

WHAT STUDENTS THINK OF CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO

**SUMMARY REPORT FROM PROGRAM REVIEW
INSTRUCTIONAL STUDENT SURVEYS 1995-1997**



**City College of San Francisco
Office of Research, Planning and Grants**

March 1999

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

LAURENCE WONG, PRESIDENT ▪ ANITA GRIER , VICE PRESIDENT ▪ NATALIE BERG
ROBERT E. BURTON ▪ JAMES HASKELL MAYO, II . ▪ RODEL E. RODIS ▪ ROBERT P. VARNI
DR. PHILIP R. DAY, JR., CHANCELLOR

**WHAT STUDENTS THINK OF
CITY COLLEGE OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**SUMMARY REPORT FROM PROGRAM REVIEW
INSTRUCTIONAL STUDENT SURVEYS 1995-1997**

City College of San Francisco

**Report Prepared By:
Steven Spurling
*sspurlin@ccsf.cc.ca.us***

**Office of Research, Planning and Grants
Report 9923~1, March 1999
*electronic version available at:
<http://www.ccsf.cc.ca.us/Services/Planning/planning/reports.htm>***

**City College of San Francisco
50 Phelan Avenue, E207
San Francisco, CA 94112
(415) 239-3743 Fax (415) 239-3010**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	5
Survey Questions.....	5-6
Findings	7-9
Appendix Tables	10-24

INTRODUCTION

The following report summarizes the results of student satisfaction surveys administered at City College of San Francisco for the three academic years between 1995 and 1997. As part of the Program Review process, 16,811 surveys were collected by individual departments in the following instructional areas of the college:

- Applied Science and Technology
- Behavioral and Social Sciences
- Business
- Health and Physical Education
- International Education and English as a Second Language
- Liberal Arts
- Sciences and Mathematics
- Library and Learning Resources

These surveys address such issues as satisfaction with facilities and instruction, course content and the ability of departments to encourage student success. Results were analyzed by school, department, age, ethnicity, gender, educational objective and students' grade outcomes.

SURVEY QUESTIONS

All surveys asked essentially the same set of questions. Students were asked to respond to the seven questions below using an eight point scale. On this scale, a mark of one was poor and eight was excellent.

The questions are summarized here:

- | | | |
|---|------------------------|---|
| 1 | Educational goals: | Encouragement from instructors in this department for students to complete their educational goals. |
| 2 | Facilities: | Classroom facilities in this department. |
| 3 | Office hours: | Availability of instructors in this department during office hours. |
| 4 | Instructional quality: | Overall quality of instruction in this department. |
| 5 | Respect for students: | Respect for students is encouraged in this department. |
| 6 | Instructors expertise: | Subject area knowledge of instructors in this department |
| 7 | Expression of views: | Encouragement from instructors for students to express viewpoints. |

Responses were analyzed to determine if they were statistically significantly different. Responses were further analyzed by four background and two institutional variables. The background variables were age, ethnicity, sex and educational objective. The institutional variables were school (e.g. Liberal Arts, Science and Mathematics etc.), grade outcome in class (pass, fail or withdraw) and self-reported grade at the time of the survey.

Responses to two other questions were marked on a different scale. These questions are:

- 8 Academic expectation: Instructors in this department have academic expectations of students that are 1) Too hard, 2) About right, 3) Too easy.
- 9 Informed of progress: Instructors in this department keep students informed about how well students are doing: 1) Agree, 0) Disagree

Surveys were given in Spring semesters to students in their classrooms after the final withdrawal date. Consequently, the results reported here are from students who remained in the course and received a final grade. But what about those who did not stay to the end of the course? These students are not part of this report since they dropped before the final withdrawal date. For these students, we will need to find additional survey mechanisms in order to determine why they left the course and what they thought of the program.

A summary of student responses to the survey questions are presented below, first by school, and then, within school by program. Following this, responses are presented by the background variables of age, ethnicity and gender. Finally Table 14 lists the number of surveys returned in each program and the percentage of each program population responding.

