

ASSESSMENT REPORT

Freshman Seminar
First Year Initiative Survey Report
Class of 2012

June 2009



The University of Scranton
2008 Freshman Seminar
First Year Initiative Survey Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary3

Introduction.....4

Respondent Demographics5

How does the University of Scranton perform across all aspects of the experience?6

 Table 1: Aspects with which the University of Scranton freshmen were most and least
 satisfied6

 Table 2: Aspects with which the University of Scranton freshmen were most and least
 satisfied compared to Carnegie Class and All Institutions.7

Areas where the University of Scranton has improved.9

 Table 3: Factors where satisfaction has improved.9

Where should the University of Scranton focus its attention?.....10

 Table 4: Factors where the University of Scranton needs improvement11

Conclusion12

Freshman Seminar First Year Initiative Survey Report 2008

Executive Summary

The First Year Initiative (FYI) survey includes 70 questions related to the student's experience in a first year program. Using factor analysis, these 70 questions were grouped into 15 specific generalized Factors. In analyzing the survey, one Factor, the student's perception of "*Overall Course Effectiveness*," was chosen to be the dependent variable. The other 14 Factors were analyzed and ranked as predictors on the degree to which each of those other Factors contributed to the perception of overall effectiveness.

Students answered the survey questions using a 7 point scale, with 1 meaning "not at all" and 7 meaning "significantly." There was also an option of "not applicable." For all of these Factors, a mean goal score of 5.5 or greater is considered excellent or superior; 4.5 to 5.49 is considered good; 3.5 to 4.49 is fair; and below 3.5 is poor.

The University of Scranton ranked higher in twelve of the Factors than the "Carnegie Classification" comparison group. The Factors that the University ranked lower in were "*Course Improved Knowledge of Campus Policies*" (Factor 7), "*Course Improved Knowledge of Wellness*" (Factor 10), and "*Course Included Engaging Pedagogy*" (Factor 14).

The University of Scranton ranked higher in fourteen of the Factors than the "All Institutions" comparison group. The Factor that the University's mean score was lower in was "*Course Included Engaging Pedagogy*" (Factor 14).


The FYI indicated priority Factors or Predictors that should produce the greatest impact on course effectiveness and student satisfaction in the Freshman Seminar at The University of Scranton. The Factors or predictors were: "*Course Improved Study Strategies*" (Factor 1, 3rd Predictor), "*Course Improved Connections with Peers*" (Factor 5, 4th Predictor), "*Course Increased Out-of-Class Engagement*" (Factor 6, 5th Predictor), "*Usefulness of Course Readings*" (Factor 12, 2nd Predictor), and "*Course Included Engaging Pedagogy*" (Factor 14, 1st Predictor). Performance on these Factors is below the 5.5 mean goal value and improvement of these Factors should impact overall course effectiveness. Increased efforts (e.g. personnel, fiscal, time, focus) in these areas should increase overall satisfaction with and effectiveness of the Freshman Seminar course.

The data from the FYI and the recommendations from Educational Benchmarking, Inc. suggest future investigations of the Freshman Seminar course at The University of Scranton might include the following topics: research on the impact of assignments; various teaching methods; course readings; available civic engagement opportunities; various and differentiated study strategies; exploration of various peer interactions; and college differences regarding these areas.

Although “

How the does University of Scranton perform across all aspects of the experience?

Table 1:
Aspects with which the University of Scranton freshmen were most and least satisfied.



- = The University of Scranton has a higher mean than the goal (5.5).
- = The University of Scranton is within .25 of the goal (5.5).
- = The University of Scranton has a lower mean than the goal (5.5) by more than .25.

Table 2:
Aspects with which the University of Scranton freshmen were most and least satisfied compared to Carnegie Class and All Institutions.



Table 1 represents our mean scores for each of the fifteen benchmarks and Table 2 shows our mean scores alongside the comparison groups. Both tables me 8

Areas where the University of Scranton has improved.

Table 3:
Factors where satisfaction has improved. These results are based on a comparison to the respondents from the 2005 FYI survey.


<u>Factors</u>	<u>N</u>	Difference in Satisfaction: 2008 vs. 2005
Overall Course Effectiveness	401	.50
Course Increased Out-of-Class Engagement - 5th Predictor	412	
Course Improved Knowledge of Wellness	415	
Course Improved Critical Thinking	410	.99
Course Improved Academic and Cognitive Skills	416	
Course Improved Connection with Peers - 4th Predictor	416	.77
Course Improved Managing Time and Priorities	415	
Course Improved Study Strategies - 3rd Predictor	416	.66
Course Included Engaging Pedagogy - 1st Predictor	415	.61
Usefulness of Course Readings - 2nd Predictor	335	.61
Course Improved Connections with Faculty	415	-.57
Course Improved Knowledge of Campus Policies	415	.50
Course Improved Knowledge of Academic Services	415	-.19

The Predictor Factors represent the areas where improvement should result in increased *“Overall Course Effectiveness”*. All five Predictor Factors show increased satisfaction with the Freshman Seminar course.

The Five Predictor Factors are:

- *Course Included Engaging Pedagogy - 1st Predictor*
- *Usefulness of Course Readings - 2nd Predictor*
-

**Table 4:
Factors where the University of Scranton needs improvement.**

Overall Course Effectiveness Factors	Impact on Overall Course Effectiveness	Contribution to the Total Impact	Factor Performance	Recommendation Category
High Impact Factors				
Course Included Engaging Pedagogy	1 st Predictor	22.6%	Below Goal  (4.80)	Top Priority

