

**DISTANCE EDUCATION SURVEY 2001**

**SPRING 2001**

**UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT  
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

**Table of Contents**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	Page
INTRODUCTION AND SAMPLE . . . . .	3
SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS . . . . .	3
INTERRUPTIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION . . . . .	4
FINANCIAL AID . . . . .	5
ADVISING . . . . .	5
COURSES AND FACULTY . . . . .	6
GOALS AND PROGRESS . . . . .	7
SUPPORT SERVICES . . . . .	8
Importance, Use and Opinion . . . . .	8
GENERAL EDUCATION PREPARATION . . . . .	10
IMPRESSIONS OF USU . . . . .	10
AVAILABILITY . . . . .	11
CONDUCTIVENESS OF FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT . . . . .	11
CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY . . . . .	11
CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES . . . . .	12
INTERACTION . . . . .	12
KINDS OF QUESTIONS ASKED OVER SYSTEM . . . . .	13
PERCENT COURSES TAKEN BY RESPONDENTS IN THREE MODES . . . . .	13
 DISTANCE EDUCATION SURVEY 2001	
PROCEDURES AND SAMPLING . . . . .	15
SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS . . . . .	16
INTERRUPTIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION . . . . .	21
Reasons for Interruption . . . . .	22
FINANCIAL AID . . . . .	25
Source . . . . .	25
ADVISING . . . . .	28
My Advisor . . . . .	30
COURSES AND FACULTY . . . . .	32
GOALS AND PROGRESS TOWARD GOALS . . . . .	36
SUPPORT SERVICES . . . . .	51
Importance, Use and Opinion . . . . .	51
GENERAL EDUCATION PREPARATION . . . . .	61
IMPRESSIONS OF USU . . . . .	63
AVAILABILITY . . . . .	65
CONDUCTIVENESS OF FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT . . . . .	67
CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY . . . . .	69
CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES . . . . .	70
INTERACTIONS . . . . .	71
KINDS OF QUESTIONS ASKED OVER SYSTEM . . . . .	74
PERCENT COURSES TAKEN BY RESPONDENTS IN THREE MODES . . . . .	75

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### INTRODUCTION AND SAMPLE

This is the second year that the Distance Education Survey study has been conducted. The survey was distributed to the same sites as the previous year. The surveys were distributed during the spring semester of 2001. Six hundred and forty-six surveys were distributed and 287 were completed. The return rate was 44.4%.

A number of distance education sites were not selected to be a part of the sample. Thus, selectivity along with a marginal return rate precludes this data from being representative of the population of distance education and independent study students. However, the sample does appear to represent the adult learner. Characteristics of the adult learner are considered to be students who are probably: 25 years of age or older, married with dependents, working half to full-time, and students who have probably had interruptions in their college educations. Demographic categories in which the sample was comparable to the distance education population were citizenship and ethnicity.

Surveys were returned from the following sites in order of frequency:

<u>Site</u>	<u>Number</u>
• All other sites	91
• North Central	44
• Ephriam	34
• Tooele	32
• Brigham	31
• Bluffdale	26
• St. George	13
• Logan	9
• Ogden	5
• Price	1
• Uintah Basin	1

### SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

(Comparisons with *Distance Education Survey - 2000* in parentheses)

- 73.9% in College of Business and Education (76.2%)
- 50% female (56%)
- 98.9% US citizenship (98.8%)
- 89.3% white, Non-Hispanic (90.0%)
- 59.8% married (58.3%)
- 67% had 1 or more dependents (58.2%)
- Four modal age categories: 21-25, 26-30, 31-40, 41-50 (two modal age categories: 21-25, 31-40)
- 81.8% attended USU for 3 years or less (81.6%)
- 56.2% had taken the majority of their USU courses at distance education sites (78.8%)
- 82.4% were employed full or part-time (80.7%)
- 56.7% worked full-time (61.4%)
- 89.5% planned to continue their educations (89.8%)
- 48.6% were in degree programs related to their work (47.0%)
- 29.6% had gained no practical experience while going to college (34.2%)

**WHAT STUDENTS TELL THEIR FRIENDS ABOUT USU**

85.0% of the respondents told their friends that USU was great or said mostly positive things about USU (Table i).

**Table i.** "What would you tell your friends about USU?"

Say What?	Percent
It's great	39.1 (29.7)
Mostly positive things	45.9 (51.7)
Nothing much, positive or negative	13.5 (15.7)
Mostly negative things	1.1 (2.2)
It's not great	0.4 (0.7)

**INTERRUPTIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION**

- 52.2% interrupted (47.0%)
- 52.6% interrupted more than once (51.3%)
- 59.4% interrupted from 2 years or less (58.0%)
- 26.6% interrupted for greater than 5 years (31.6%)

Over half of the sample interrupted their educations once. The same is true of those who interrupted their educations for two years or less. Table ii shows that employment demands, finances, job opportunities, and homemaking responsibilities were the most frequently reported reasons for students interrupting their educations. The order for the top five items was the same for the year 2000.

**Table ii.** Reasons for interrupting higher education.

Reason	Major + Minor (%)
Employment Demands	50.8 (57.5)
Financial	49.2 (51.9)
Job Opportunity	42.5 (44.5)
Homemaking Responsibilities	41.3 (40.5)
Stress	35.0 (31.8)
Church/Mission Service	24.8 (15.8)
Transferred to another school	21.7 (23.4)
Lack of Interest	21.2 (23.0)
Illness	12.5 (7.7)
Academic Standing	8.6 (6.0)
Exchange Program	0.0 (1.2)

## FINANCIAL AID

Employment was the first source of financial aid for this sample to finance their educations. Savings and spouse came in a distant second and third. Although in the year 2000 the rank order of these first two sources of financial aid was the same, the remainder of sources varied somewhat in rank order from this year's sample. Table iii shows sources of financial aid from highest to lowest.

**Table iii.** Major plus minor sources of financial aid in order of frequency.

Source	Major + Minor (%)
Employment	72.2 (73.6)
Savings	46.5 (46.5)
Spouse	42.4 (34.1)
Loans	35.6 (35.4)
Parents	34.3 (29.1)
Scholarship	27.1 (31.0)
Veteran's Benefits	26.4 (4.9)
Grants	13.3 (41.4)
Other Relatives	8.8 (5.6)
Graduate Assistantship	2.0 (1.3)
Work-Study	1.5 (5.9)

## ADVISING

- 61.0% knew they had been assigned an advisor (57.3%)
- 59.3% met with their advisors at least annually (61.8%)
- 40.7% never met with their advisors (38.2%)
- 51.3% didn't know what type of advisor they had (48.9%)
- 36.2% reported the major requirement sheets as their major source of planning (41.6%)

A majority of respondents thought that their advisors' gave them correct information, were positive, and interested in their welfare. Advising items on this and other surveys (e.g., Sophomore/Junior Student Survey, Graduating Students Survey) score much lower than other items students' are asked to respond to. There were some similarities between this sample and respondents in the year 2000. Ordering of the items between years was similar as well (Table iv).

