *substantial* or *exceptional* progress for those objectives identified by faculty as *essential* ranged from 90% to 75%.
- H.7. For the objective of written/oral expression, 81% of students rated their progress as *exceptional/substantial*, with a mean of 4.3.

Distance Education

- H.8. 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 3.9. Overall, the percentage of students reported either *substantial* or *exceptional* progress for those objectives identified by faculty as *essential* ranged from 89% to 76%. 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 Learning IDEA 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 *moderate* to *substantial progress* range for all learning objectives, ranging from 4.4 to 3.3.
- I.2. The highest overall student ratings on progress toward learning objectives were reported in courses using the field experience as the primary teaching approach, followed by seminar, discussion, and skill/activity.

- I.3. The lowest overall student ratings (*moderate progress*) on 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 3.9 or below. For gaining factual knowledge, means for the lecture method ranged from 4.5 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 4.2), 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 3.6).
- 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 4.0), 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 3.4).
- 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 ratings (means of 4.3 and 4.0).

Writing Proficiency

- I.12. Student ratings for progress toward learning objectives based on teaching approach for writing proficiency courses did not yield significant differences.
- I.13. For writing proficiency courses, the highest overall student ratings linked to *primary* teaching approach was found for seminar and discussion courses (mean of 4.2 and 4.1).

Distance Education

- I.14. Student ratings for progress toward learning objectives based on teaching approach for distance education courses did not yield 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 essential learning objectives and faculty selection of *primary* teaching approaches.
- J.2. The lecture was most often selected *primary* teaching approach as linked to 11 of the 12 essential learning objectives (30% to 65%). The exception was for developing creative capacities in which faculty selected skill/activity (25%) and studio (19%) as *primary* teaching approaches, percentages close to lecture at 23%.

Undergraduate and Graduate

- J.3. Overall, for undergraduate courses the same pattern for courses overall was found, with the highest percentage (69%) for lecture as the *primary* teaching approach linked to *essential* objectives.

- J.4. For graduate courses, the seminar (65%) was the predominant *primary* teaching approach linked to *essential* objectives.
- J.5. A comparison of undergraduate and graduate courses indicated significant difference 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.6. Overall, there was no discernible relationship between faculty selection of essential learning objectives and faculty selection of primary teaching approaches.

Writing Proficiency

- J.7. Overall, there was no discernible relationship between faculty selection of essential learning objectives and faculty selection of primary teaching approaches.

Distance Education

- J.8. Overall, there was no discernible relationship between faculty selection of essential learning objectives and faculty selection of primary teaching approaches.

:4/29/08