FINDINGS

- Table One on page 10 presents school and college-wide findings. Students were generally quite positive about City College of San Francisco. On the seven questions responded to using the eight point scale, the average response across all questions was 6.76.
- Students were most positive about the subject matter knowledge of instructors (7.34) and were least positive about the quality of the facilities (5.87). (See the college-wide row).
- Students were most positive in Library and Learning Resources (6.94), and least positive in Science and Mathematics (6.48) and International Education and ESL (6.49). (See column labeled 'Average for 1 - 7').
- Differences between schools were most pronounced on the questions about facilities and viewpoints. On facilities, International Education and ESL received the most negative rating (5.27) while on the expression of viewpoints, Science and Mathematics was rated the most negative (6.29). This compares to average ratings of 6.62 and 7.11 respectively for Library and Learning Resources on these two questions. In both cases the differences were roughly one full point.

Tables Two through Nine on pages 11 - 18 present similar mean scores for programs within each school. Table 2 presents student responses by program within the school Applied Science and Technology. The school-wide means in the last row of that table are the same scores that appear to the right in the row labeled 'Applied Science and Technology' in Table 1. A careful examination of these tables reveals greater differences by program within each school than between schools when college-wide differences are examined.

- In the school of Health and Physical Education, two point differences exist between programs on the scales defining educational goals, facilities, quality of instruction, respect for others and encouragement of students to express their viewpoints. At the high end of the rating scale is Echocardiography and Cardiovascular Technician.
- One to two point differences between programs exist on many of the scales in the schools of Applied Science and Technology, Science and Mathematics, Business and Liberal Arts. These differences are, by and large, statistically significant and of a magnitude to be of practical interest. Of particular note is the praise of Math Bridge and Earth Sciences in the school of Science and Mathematics, the Public Safety program in the school of Applied Science and Technology and the Library Information Technology Program.

Tables 10, 11 and 12 present survey responses by background variables. The following comments highlight the main differences by background variable.

- Differences existed by ethnicity (Table 10). The most critical groups on nearly all questions were Asians. On many questions Filipinos and Native Americans were similarly critical. One exception was the question about facilities where White students express the most critical views.
- When responses were analyzed by the age of the student, differences of a point or more existed on many questions (Table 11). In general, older students tended to give higher ratings than younger students. Only on the question about facilities were both older and younger student viewpoints similar (average rating = 5.6). In all other areas younger students were more critical in their appraisal of programs.
- Two questions in particular provoked the greatest differences in opinion between young and old. These were encouragement to express viewpoints (a 1 point difference), and encouragement to complete educational goals (a 1.3 point difference). In addition, questions about respect for students and quality of instruction also provoked three quarters of a point differences. In all cases it was younger students who were the most critical.
- There were some differences by educational objective (Table 12). Students seeking a degree were the most critical while those studying for personal reasons, for a vocational certificate or for job reasons were the most positive.

Student responses were also analyzed by the institutional variable of grade outcome, self-reported grade, and number of courses taken within the department (see Table 13). The following differences were found.

- Students who self-reported A and B grades gave higher ratings than students who believed they were going to receive D's and F's. In particular, student responses to the questions on encouragement to complete educational goals and expression of student viewpoints varied by students' self-reported grades: those who were doing well tended to give higher marks, and those not doing well gave lower marks. In addition, the questions relating to availability of instructors during office hours, quality of instruction, respect for students and encouragement of student expression also differentiated self-reported A from self-reported D/F students.

Examination of the two additional questions reinforces some of the previous conclusions.

- Students who failed were more likely to say instructors in the department didn't keep them informed of their progress (Table 13). This seems to reinforce the earlier finding that students who failed tended to say that instructors didn't encourage them in their educational goals. Failing students complained of a lack of communication with their instructors.

- When the question of academic expectations of instructors was examined, it was the students in International Education/ESL who most often thought academic expectations were too hard (Table 1). However, students who failed their classes in Science and Mathematics also had this particular concern. In spite of this, 80 percent or more of students in all schools thought expectations were about right and in general the average of the three responses was close to two (e.g. about right).
- Younger students most frequently felt that instructors weren't keeping them informed of their progress (Table 11). Twenty-five percent of respondents in the 19 and under category believed this. Older students were much less apt to say that they were not kept informed of progress.
- Asian students were more likely to say that instructor expectations were too hard, and White students to say the expectations were too easy (Table 10). African American and Hispanic students fell in between these two groups. These differences among ethnic groups, however, were found to be small inasmuch as 90 percent of all groups said that the expectations of instructors was about right.