**Table iv.** Percent strongly agree plus agree in regard to advisement in order of frequency.

Item	Strongly Agree + Agree (%)
<b>My advisor: Gave me correct information on services/programs</b>	64.3 (61.4)
<b>Interactions with my advisor were positive</b>	63.3 (63.7)
<b>My advisor: Was interested in my welfare</b>	55.9 (51.2)
<b>Overall I was satisfied with my advisor</b>	52.9 (55.7)
<b>Overall I was satisfied with the advising system at USU</b>	51.3 (47.5)
<b>Overall I was satisfied with they advising system in my college/dept.</b>	51.1 (49.0)
<b>My advisor: Was readily available for consultation</b>	46.5 (45.5)
<b>My advisor: Helped me make academic/career decisions</b>	44.1 (38.8)

## COURSES AND FACULTY

These items received high scores in both years. Rank ordering between the years varied as seen in Table v. The most dramatic change was “Overall quality of education” which was ranked first in the year 2000 but dropped to sixth in this year’s sample. “Challenge of courses in University Studies/General Education” was first in this year’s sample but was fifth in the previous year’s sample. However, the ranges both years are comparable.

**Table v.** Percent very satisfied plus satisfied responses to items regarding courses and faculty.

Item	Very Satisfied + Satisfied (%)
<b>Challenge of courses in University Studies/General Education</b>	95.5 (91.9)
<b>Overall quality of University Studies/General Education</b>	93.0 (92.4)
<b>Challenge of courses in the major</b>	92.9 (92.6)
<b>The degree to which the student was treated fairly</b>	92.6 (92.0)
<b>Variety of courses in University Studies/General Education</b>	91.5 (85.5)
<b>Overall quality of education</b>	91.1 (93.5)
<b>Overall quality of the program in the major</b>	90.6 (91.3)
<b>Helpfulness of faculty</b>	88.2 (87.6)
<b>Variety of courses in the major</b>	85.6 (80.0)
<b>Accessibility of faculty</b>	84.8 (83.7)

## GOALS AND PROGRESS

Table vi contains a list of goals that respondents were to rate. They rated goals for their importance and the extent of progress that they had made toward each goal. The last column in the table shows the gaps between the students' ratings of importance of the goals and their progress toward them. A negative gap indicates that expectations were not met in terms of the respondents' progress toward those goals (the difference between progress and importance). A positive gap indicates that their expectations were exceeded. The table presents the data from the largest negative gap to the largest positive gap. Numbers in parentheses after the item title indicate the rank order of the items in the *Distance Education Survey - 2000* in terms of importance. As well, percentages in parentheses are students' ratings of the same items in the *Distance Education Survey - 2000*.

The most important goals of respondents' were job related items followed by self-improvement items (e.g., time management, problem solving, etc.). These goals were followed by interpersonal/social items and lastly, items relating to family life. The largest negative gaps between extent of progress and importance of goals were job related items.

**Table vi.** Goals of respondents and their progress toward those goals ranked by size of gap between extent of progress and importance of the goal.

Item	Importance of Goal: (Very Important + Important (%))	Extent of Progress (Very Good + Good (%))	Gap (Progress - Importance (%))
Informal interactions with professors (20)	76.8 (73.4)	69.1 (73.9)	-7.7 (0.5)
Likelihood for promotion/salary increase (1)	90.3 (90.4)	82.9 (80.5)	-7.4 (-9.9)
Obtain professional skills (3)	98.8 (98.4)	91.5 (91.7)	-7.3 (-6.7)
Job/career skills (4)	98.4 (98.4)	92.3 (92.4)	-6.1 (-6.0)
Staying current with job demands (2)	94.0 (94.7)	88.2 (87.2)	-5.8 (-7.5)
Time management (7)	89.0 (92.4)	83.7 (88.6)	-5.3 (-3.8)
Level of intellect (19)	98.4 (95.9)	93.7 (95.5)	-4.7 (-0.4)
Understanding of the sciences (12)	82.0 (84.4)	77.5 (81.9)	-4.5 (-2.5)
Planning and organizational skills (9)	91.3 (93.7)	87.4 (90.3)	-3.9 (-3.4)
Problem solving skills (14)	94.8 (96.6)	91.8 (94.5)	-3.0 (-2.1)
Leadership skills (24)	91.7 (90.2)	88.8 (92.5)	-2.9 (2.3)
Affiliation with the USU community (21)	63.4 (60.3)	60.7 (61.0)	-2.7 (0.7)
Critical thinking abilities (10)	96.0 (97.4)	93.5 (94.1)	-2.5 (-3.3)
Management of personal finances (11)	82.1 (82.5)	79.7 (79.3)	-2.4 (-3.2)
Acquire skills for self directed learning (8)	93.7 (95.0)	91.4 (91.2)	-2.3 (-3.8)
Verbal skills (13)	92.1 (92.7)	90.3 (90.5)	-1.8 (-2.2)

<b>Affiliation with a department/program (5)</b>	81.7 (78.7)	80.5 (73.6)	-1.2 (-5.1)
<b>General Knowledge (18)</b>	97.3 (96.7)	96.5 (96.3)	-0.8 (-0.4)
<b>Self confidence (6)</b>	89.9 (91.2)	90.0 (86.9)	0.1 (-4.3)
<b>Awareness of social issues (17)</b>	86.5 (89.9)	87.0 (89.1)	0.5 (-0.8)
<b>Social interpersonal skills (23)</b>	90.1 (86.8)	91.2 (88.6)	1.1 (1.8)
<b>Interactions with international/minority students (25)</b>	65.6 (63.2)	67.9 (66.1)	2.3 (2.9)
<b>Learn to work well with others (22)</b>	84.1 (86.4)	88.0 (87.3)	3.9 (0.9)
<b>A personal system of values (27)</b>	82.6 (85.1)	87.4 (88.7)	4.8 (3.6)
<b>Sensitivity/tolerance to others (15)</b>	86.4 (91.5)	92.3 (89.7)	5.9 (-1.8)
<b>Independence (26)</b>	88.4 (89.8)	94.5 (93.2)	6.1 (3.4)
<b>Participate in extracurricular activities (28)</b>	45.6 (46.8)	52.0 (56.2)	6.4 (9.4)
<b>Sensitivity/tolerance to alternative views and cultures (16)</b>	85.7 (90.2)	94.0 (89.0)	8.3 (-1.2)
<b>Prepare for family life (29)</b>	60.2 (57.4)	68.6 (68.1)	8.4 (10.7)
<b>Appreciation of the arts (30)</b>	69.5 (66.0)	83.0 (77.0)	13.5 (11.0)
<b>Find a spouse/partner (31)</b>	38.9 (36.4)	58.7 (54.2)	19.8 (17.8)

As can be seen from the table there are some differences between years on both ratings of importance and progress as well as the rank ordering of the items. However, with only several exceptions almost all gaps that were negative in the 2000 survey were negative in this survey. The converse was also true ( $r=.842$ ). The differences in sample size and ages between years could account for some of the differences.