Table 1
Survey Results 1995 -1997
Unweighted Mean Survey Scores by School and College-wide,
8 = Excellent
1 = Poor

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
SCHOOL										
Applied Science and Technology	6.88	6.22	6.76	7.14	7.09	7.40	7.04	6.93	2.05	89.27%
Behavioral & Social Sciences	6.48	5.90	6.57	6.98	7.10	7.35	6.85	6.75	1.98	86.43%
Business	6.48	5.85	6.37	6.87	6.90	7.17	6.70	6.62	2.02	89.14%
Health / Physical Education	6.82	6.08	6.83	7.21	7.12	7.46	6.91	6.92	1.95	92.60%
International Education & ESL	6.54	5.27	6.64	6.77	7.02	NA	6.72	6.49	1.92	90.47%
Liberal Arts	6.57	5.43	6.55	7.02	7.10	7.42	6.94	6.72	2.00	87.96%
Library/Learning Resources	6.76	6.62	6.94	7.19	7.21	7.42	7.11	7.04	1.99	92.37%
Sciences & Mathematics	6.08	5.80	6.44	6.76	6.76	7.26	6.29	6.48	1.94	84.61%
College-wide Average	6.58	5.90	6.64	6.99	7.04	7.35	6.82	6.76	1.98	89.11%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 2

Survey Results 1995 -1997
Unweighted Mean Survey Scores for the School of Applied Science and Technology
8 = Excellent
1 = Poor

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
PROGRAM	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
Aeronautics	6.43	5.28	6.27	6.81	6.56	7.13	6.40	6.41	2.04	88.82%
Automotive credit	6.60	6.33	6.68	6.83	7.00	7.00	6.55	6.71	2.03	94.90%
Automotive noncredit	7.50	7.07	7.31	7.36	7.43	7.54	7.43	7.38	2.00	100.00%
Consumer Arts & Sciences	7.05	5.48	6.83	7.43	7.21	7.69	7.17	6.98	2.08	94.00%
Environmental Horticulture	6.80	6.01	6.79	7.13	6.98	7.52	6.84	6.87	2.00	83.33%
Hospitality American Cooks	7.26	6.78	7.11	7.33	6.89	7.57	7.20	7.16	2.08	80.00%
Hotel & Restaurant	5.94	5.78	6.17	6.04	5.86	6.78	5.70	6.04	2.10	71.95%
Labor Studies	7.27	6.74	6.27	7.46	7.59	7.48	7.69	7.21	2.05	92.68%
Labor Studies Apprenticeship	6.35	5.85	6.28	7.10	7.31	7.34	7.39	6.80	2.18	82.05%
Public Safety	7.42	6.58	7.82	7.67	7.75	7.83	7.83	7.56	2.00	100.00%
Public Safety Fire Science	6.53	6.09	6.35	7.11	7.20	7.39	6.98	6.81	2.04	86.43%
Trade Skills	7.37	6.68	7.23	7.44	7.33	7.49	7.28	7.26	2.00	97.08%
Unweighted Mean for School	6.88	6.22	6.76	7.14	7.09	7.40	7.04	6.93	2.05	89.27%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 3

Survey Results 1995 -1997
Unweighted Mean Survey Scores for the School of Behavioral and Social Sciences
8 = Excellent
1 = Poor

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
PROGRAM	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
American Studies	6.28	5.85	6.61	6.60	6.82	7.45	6.84	6.64	2.03	79.90%
Asian American Studies	6.42	6.29	6.35	6.79	6.94	7.20	6.76	6.68	1.98	89.15%
Asian Studies	6.18	5.78	6.39	6.65	6.86	7.16	6.44	6.50	1.98	84.90%
Behavioral Sciences	6.12	5.50	6.35	6.74	6.92	7.11	6.75	6.50	1.99	81.82%
Child Development & Family Studies	7.21	6.59	6.78	7.40	7.51	7.61	7.44	7.22	2.02	94.74%
Interdisciplinary Studies	5.90	5.82	6.48	7.01	7.31	7.32	7.01	6.69	2.00	78.87%
Latin American Studies	7.15	6.27	6.54	7.42	7.08	7.46	6.73	6.95	1.88	88.00%
Philippine Studies	6.52	5.54	6.89	7.07	7.23	7.52	6.95	6.82	1.99	87.88%
Social Sciences	6.03	5.55	6.50	6.77	6.82	7.30	6.44	6.49	1.97	86.41%
Transitional Studies	6.63	6.10	6.43	6.88	6.92	6.98	6.43	6.62	2.01	82.85%
Women's Studies	6.87	5.60	7.00	7.41	7.64	7.71	7.55	7.11	1.95	96.18%
Unweighted Mean for School	6.48	5.90	6.57	6.98	7.10	7.35	6.85	6.75	1.98	86.43%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 4
Survey Results 1995 -1997
Unweighted Mean Survey Scores for the School of Business

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
PROGRAM	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
Accounting credit	6.03	5.23	6.07	6.40	6.49	6.83	6.10	6.16	1.89	82.39%
Accounting noncredit	7.07	6.15	7.10	7.18	7.21	7.24	6.97	6.99	2.00	94.37%
Business Math and English	6.41	6.06	6.42	7.01	7.03	7.29	6.62	6.69	2.00	91.95%
Business Office Information	6.45	6.14	6.38	6.75	6.83	6.96	6.49	6.57	2.00	88.55%
Commercial Law	5.96	5.62	6.03	6.36	6.42	6.81	6.18	6.20	1.95	88.17%
Court Reporting	6.66	5.24	6.63	6.80	6.94	7.44	7.00	6.67	2.00	88.57%
Fashion Merchandising	6.24	5.33	5.98	6.49	6.54	7.14	6.59	6.33	2.10	88.24%
Finance	6.21	5.51	6.41	7.03	6.80	7.23	6.92	6.59	1.99	86.96%
International Business	6.33	5.74	6.27	6.74	6.92	7.06	6.42	6.50	2.08	96.15%
Legal Assisting	5.90	5.78	5.58	6.66	6.71	6.99	6.20	6.26	2.11	92.08%
Marketing	5.71	6.14	6.07	6.53	6.27	7.03	6.38	6.31	1.90	72.41%
Microcomputers noncredit	6.62	6.20	6.32	7.07	6.94	7.24	6.67	6.72	2.04	88.32%
Real Estate	6.78	6.08	6.22	7.08	7.19	7.39	7.00	6.82	2.04	93.75%
Small Business & Supervision credit	6.78	6.36	6.56	6.89	7.20	7.29	7.24	6.90	2.11	91.11%
Small Business & Supervision noncredit	6.71	6.74	6.54	7.04	7.00	6.92	6.96	6.84	2.17	82.61%
Travel and Tourism	7.28	4.67	6.76	7.47	7.41	7.58	7.20	6.91	2.00	97.83%
Word Processing noncredit	7.01	6.55	6.97	7.25	7.39	7.47	6.98	7.09	1.99	91.95%
Unweighted Mean for School	6.48	5.85	6.37	6.87	6.90	7.17	6.70	6.62	2.02	89.14%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 5

Survey Results 1995 -1997
Unweighted Mean Survey Scores for the School of Health and Physical Education
8 = Excellent
1 = Poor

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
PROGRAM	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
Consumer Education	7.47	7.01	7.67	7.82	7.71	7.84	7.69	7.60	2.01	99.72%
Dental Assisting	6.57	6.07	6.71	7.04	7.22	7.29	6.59	6.78	1.89	92.86%
Dental Lab Technology	6.86	6.45	6.82	7.36	7.23	7.50	6.77	7.00	1.95	90.91%
Cardiovascular Technician	7.89	6.89	7.78	7.94	7.83	8.00	7.67	7.71	2.00	100.00%
Health Science	6.28	5.82	6.33	7.00	7.02	7.38	6.86	6.67	2.03	88.69%
Nursing, Registered	5.97	5.04	5.97	6.44	6.00	7.23	6.05	6.10	1.83	81.52%
Nursing, Vocational	6.58	5.85	6.41	6.76	6.58	6.99	6.50	6.52	1.89	92.31%
Physical Education	6.97	5.48	6.96	7.33	7.36	7.48	7.13	6.96	2.02	94.77%
Unweighted Mean for School	6.82	6.08	6.83	7.21	7.12	7.46	6.91	6.92	1.95	92.60%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Programs in Health Technology are not included in these survey results.