## SUPPORT SERVICES

**Importance, Use and Opinion.** Table vii should be read in the same way as the preceding table. Students were to rate the importance of support services and their opinion of them. The gaps between the respondents use and opinion of the services minus the importance of the services is listed in descending order. Negative gaps indicate that students expectations of the services have not been met. Positive gaps indicate that students' expectations of the services have been met and/or exceeded. Numbers in parentheses after the item title indicate the rank order of the items in the *Distance Education Survey - 2000* in terms of importance. As well, percentages in parentheses are students ratings of the same items in the *Distance Education Survey - 2000*.



**Table vii.** Percent of respondents rating importance of support service (Very important + Moderately Important) and their use and opinion of that service (Very Satisfied + Satisfied). (Opinion is based only on those who used the service.) The table is ranked by size of gap between importance and opinion.

<b>Item</b>	<b>Importance of Service: (Very Important + Important (%)</b>	<b>Opinion of Service: (Very Satisfied + Satisfied (%)</b>	<b>Gap: (Opinion - Importance of Service) (%)</b>
<b>Bookstore (1)</b>	84.7 (89.4)	77.4 (76.0)	-7.3 (-13.4)
<b>Distance Education Library Services (2)</b>	79.7 (84.7)	85.6 (83.0)	5.9 (-1.7)
<b>Fee &amp; Tuition Payment Services (3)</b>	79.9 (83.2)	86.8 (85.6)	6.9 (2.4)
<b>Registration &amp; Records Office (5)</b>	76.1 (78.8)	85.6 (88.5)	9.5 (9.7)
<b>Computer Labs (7)</b>	66.0 (74.3)	80.6 (87.6)	14.6 (13.3)
<b>Financial Aid Office (9)</b>	63.0 (68.9)	80.9 (84.4)	17.9 (15.5)
<b>General Registration Office (6)</b>	67.5 (76.4)	89.0 (87.2)	21.5 (10.8)
<b>Career Services (4)</b>	60.8 (68.8)	82.8 (76.5)	22.0 (7.7)
<b>Counseling Center (8)</b>	50.2 (59.8)	77.0 (74.4)	26.8 (14.6)
<b>Merrill Library (11)</b>	58.1 (60.7)	89.0 (88.8)	30.9 (28.1)
<b>Student Orientation &amp; Registration (12)</b>	46.2 (56.4)	78.8 (87.2)	32.6 (30.8)
<b>Cashier's Office (10)</b>	55.2 (62.1)	91.8 (85.5)	36.6 (23.4)
<b>Cazier Science &amp; Technology Library (13)</b>	42.0 (44.3)	92.6 (82.9)	40.9 (38.6)
<b>USU ID Card Office (15)</b>	41.8 (43.3)	92.1 (87.1)	50.3 (43.8)
<b>Disability Resource Center (17)</b>	36.3 (40.4)	87.3 (88.5)	51.0 (48.1)
<b>Touch Tone Registration (14)</b>	40.0 (44.3)	92.6 (86.1)	52.6 (41.8)
<b>Statesman (19)</b>	33.8 (31.3)	88.4 (84.2)	54.6 (52.9)
<b>Varsity Athletics (18)</b>	30.9 (33.1)	89.8 (83.5)	58.9 (50.4)
<b>Intramural/Club Sports (16)</b>	28.3 (31.1)	87.7 (78.3)	59.4 (47.2)
<b>KUSU Public Radio (20)</b>	31.6 (30.6)	94.0 (84.1)	62.4 (53.5)

Respondents seemed satisfied with most of the available services. The Bookstore was the only service that did not meet the respondents' expectations. For distance education students each center has a small bookstore of its own which coordinates with the USU Bookstore. Most distance education students probably have more realistic expectations of support services, thus the positive ratings of the services available to them despite the fact that the scope of some of these services is limited because of the respondents' distance from the campus service or event. Ratings and rankings between years were similar ( $r=.975$ ).

## GENERAL EDUCATION PREPARATION

Respondents rated how well the University Studies Program prepared them in general education (Table viii). Ratings were high in both years.

**Table viii.** Percent respondents rating their preparation in the cognitive areas of general education as very well or well.

Area	Very Well + Well
Communication	94.2 (96.8)
Numeracy	87.3 (91.2)
Computer Literacy	89.1 (90.1)
Humanities and Art	90.9 (90.0)
Social Science	93.1 (91.5)
Life Science	89.4 (90.6)
Physical Science	91.2 (89.8)

## IMPRESSIONS OF USU

Table ix shows how respondents rated their impressions of various aspects of the university. The current samples' ratings of all items were lower than the ratings from the previous year. Impressions of undergraduate programs showed the most variation between years (almost 22%). In both years research activities and public relations were ranked last. Research activities are probably not as readily available for distance education students to participate in.

**Table ix.** Percent of respondents rating their impressions of USU in a number of areas as very good or good.

Item	Very Good + Good (%)
Undergraduate programs	65.6 (87.5)
Major department	76.7 (85.8)
Teaching ability of faculty	79.0 (84.5)
Personal interest of faculty in students	69.2 (75.7)
Quality of students	74.4 (78.2)
Research activities	58.7 (69.6)
Public relations	53.1 (68.2)

## AVAILABILITY

Table x lists the availability of particular resources that enhance distance education programs and offerings. Respondents ranked library and other learning resources ahead of multimedia materials. Availability ratings are similar in both years.

**Table x.** Availability of various resources to expedite distance education.

Item	Always Available + Usually Available (%)
Course materials	86.2 (85.3)
Technical assistance	78.4 (75.6)
Multimedia materials	68.8 (67.4)
Library and other learning resources	71.6 (67.4)
Instructor (other than class)	64.8 (66.0)

## CONDUCTIVENESS OF FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT

Table xi shows the ratings of the conduciveness of the learning environments for the distance education students. Facility environment for “taking exams” was the highest ranked item. With the exception of “communicating with instructor during class”, this year’s respondents rated all other items a little lower than the previous year’s respondents.

**Table xi.** Conduciveness of facilities and environment for pedagogy.

Item	Best + Pleasant (%)
<b>Conduciveness of facilities for:</b>	
Communicating with instructor during class	53.5 (54.9)
Communicating with instructor after class	39.8 (46.1)
Viewing videotapes and other multimedia materials	39.8 (42.3)
<b>Conduciveness of environment for:</b>	
Paying attention to the instructor	49.8 (57.3)
Taking exams	55.4 (64.3)

## CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY

Table xii shows how respondents rated the importance and reliability of the technology used in their classes. Ratings were similar in both years with the exception of the item asking about technology being essential to the course. Respondents rated this item lower in the year 2000.

**Table xii.** Percent respondents rating the use of technology in the classroom with a strongly agree or agree.

Item	Strongly Agree + Agree (%)
The technology used enhanced my learning.	74.7 (75.4)
The technology used was essential to the course (it could not have been offered otherwise).	81.2 (76.9)
The technology used was reliable.	76.1 (75.1)
The technology actually got in the way of learning.	22.8 (22.4)

### CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

The median number of exams taken, and papers/projects written was between 2 and 3 (Table xiii). There is some variance between the measures of central tendency for this year's respondents. However, in the year 2000 there was complete agreement on the two measures of central tendency within each question. The mode likewise varied between 1 and 4 in the year 2001, while in 2000 it was between 1 and 3.

**Table xiii.** Modal and median frequencies of test taking, papers written, and projects completed.

Item	Mode	Median
About how many <i>exams</i> did you take per course?	4 (3)	3 (3)
About how many <i>major papers</i> did you write per course?	2 (2)	2 (2)
About how many <i>minor papers</i> did you write per course	2 (2)	3 (2)
About how many <i>projects</i> did you do per course?	1 (1)	2 (1)

### INTERACTION

90.5% of the respondents rated the importance of classroom interactions as essential, very important, and important. Approximately the same percentage of respondents felt the same way in the year 2000. Modal frequencies were the same in both years (Table xiv).

**Table xiv.** Modal frequencies of interactions in the classroom estimated by respondents.

Type of Interaction	Interactions				
	0	At least once	>2	1-4	5-10
Interactions with:					
Instructors					x (x)
The students at your location	x (x)				
The students at other locations					x (x)
About how many times did you study with other students?	x (x)				
How many times did the instructors encourage students to comment, ask questions, or otherwise interact?					x (x)
How often did you ask questions (either to instructors or other class members)?					x (x)

#### KINDS OF QUESTIONS ASKED OVER SYSTEM

The kinds of questions asked most frequently were questions about subject matter (Table xv).

**Table xv.** Modal frequencies of kinds of questions asked in the classroom.

Item	About Social Life	About Exams	About Assignments	About Conduct of the Class	About Subject Matter
Generally the kinds of questions asked over the system were:					x (x)
Generally the kinds of questions asked at the local sites were:					x (x)

#### PERCENT COURSES TAKEN BY RESPONDENTS IN THREE MODES

The distance education nature of this sample becomes obvious from the measures of central tendency in Table xvi. The respondents' smallest percentages of courses were taken in the face-to-face mode. Although some respondents had taken courses on line the mode and median were zero. Most courses were taken by satellite delivery.

**Table xvi.** Modal and median percentages of course transmission modes experienced by respondents.

<b>Transmission Mode</b>	<b>Mode (%)</b>	<b>Median (%)</b>
<b>Face-to-face</b>	0 (0)	20 (25)
<b>Satellite delivery</b>	100 (100)	98 (70)
<b>On line</b>	0 (0)	0 (0)

**DISTANCE EDUCATION SURVEY  
SPRING 2001**

**PROCEDURES AND SAMPLING**

Printed surveys were delivered to the Director of Independent and Distance Education for distribution to students enrolled in distance education during the Spring Semester, 2001. As reported by the Director surveys were distributed to selected distance education sites. Table 1 shows the number of surveys sent to the centers and then distributed to students at each site. A number of distance education sites were not represented in the survey. As such, the representative nature of the sample is questionable. University data indicated that there were 10,123 students enrolled in distance education programs for spring semester, 2001. It should be noted that this number represents any person who has enrolled in any course or workshop offered at a distance education site; that is, anyone taking more than 0 credit hours. Thus, the population does not represent students truly enrolled for the purpose of getting a certificate, associate, bachelors, or masters degree through distance education programs at Utah State University. Sites are listed in alphabetical order. The population to which the surveys were delivered (N = 1067) was 10.5% of the entire population of distance education and independent study students. The actual number of surveys distributed to students at the distance education sites was 646. There were 287 surveys returned, a return rate of 44.4%. No attempt was made to gather a sample of the entire population. To determine whether the sample in this survey represents the population of distance education and independent study students comparisons of demographic data of the sample are made throughout where population data are available.

**Table 1.** Distribution and return of surveys from selected distance education sites.

<b>Site</b>	<b># Surveys Sent to Center</b>	<b># Surveys Distributed to Students</b>	<b># Surveys Completed by Students</b>
<b>Bluffdale</b>	29	29	26
<b>Brigham</b>	40	40	31
<b>Ephriam</b>	85	85	34
<b>Logan</b>	158	50	9
<b>North Central</b>	67	52	44
<b>Ogden</b>	83	40	5
<b>Price</b>	120	80	1
<b>Salt Lake City</b>	70	0	0
<b>St. George</b>	131	20	13
<b>Tooele</b>	60	45	32
<b>Uintah Basin</b>	30	30	1
<b>All other sites - Gunnison</b>	194	100 75	70 21
<b>Total</b>	1067	646	287

**SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS**

A small plurality of respondents (14.8%) reported a Psychology bachelor's degree as their major. Slightly fewer reported a degree program outside the offerings of the distance education program at USU (see Other in the table below). 43.2 percent, of the respondents were majors in the College of Education. The College of Business was also well represented accounting for 1/3 of the sample's respondents.

**Table 2.** Bachelor's & Master's degree of respondents.

<u>Degree Programs</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Accounting	19	7.4
Health, Physical Ed & Recreation (MEd)	1	.4
Human Environments (MSS)	11	4.3
Liberal Arts and Sciences	3	1.2
Psychology (BS)	38	14.8
School Counseling (MS)	12	4.7
Rehabilitation (MS)	1	.4
Secondary Education (MEd)	11	4.3
Special Education (MEd)	9	3.5
Other	37	14.4
Agribusiness	2	.8
Business Administration (MBA)	36	14.0
BIS (MS)	30	11.7
Computer Science	8	3.1
Elementary Education (MEd)	34	13.2
Instructional Technology (MS)	5	1.9
Biology	0	0
Environmental Studies	0	0
Sub Total	257	100.0
Missing	30	
Total	287	

A larger plurality of respondents reported having enrolled in certificate or associate degree programs in science (23%). 21.6 percent reported having enrolled in programs not offered in the distance education program at USU (see Other in the table below). Over 1/3 of the respondents reported declaring majors in the College of Education in both years.