Table 6

Survey Results 1995 -1997

Unweighted Mean Survey Scores for the School of International Education and ESL

8 = Excellent

1 = Poor

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
PROGRAM	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Question Average for Program	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
ESL credit	6.38	4.94	6.64	6.65	6.86	NA	6.61	6.35	1.89	89.93%
ESL noncredit	6.70	5.59		6.88	7.18	NA	6.84	6.64	1.95	91.00%
Unweighted Mean for School	6.54	5.27	6.64	6.77	7.02	NA	6.72	6.49	1.92	90.47%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 7
Survey Results 1995 -1997
Unweighted Mean Survey Scores for the School of Liberal Arts
8 = Excellent
1 = Poor

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
PROGRAM										
Art	6.84	4.80	6.82	7.15	7.27	7.56	6.97	6.77	2.02	91.53%
Film	6.21	4.10	5.75	6.45	6.92	7.17	6.76	6.20	2.04	80.41%
Graphic Communications credit	6.18	5.55	6.06	6.80	6.86	7.12	6.57	6.45	2.04	83.24%
Older Adults	7.55	6.68	7.58	7.71	7.73	7.71	7.69	7.52	2.00	98.43%
Graphic Communications noncredit	7.17	5.91	6.91	7.52	7.17	7.48	6.91	7.01	1.96	91.30%
Photography	6.02	5.23	5.74	6.60	6.55	7.32	6.52	6.28	2.00	78.63%
Gay & Lesbian Studies	6.63	5.45	6.75	7.40	7.53	7.67	7.50	6.99	2.00	90.12%
Journalism	6.47	6.00	7.05	7.18	7.73	7.68	7.36	7.07	1.93	86.36%
Music	6.50	5.60	6.60	7.01	7.01	7.46	6.73	6.70	2.02	87.88%
Broadcast Communications	6.34	5.22	6.21	6.46	6.42	6.95	6.54	6.31	2.03	81.82%
Channel 52	5.88	5.31	6.42	6.46	6.53	7.06	6.46	6.30	1.92	82.75%
Foreign Languages	6.74	5.72	6.73	7.15	7.14	7.65	6.79	6.85	2.01	95.24%
Theater Arts	6.91	5.08	6.59	7.41	7.46	7.68	7.37	6.93	2.01	95.83%
Unweighted Mean for School	6.57	5.43	6.55	7.02	7.10	7.42	6.94	6.72	2.00	87.96%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 8

Survey Results 1995 -1997
Unweighted Mean Survey Scores for the School of Science and Mathematics
8 = Excellent
1 = Poor

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
PROGRAM	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
Architecture	6.36	5.30	6.28	6.78	6.97	7.18	6.72	6.51	2.05	89.00%
Astronomy	6.13	5.85	6.30	6.83	6.79	7.42	6.34	6.52	1.95	81.62%
Biological Sciences	5.57	5.55	6.17	6.48	6.44	7.13	5.66	6.14	1.91	84.59%
Chemistry	5.27	5.66	6.17	6.30	6.06	7.06	5.56	6.01	1.83	71.71%
CIS	6.09	5.47	6.31	6.59	6.68	7.05	6.24	6.35	2.01	88.19%
Earth Sciences	6.37	5.97	6.91	7.21	7.18	7.58	6.75	6.85	1.91	93.51%
Engineering	6.43	5.86	6.52	6.69	6.84	7.15	6.42	6.56	1.98	83.39%
Math Bridge	6.96	6.80	7.21	7.52	7.52	7.72	7.04	7.25	1.96	92.00%
Mathematics	5.73	5.59	6.10	6.52	6.46	7.18	5.98	6.22	1.92	76.05%
Physics	5.93	5.96	6.40	6.65	6.67	7.17	6.19	6.42	1.93	86.07%
Unweighted Mean for School	6.08	5.80	6.44	6.76	6.76	7.26	6.29	6.48	1.94	84.61%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 9