**Table 3.** Certificate & associate degree programs of respondents.

<u>Certificate/Associate Degree</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Arts	5	6.8
Reading	4	5.4
Science	17	23.0
School Library Media	2	2.7
Secondary Education -- Gifted and Talented	1	1.4
Special Education -- Mild, Moderate	3	4.1
Horticulture -- Ornamental	1	1.4
Other	16	21.6
Computer Aided Drafting	1	1.4
Office Systems Support	2	2.7



<b>Administrative/Supervision for Education (ASC)</b>	12	16.2
<b>Child Development</b>	2	2.7
<b>Early Childhood Education</b>	4	5.4
<b>Elementary Education -- Gifted and Talented</b>	3	4.1
<b>English as a Second Language (ESL)</b>	1	1.4
<b>Sub Total</b>	74	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	213	
<b>Total</b>	287	

Gender of the respondents was equal at 50% for both males and females. This was not similar to the respondents of this same survey in the year 2000. Distance education data showed 58.7% female enrollment and 41.3% male enrollment. (Distance Education population data were provided by Computer Services). University data for the year 2000 indicates that in regular programs at the university there were 52% females and 48% males (*Utah State University Fact Book, 1999-2000*).

**Table 4.** Gender of respondents.

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Female	143	50.0
Male	143	50.0
Sub Total	286	100.0
Missing	1	
Total	287	

The sample was constituted overwhelmingly by American citizens in both years and compares well with university population data. (*Utah State University Fact Book, 1999-2000*).

**Table 5.** Citizenship status of respondents.

<u>Citizenship</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
US	281	98.9
International	3	1.1
Sub Total	284	100.0
Missing	3	
Total	287	

Eighty-nine percent of the respondents were of white, non Hispanic origin. This is comparable to the USU student population which is 88.6% white (*Utah State University, Fact Book, 1999-2000*) and to the distance education population at 87.8%. The sample was over represented in the American Indian/Alaskan Native minority category, 2.5% versus 0.8% for the USU population as a whole. The Hispanic sample was also over represented 3.6% versus 1.8% in the USU population.

**Table 6.** Ethnicity of respondents.

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
American Indian/Alaskan Native	7	2.5
Hispanic	10	3.6
Asian or Pacific Islander	3	1.1
White, Non-Hispanic	250	89.3
Other, unspecified	10	3.6
Sub Total	280	100.0
Missing	7	
Total	287	

The marital status of the sample was not representative of the distance education population as a whole. Single students were under represented in the sample, 29.4% compared to 51% in the distance education population. Married students were over represented, 59.8% compared to 29.1% in the distance education population (Distance Education population data were provided by Computer Services). The Logan, Salt Lake, and Roosevelt sites are included in the population data. The Logan site is made up of more traditional, i.e., single, students. There were only 9 respondents at the Logan site in the sample.

**Table 7.** Marital status of respondents.

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Single	84	29.4
Married	171	59.8
Divorced	26	9.1
Separated	5	1.7
Sub Total	286	100.0
Missing	1	
Total	287	

Nearly 67% of the respondents reported having one or more dependents. This would be considered typical of the adult learner who would probably have already established a family.

**Table 8.** Number of dependents.

<u>Number of Dependents</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Zero	96	33.8
1	60	21.1
2	50	17.6
3	31	10.9
4	21	7.4
5+	26	9.2
Sub Total	284	100.0
Missing	3	
Total	287	

The population was more traditional in nature, a plurality being 18-20 years of age. Ninety percent of this year's sample were between ages 21 and 50 years, only 57% of the distance education population were. (Distance Education population data were provided by Computer Services). This sample is more representative of the adult learner than the distance education population as a whole.

**Table 9.** Age of respondents.

<u>Age (yrs.)</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Population Percent</u>
<= 17	0	0.0	2.0
18 - 20	15	5.3	32.8
21 - 25	67	23.5	19.8
26 - 30	64	22.5	13.3
31 - 40	64	22.5	13.2
41 - 50	58	20.4	11.6
51 - 60	14	4.9	5.8
60+	3	1.1	1.5
<b>Sub Total</b>	285	100.0	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	2		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Sixty-nine percent of the sample attended USU 2 years or less.

**Table 10.** Length of attendance at USU.

<u>Length (yrs)</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
<b>Less than 1</b>	72	25.3
1	47	16.5
2	78	27.4
3	36	12.6
4	20	7.0
5	16	5.6
6+	16	5.6
<b>Sub Total</b>	285	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	2	
<b>Total</b>	287	

31.1% of respondents had taken their classes at "other" sites, while 30.4% had taken theirs at another college or university.

**Table 11.** Site where majority of classes were taken.

<u>Site</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
<b>Other</b>	87	31.1
<b>Another college/university</b>	85	30.4
<b>Logan Campus</b>	38	13.6
<b>Bluffdale</b>	24	8.6
<b>Tooele</b>	24	8.6
<b>Brigham City</b>	16	5.7
<b>Salt Lake City</b>	4	1.4
<b>Price</b>	1	.4
<b>Uintah Basin</b>	1	.4
<b>Sub Total</b>	280	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	7	
<b>Total</b>	287	

A majority of respondents (58.1%) reported being employed full-time. This is indicative of their status as adult learners. 82.4% were employed full or part-time.

**Table 12.** Employment status.

<u>Employment Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Employed full-time	165	58.1
Employed part-time	69	24.3
Unemployed	50	17.6
Sub Total	284	100.0
Missing	3	
Total	287	

A majority (56.7%) of respondents worked full-time while attending school. Over 80% of the sample worked half to full-time.

**Table 13.** Amount of time worked while attending university.

<u>Time Worked</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
None	31	11.0
1/4 Time	25	8.9
1/2Time	43	15.2
3/4 Time	23	8.2
Full-time	160	56.7
Sub Total	282	100.0
Missing	5	
Total	287	

A majority (66.3%) of respondents planned to continue their educations as graduate students. Another 17.9% planned to continue their educations to obtain an additional bachelor's degree.

**Table 14.** Educational plans of respondents.

<u>Education Plans</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Continue my education as a graduate student	189	66.3
Continue my education with an additional degree (BS or equivalent)	51	17.9
Continue my education as an employee in company sponsored programs	15	5.3
Not continue my education	30	10.5
Sub Total	285	100.0
Missing	2	
Total	287	

Almost half (48.6%) of the respondents reported working in a job related to their degree.

**Table 15.** Relationship of job to university study.

<u>Job Relationship</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
related to your degree?	134	48.6
unrelated to your degree?	95	34.4
not employed?	47	17.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Missing</b>	<b>11</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>287</b>	

A plurality of respondents (30.0%) indicated that their employment had been their career-related practical experience during college. This could readily be expected of the adult learner.

**Table 16.** Practical experience related to career while at university.

<u>Practical Experience</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Practicum/internship	58	20.9
Volunteer experience	37	13.4
Employment	83	30.0
Work-study	17	6.1
None	82	29.6
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>277</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Missing</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>287</b>	

85.0% of the respondents would tell their friends that USU was great or would say mostly positive things about USU.

**Table 17.** "What would you tell your friends about USU?"

<u>Say what?</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
It's great	110	39.1
Mostly positive things	129	45.9
Nothing much, positive or negative	38	13.5
Mostly negative things	3	1.1
It's not great	1	.4
<b>Sub Total</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>Missing</b>	<b>6</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>287</b>	

### INTERRUPTIONS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A little over half of the respondents (52.2%) reported an interruption in their educations other than summers.

**Table 18.** Interruptions in education of respondents(other than summers).

<u>Interruptions</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Yes	141	52.2
No	129	47.8
<b>Sub Total</b>	270	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	17	
<b>Total</b>	287	

Just over half of the respondents (52.6%) who had reported interruptions in their educations, had interrupted them more than once.

**Table 19.** Number of interruptions.

<u>Number of Interruptions</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Once	65	47.4
More than once	72	52.6
<b>Sub Total</b>	137	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	150	
<b>Total</b>	287	

Of those who had interrupted their educations, a majority (59.5%) had interrupted their educations 2 years or less. However, 26.6% had interrupted their educations 5 or more years. Longer periods of interruption would be expected of an adult learner sample.

**Table 20.** Longest interruption.

<u>Length of Interruptions</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>
Less than a year	34	23.8
1 - 2	51	35.7
3 - 4	20	14.0
5+	38	26.6
<b>Sub Total</b>	143	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	144	
<b>Total</b>	287	

### Reasons for Interruption

Respondents who had interrupted their educations indicated reasons for the interruptions. Reasons were ranked as major, minor, or not a reason.

Just less than half of those respondents (49.2%) who had interrupted their educations indicated finances as a major or minor reason.

**Table 21.** Financial.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Reason	34	27.4	27.4
Minor Reason	27	21.8	49.2
Not a Reason	63	50.8	100.0
Sub Total	124	100.0	
Missing	163		
Total	287		

41.3% of the respondents who had interrupted their educations ranked homemaking responsibilities as a major or minor reason. Since the sample reflected an adult learner status this result would not be unexpected. Remember, nearly 67.0% of the sample had one or more dependents.

**Table 22.** Homemaking responsibilities.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Reason	39	32.2	32.2
Minor Reason	11	9.1	41.3
Not a Reason	71	58.7	100.0
Sub Total	121	100.0	
Missing	166		
Total	287		

Over a third of the respondents (35.0%) indicated stress as a major or minor reason for interrupting their educations. However, a majority of respondents (65.0%) indicated it was not a reason for interrupting their educations.

**Table 23.** Stress.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Reason	16	13.0	13.0
Minor Reason	27	22.0	35.0
Not a Reason	80	65.0	100.0
Sub Total	123	100.0	
Missing	164		
Total	287		

Very few of the respondents (8.6%) cited academic standing as a major or minor reason for interrupting their educations. 91.4% of the respondents indicated it was not a reason.

**Table 24.** Academic standing.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Reason	3	2.6	2.6
Minor Reason	7	6.0	8.6
Not a Reason	106	91.4	100.0
Sub Total	116	100.0	
Missing	171		
Total	287		

Interruption for church/mission service was not a reason for 75.2% of the respondents. This is in keeping with the adult learner nature of the sample. The converse is true of students on campus at USU where the more traditional student attends.

**Table 25.** Church/mission service.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Reason	27	23.1	23.1
Minor Reason	2	1.7	24.8
Not a Reason	88	75.2	100.0
Sub Total	117	100.0	
Missing	170		
Total	287		

Job opportunity was a major or minor reason for interruptions for 42.5% of the respondents.

**Table 26.** Job opportunity.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Reason	36	30.0	30.0
Minor Reason	15	12.5	42.5
Not a Reason	69	57.5	100.0
Sub Total	120	100.0	
Missing	167		
Total	287		

For the majority of respondents (87.5%) illness was not a reason for interrupting their educations.

**Table 27.** Illness.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Reason	11	9.2	9.2
Minor Reason	4	3.3	12.5
Not a Reason	105	87.5	100.0
Sub Total	120	100.0	
Missing	167		
Total	287		

For 21.2% of the respondents lack of interest was a major or minor reason for interrupting their educations. For the majority (78.8%) it was not a reason.

**Table 28.** Lack of interest.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Reason	3	2.5	2.5
Minor Reason	22	18.6	21.2
Not a Reason	93	78.8	100.0
Sub Total	118	100.0	
Missing	169		
Total	287		



21.7% of the respondents cited transferring to another school as a major or minor reason for interrupting their educations. For 78.3% of the respondents this was not a reason.

**Table 29.** Transferred to another school.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Major Reason</b>	13	10.8	10.8
<b>Minor Reason</b>	13	10.8	21.7
<b>Not a Reason</b>	94	78.3	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	120	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	167		
<b>Total</b>	287		

No respondents interrupted their educations to participate in an exchange program.

**Table 30.** Exchange program.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Major Reason</b>	0	0.0	0.0
<b>Minor Reason</b>	0	0.0	0.0
<b>Not a Reason</b>	116	100.0	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	116		
<b>Missing</b>	171		
<b>Total</b>	287		

A very slim majority of the respondents (50.8%) cited employment demands as a major or minor reason for interrupting their educations.

**Table 31.** Employment demands.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Major Reason</b>	44	33.8	33.8
<b>Minor Reason</b>	22	16.9	50.8
<b>Not a Reason</b>	64	49.2	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	130	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	157		
<b>Total</b>	287		

## FINANCIAL AID

Respondents were asked to rate their sources of financial aid while attending USU. Each table represents a possible source. They were to indicate whether the source was major, minor, or not a source of financial aid. Percentages represent the sub total of the sample who responded to having received financial aid of some kind while attending USU.