Survey Results 1995 -1997
Unweighted Mean Survey Scores for the School of Library and Learning Resources
8 = Excellent
1 = Poor

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
PROGRAM	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
Learning Assistance	6.67	6.04	7.05	7.07	7.30	7.29	7.24	6.95	1.98	95.45%
Library Information Technology	6.86	7.19	6.84	7.32	7.12	7.55	6.98	7.12	2.00	89.29%
Unweighted Mean for School	6.76	6.62	6.94	7.19	7.21	7.42	7.11	7.04	1.99	92.37%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 10

Survey Results 1995 - 1997
Weighted Mean College-wide Survey Scores by Ethnicity
8 = Excellent
1 = Poor

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
	Number Of Respondents	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
ETHNICITY											
African American	661	6.43	5.91	6.59	6.96	6.93	7.37	6.78	6.71	1.96	85.65%
American Indian	59	6.19	5.67	6.19	6.88	7.00	7.31	6.63	6.55	2.09	87.27%
Asian	5,121	6.15	5.65	6.25	6.59	6.68	7.05	6.41	6.40	1.94	87.16%
Filipino	838	6.22	5.78	6.37	6.82	6.88	7.25	6.55	6.55	1.96	84.06%
Hispanic	1,762	6.59	5.92	6.41	7.09	7.23	7.36	6.90	6.79	1.98	87.29%
Other	236	6.39	5.40	6.72	6.91	6.96	7.43	6.72	6.65	1.99	85.41%
Unknown	647	6.52	5.36	6.64	6.93	7.03	7.39	6.69	6.65	2.02	89.71%
White	3,133	6.49	5.26	6.56	6.90	7.05	7.42	6.80	6.64	2.01	88.22%
Weighted Mean for All Ethnicities	12,457	6.34	5.59	6.41	6.80	6.91	7.25	6.63	6.56	1.97	87.25%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 11

Survey Results 1995-1997
Weighted Mean College-wide Survey Scores by Age
8 = Excellent
1 = Poor

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
	Number Of Respondents	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
AGE											
19 or younger	1136	5.73	5.58	6.15	6.55	6.63	7.10	6.17	6.27	1.95	76.39%
20 - 24	3818	6.10	5.62	6.36	6.66	6.74	7.15	6.43	6.44	1.97	84.26%
25 - 29	2296	6.39	5.56	6.41	6.80	6.92	7.31	6.66	6.58	1.99	89.05%
30 - 34	1566	6.52	5.51	6.51	6.89	6.99	7.36	6.77	6.65	1.99	90.01%
35 - 39	1013	6.60	5.72	6.47	6.92	7.04	7.28	6.86	6.70	1.98	91.25%
40 - 49	1196	6.67	5.56	6.57	7.01	7.14	7.44	6.94	6.76	1.98	90.91%
50 - 54	293	6.82	5.65	6.92	7.07	7.13	7.58	7.01	6.88	1.97	91.04%
55 - 59	210	6.90	5.31	6.96	7.15	7.27	7.58	6.94	6.87	1.92	94.33%
60 - 64	167	7.00	5.40	6.75	7.23	7.38	7.74	7.20	6.96	1.89	95.48%
65 or older	307	6.87	5.87	7.17	6.97	7.14	7.55	6.97	6.93	1.88	93.06%
Mean Score for All Age Groups	12002	6.33	5.59	6.41	6.80	6.90	7.25	6.63	6.56	1.97	87.12%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 12
Survey Results 1995 - 1997
Weighted Mean Survey Scores by Educational Goal of the Students
8 = Excellent
1 = Poor