34.3% of the respondents cited parents as a major or minor source of financial aid. However, 65.7% stated parents were not a source of financial aid.

**Table 32.** Parents.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Source	31	14.6	14.6
Minor Source	42	19.7	34.3
Not a Source	140	65.7	100.0
Sub Total	213	100.0	
Missing	74		
Total	287		

42.4% of the respondents cited their spouse as a source of financial aid while attending school. The majority (57.6%) indicated that their spouse was not a source of financial aid. More women than expected cited their spouses as a major or minor source of financial aid, and more men than women cited their spouses as not a source of financial aid ( $X^2 = 40.36$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

**Table 33.** Spouse.

<u>Reason</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Source	37	17.1	17.1
Minor Source	55	25.3	42.4
Not a Source	125	57.6	100.0
Sub Total	217	100.0	
Missing	70		
Total	287		

An overwhelming majority of respondents (91.2%) indicated that other relatives were not a source of financial aid.

**Table 34.** Other relatives.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Source	5	2.5	2.5
Minor Source	13	6.4	8.8
Not a Source	186	91.2	100.0
Sub Total	204	100.0	
Missing	83		
Total	287		

46.5% of the respondents indicated that their savings were a major or minor source of their financial aid. However, a very small majority ( 53.5%) indicated that savings were not a source of financial aid for their educations.

**Table 35.** Savings.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Major Source	50	23.3	23.3
Minor Source	50	23.3	46.5
Not a Source	115	53.5	100.0
Sub Total	215	100.0	
Missing	72		
Total	287		

A majority of respondents (72.2%) indicated that employment was a major or minor source of financial aid for their educations.

**Table 36.** Employment (not work-study).

<u>Source</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Major Source</b>	112	49.3	49.3
<b>Minor Source</b>	52	22.9	72.2
<b>Not a Source</b>	63	27.8	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	227	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	60		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Almost all respondents (98.5%) indicated that work-study was not a source of financial aid for their educations.

**Table 37.** Work-Study.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Major Source</b>	2	1.0	1.0
<b>Minor Source</b>	1	.5	1.5
<b>Not a Source</b>	199	98.5	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	202	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	85		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Almost all respondents (98.0%) indicated that a graduate assistantship was not a source of financial aid for their educations.

**Table 38.** Graduate assistantship.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Major Source</b>	3	1.5	1.5
<b>Minor Source</b>	1	.5	2.0
<b>Not a Source</b>	200	98.0	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	204	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	83		
<b>Total</b>	287		

The majority of respondents (72.9%) reported that scholarships were not a source of financial aid for their educations. However, 27.1% cited scholarships as a major or minor source of financial aid.

**Table 39.** Scholarship.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Major Source</b>	33	15.7	15.7
<b>Minor Source</b>	24	11.4	27.1
<b>Not a Source</b>	153	72.9	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	210	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	77		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Over one third of the respondents (35.6%) cited loans as a major or minor source of financial aid for their educations. However, the majority of respondents (64.4%) indicated loans were not a source of financial aid.

**Table 40.** Loans.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Major Source</b>	59	26.6	26.6
<b>Minor Source</b>	20	9.0	35.6
<b>Not a Source</b>	143	64.4	100.0
<b>Total</b>	222	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	65		
<b>Total</b>	287		

13.3% of the respondents cited grants as a major or minor source of financial aid for their educations. However, for the majority (86.7%) grants were not a source.

**Table 41.** Grants.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Major Source</b>	25	11.9	11.9
<b>Minor Source</b>	3	1.4	13.3
<b>Not a Source</b>	182	86.7	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	210	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	77		
<b>Total</b>	287		

A little over a quarter of the respondents (26.4%) cited veteran's benefits as a major or minor source of financial aid for their educations. This is much higher than on-campus samples, again reflecting the nature of this sample as adult learners.

**Table 42.** Veteran's benefits.

<u>Source</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Major Source</b>	46	20.9	20.9
<b>Minor Source</b>	12	5.5	26.4
<b>Not a Source</b>	162	73.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	220	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	67		
<b>Total</b>	287		

## ADVISING

A majority of respondents (61.0%) were assigned an advisor by their college or department. However, 14.8% did not know if they had an advisor.

**Table 43.** "Were you assigned an advisor by your college/department?"

<u>Assigned Advisor</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Yes	169	61.0	61.0
No	67	24.2	85.2
Don't know	41	14.8	100.0
Sub Total	277	100.0	
Missing	10		
Total	287		

A majority of respondents (59.3%) met with their advisors once or more a year. 40.7% reported never meeting with their advisors. More distance education students than on campus students never see their advisors.

**Table 44.** "How often did you meet with your advisor?"

<u>Met With Advisor</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Weekly	5	1.8	1.8
Monthly	9	3.3	5.1
Each Quarter/Semester	75	27.5	32.6
Once a Year	73	26.7	59.3
Never	111	40.7	100.0
Sub Total	273	100.0	
Missing	14		
Total	287		

A little over half of the respondents (51.3%) did not know what type of an advisor they had. A plurality of those students who knew (23.8%) indicated their advisor was a faculty member.

**Table 45.** Was your advisor a:

<u>Type of Advisor</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Continuing Ed Administrator	24	9.1	9.1
Faculty member	63	23.8	32.8
Full-time advisor	42	15.8	48.7
Don't know	136	51.3	100.0
Sub Total	265	100.0	
Missing	22		
Total	287		

A plurality of respondents (36.2%) reported that their major source for academic planning was the major requirement sheets. The next reported source was their advisors (20.3%).

**Table 46.** "What was the major source of planning in your academic program?"

<u>Source</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Advisor	55	20.3	20.3
Other faculty	13	4.8	25.1
Catalog	48	17.7	42.8
Major requirement sheets	98	36.2	79.0
Other students	24	8.9	87.8
Other	33	12.2	100.0
Sub Total	271	100.0	
Missing	16		
Total	287		

**Students' asked if their advisor did the following:**

A majority of respondents (64.3%) agreed or strongly agreed that their advisor gave them correct information on services and programs. About one quarter (26.4%) were neutral. 60 respondents or so did not answer the following items addressing advisor satisfaction. It is assumed that these may have been respondents who did not know who their advisor was and some who had possibly never seen their advisor.

**Table 47.** Gave me correct information on services/programs.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	72	31.7	31.7
Agree	74	32.6	64.3
Neutral	60	26.4	90.7
Disagree	10	4.4	95.2
Strongly Disagree	11	4.8	100.0
Sub Total	227	100.0	
Missing	60		
Total	287		

A majority of respondents (55.9%) agreed or strongly agreed that their advisor was interested in their welfare. 30.0% were neutral.