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
EDUCATIONAL GOAL	Number Of Respondents	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of Instructors	Informed of Progress
AA or Achievement Award	1,957	6.35	5.82	6.40	6.76	6.76	7.17	6.57	6.55	1.98	85.97%
BA or Higher	7,614	6.16	5.56	6.41	6.74	6.82	7.23	6.50	6.49	1.97	85.10%
Improve Basic Skills	943	6.65	5.77	6.61	6.85	7.01	7.21	6.72	6.69	1.95	89.96%
Improve Job Skills	1,640	6.70	5.65	6.50	6.96	7.11	7.36	6.88	6.74	2.00	90.80%
Personal Interest	3,041	6.97	6.00	7.02	7.28	7.36	7.61	7.17	7.06	2.00	93.53%
Vocational Certificate	924	6.84	6.03	6.72	7.09	7.12	7.33	6.86	6.86	2.00	91.10%
Mean for All Educational Goals	16,119	6.45	5.72	6.53	6.89	6.97	7.30	6.70	6.65	1.98	87.93%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 13
Survey Results 1995 - 1997
Mean Survey Scores by Grade outcome in the class in which the survey was
completed
8 = Excellent
1 = Poor

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8	9
GRADE OUTCOME	Number Of Respondents	Educational Goals	Facilities	Office Hours	Instructional Quality	Respect for Students	Instructor's Expertise	Expression of Views	Average for 1 - 7	Academic Expectations of	Informed of Progress
Fail	766	5.75	5.74	6.19	6.53	6.52	7.08	6.11	6.28	1.88	78.70%
Pass	8,524	6.30	5.58	6.44	6.81	6.87	7.27	6.62	6.55	1.99	87.14%
W	52	6.04	5.38	6.71	6.78	6.80	7.42	6.48	6.52	1.90	82.98%
Mean for all Grade Outcomes	9,342	6.25	5.59	6.42	6.78	6.84	7.26	6.57	6.53	1.98	86.43%

The first seven number columns are based on an eight point scale. Column eight is based on a three point scale with one equal to 'Too hard', two equal to 'Just right' and three equal to 'Too Easy'. Column nine is based on a two point scale with one equal to agree and zero equal to disagree. The number therefore represents the percentage of students who agree with the statement.

Table 14
Survey Results 1995 - 1997
Response Rates and Number of Respondents

PROGRAM	Number of Respondents	% of Sample Responding		% of Population Responding		Survey Year
		(Size of sample*)		(Size of population*)		
Accounting, CR	146	68.22%	214	19.97%	731	1997
Accounting, NC	73	46.50%	157	32.74%	223	1997
Aeronautics	171	99.42%	172	92.93%	184	1995
Afr. Amer. Studies	203	64.04%	317	26.82%	757	1996
Architecture	210	71.67%	293	65.83%	319	1997
Art	192	71.11%	270	11.17%	1719	1997
Asian Amer. Studies	264	74.58%	354	66.33%	398	1996
Asian Studies	357	82.45%	433	23.35%	1529	1997
Astronomy	137	68.50%	200	21.64%	633	1996
Automotive, CR	102	66.67%	153	45.54%	224	1997
Automotive, NC	14	50.00%	28	10.61%	132	1997
Behavioral Sciences	622	66.24%	939	23.85%	2608	1995
Biological Science	301	79.00%	381	10.65%	2825	1996
Broadcast Communication	115	76.16%	151	68.45%	168	1996
Bus. Office Info. Processing	235	73.67%	319	22.13%	1062	1997
Business Math and English	90	68.18%	132	18.63%	483	1997
Chemistry	357	67.61%	528	38.97%	916	1995
Child Dev't/Familv Studies	466	60.28%	773	19.45%	2396	1995
Computer Information Sc.	262	66.16%	396	13.40%	1955	1995
Commercial Law	95	73.08%	130	62.09%	153	1997
Consumer Arts & Sc.	105	62.13%	169	19.44%	540	1995
Consumer Education, NC	432	76.33%	566	19.19%	2251	1996
Court Reporting	35	62.50%	56	62.50%	56	1997
Dental Assisting	29	80.56%	36	80.56%	36	1997
Dental Lab Technology	22	95.65%	23	95.65%	23	1997
Earth Sciences	189	80.43%	235	74.70%	253	1996
Echocard/C V Tech.	18	94.74%	19	85.71%	21	1996
Engineering	322	84.96%	379	53.14%	606	1997
English	880	75.86%	1160	18.97%	4639	1996
Env. Hort./Retail Floristrv	158	78.61%	201	44.01%	359	1996
ESL, CR	449					
ESL, NC	2578					
Fashion Merchandising	51	64.56%	79	55.43%	92	1997
Film	156	70.27%	222	40.94%	381	1997
Finance	73	74.49%	98	74.49%	98	1995
Foreign Languages	401	69.26%	579	12.09%	3316	1996
Gav/Lesbian Studies	83	60.58%	137	53.90%	154	1995
Graphic Comm., CR	177	69.69%	254	54.46%	325	1997
Graphic Comm., NC	23	26.44%	87	26.44%	87	1997
TOTAL	10593	99.56%	10640	32.44%	32652	

*NOTE: Withdrawals excluded; Noncredit students w/ 0 positive attendance hrs. excluded

Diagnostic Medical Imaging, EKG Technician, Emergency Medical Technician,
Health Info. Techn., Medical Assisting, and Radiology/Oncology did not return surveys.

Table 14
Survey Results 1995 - 1997
Response Rates and Number of Respondents - Continued

PROGRAM	Number of Respondents	% of Sample Responding		% of Population Responding		Survey Year
		(Size of sample*)		(Size of population*)		
Health Science	295	59.00%	500	14.17%	2082	1995
Hospitality/Amer. Cooks	37	53.62%	69	45.12%	82	1997
Hotel & Restaurant	166	83.00%	200	77.21%	215	1997
Interdisciplinary Studies	71	65.14%	109	23.13%	307	1996
Internat'l Business. CR	53	79.10%	67	71.62%	74	1996
Journalism	45	80.36%	56	77.59%	58	1997
Labor Studies. CR.	44	68.75%	64	37.93%	116	1995
Labor St./Apprent.. CR	42	51.22%	82	33.33%	126	1997
Latin Amer. Studies	26	54.17%	48	5.20%	500	1996
Learning Assistance	45	56.25%	80	2.22%	2027	1996
Legal Assisting	104	72.22%	144	71.72%	145	1996
Library Info. Tech.	57	75.00%	76	42.86%	133	1996
Marketing	30	83.33%	36	44.78%	67	1997
Math Bridge	25	80.65%	31	80.65%	31	1995
Mathematics	387	71.40%	542	11.01%	3516	1995
Microcomp., NC	143	52.38%	273	6.23%	2296	1995
Music	336	66.67%	504	22.84%	1471	1995
Nursing, Reg.	94	97.92%	96	65.28%	144	1995
Nursing, Voc.	130	80.75%	161	51.59%	252	1995
Older Adults	387	57.85%	669	14.97%	2585	1997
Pharmacy Technician	24	100.00%	24	100.00%	24	1995
Philippine Studies	132	64.39%	205	64.08%	206	1996
Photography	268	64.11%	418	43.51%	616	1997
Physical Education	452	74.22%	609	10.83%	4172	1996
Physics	500	80.52%	621	64.02%	781	1997
Public Safety/F S. CR	144	56.47%	255	37.11%	388	1996
Public Safety. NC	12	60.00%	20	60.00%	20	1996
Real Estate	80	80.00%	100	33.47%	239	1996
Sm. Bus./Superv.. CR	45	55.56%	81	32.37%	139	1996
Sm. Bus./Superv.. NC	24	68.57%	35	7.04%	341	1996
Social Sciences	726	77.07%	942	18.81%	3860	1997
Theater Arts	319	88.61%	360	87.40%	365	1996
Trade Skills	323	76.72%	421	56.08%	576	1997
Transitional Studies	287	19.22%	1493	11.07%	2593	1997
Travel and Tourism	46	83.64%	55	83.64%	55	1997
Women's Studies	134	69.79%	192	27.97%	479	1995
Word Proc.. NC	185	56.40%	328	17.70%	1045	1995
TOTAL	6218	62.39%	9966	19.36%	32126	
GRAND TOTAL	16811	81.58%	29696	31.81%	64778	

*NOTE: Withdrawals excluded; Noncredit students w/ 0 positive attendance hrs. excluded

Diagnostic Medical Imaging, EKG Technician, Emergency Medical Technician,
Health Info. Techn., Medical Assisting, and Radiology/Oncology did not return surveys.