**Table 48.** Was interested in my welfare.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	57	25.1	25.1
Agree	70	30.8	55.9
Neutral	68	30.0	85.9
Disagree	14	6.2	92.1
Strongly Disagree	18	7.9	100.0
Sub Total	227	100.0	
Missing	60		
Total	287		

Less than half of the respondents (46.5%) agreed or strongly agreed that their advisors were readily available for consultation. 32.5% were neutral and 20.0% of the respondents disagreed or

strongly disagreed about the availability of their advisors.

**Table 49.** Was readily available for consultation.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	40	17.5	17.5
<b>Agree</b>	66	28.9	46.5
<b>Neutral</b>	74	32.5	78.9
<b>Disagree</b>	26	11.4	90.4
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	22	9.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	228	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	59		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Less than half of the respondents (44.1%) agreed or strongly agreed that their advisors helped them make academic career decisions. 36% were neutral.

**Table 50.** Helped me make academic/career decisions.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	39	17.6	17.6
<b>Agree</b>	59	26.6	44.1
<b>Neutral</b>	80	36.0	80.2
<b>Disagree</b>	24	10.8	91.0
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	20	9.0	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	222	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	65		
<b>Total</b>	287		

A majority of respondents (63.3%) agreed or strongly agreed that their interactions with their advisors were positive. 27.0% of the respondents were neutral.

**Table 51.** Interactions with my advisor were positive.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	75	33.2	33.2
<b>Agree</b>	68	30.1	63.3
<b>Neutral</b>	61	27.0	90.3
<b>Disagree</b>	8	3.5	93.8
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	14	6.2	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	226	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	61		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Barely over half of the respondents (51.3%) agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the advising system at USU. 27.9% of the respondents were neutral and 20.8% disagreed or strongly disagreed.

**Table 52.** Overall I was satisfied with the advising system at USU.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	53	23.5	23.5
Agree	63	27.9	51.3
Neutral	63	27.9	79.2
Disagree	25	11.1	90.3
Strongly Disagree	22	9.7	100.0
Sub Total	226	100.0	
Missing	61		
Total	287		

Just over half of the respondents (51.1%) agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the advising system in their colleges or departments. Nearly one third (31.7%) were neutral and 17.2% disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement.

**Table 53.** Overall I was satisfied with the advising system in my college/department.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	56	24.7	24.7
Agree	60	26.4	51.1
Neutral	72	31.7	82.8
Disagree	19	8.4	91.2
Strongly Disagree	20	8.8	100.0
Sub Total	227	100.0	
Missing	60		
Total	287		

A little over half of the respondents (52.9%) agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with their advisor. 32.9% of the respondents were neutral.

**Table 54.** Overall I was satisfied with my advisor.

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Strongly Agree	56	24.9	24.9
Agree	63	28.0	52.9
Neutral	74	32.9	85.8
Disagree	14	6.2	92.0
Strongly Disagree	18	8.0	100.0
Sub Total	225	100.0	
Missing	62		
Total	287		

## COURSES AND FACULTY

A very large majority of the respondents (91.1%) reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall quality of their educations at USU.



**Table 55.** Overall quality of education.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	100	36.9	36.9
<b>Satisfied</b>	147	54.2	91.1
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	16	5.9	97.0
<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	8	3.0	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	271	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	16		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Even more respondents (93.0%) stated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall quality of the University Studies/General Education programs at USU.

**Table 56.** Overall quality of University Studies/General Education.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	80	31.1	31.1
<b>Satisfied</b>	159	61.9	93.0
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	13	5.1	98.1
<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	5	1.9	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	257	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	30		
<b>Total</b>	287		

90.6% of the respondents reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with the overall quality of the program in their majors.

**Table 57.** Overall quality of the program in the major.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	84	31.5	31.5
<b>Satisfied</b>	158	59.2	90.6
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	16	6.0	96.6
<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	9	3.4	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	267	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	20		
<b>Total</b>	287		

A few less respondents, but still a majority (85.6%), were satisfied or very satisfied with the variety of courses in their majors.

**Table 58.** Variety of courses in the major.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	57	21.1	21.1
<b>Satisfied</b>	174	64.4	85.6
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	27	10.0	95.6
<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	12	4.4	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	270	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	17		
<b>Total</b>	287		

More respondents (91.5%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the variety of courses in University Studies/General Education.

**Table 59.** Variety of courses in University Studies/General Education.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	60	24.2	24.2
<b>Satisfied</b>	167	67.3	91.5
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	14	5.6	97.2
<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	7	2.8	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	248	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	39		
<b>Total</b>	287		

A large majority of respondents (92.9%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the challenge of courses in their majors.

**Table 60.** Challenge of courses in the major.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	90	33.7	33.7
<b>Satisfied</b>	158	59.2	92.9
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	12	4.5	97.4
<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	7	2.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	267	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	20		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Even more respondents (95.5%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the challenge of courses in University Studies/General Education.

**Table 61.** Challenge of courses in University Studies/General Education.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	71	28.7	28.7
Satisfied	165	66.8	95.5
Dissatisfied	4	1.6	97.2
Very Dissatisfied	7	2.8	100.0
Sub Total	247	100.0	
Missing	40		
Total	287		

84.9% of the respondents were either satisfied or very satisfied with the accessibility of faculty, some 6% to 10% or so lower than earlier items.

**Table 62.** Accessibility of faculty.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	64	23.7	23.7
Satisfied	165	61.1	84.8
Dissatisfied	34	12.6	97.4
Very Dissatisfied	7	2.6	100.0
Sub Total	270	100.0	
Missing	17		
Total	287		

A few more respondents (88.2%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the helpfulness of faculty.

**Table 63.** Helpfulness of faculty.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	82	30.3	30.3
Satisfied	157	57.9	88.2
Dissatisfied	24	8.9	97.0
Very Dissatisfied	8	3.0	100.0
Sub Total	271	100.0	
Missing	16		
Total	287		

92.6% of the respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the degree to which they were treated fairly while at USU.

**Table 64.** The degree to which you were treated fairly.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	98	36.2	36.2
Satisfied	153	56.5	92.6
Dissatisfied	13	4.8	97.4
Very Dissatisfied	7	2.6	100.0
Sub Total	271	100.0	

<b>Missing</b>	16
<b>Total</b>	287

## GOALS AND PROGRESS TOWARD GOALS

Students were asked to indicate the importance of a variety of goals in their college educations. Students were then asked to indicate the extent to which their education at USU contributed to their progress toward those goals. Tables are presented in pairs; first, Importance of Goal, and second Extent of Progress toward that goal.

The majority of respondents (97.3%) indicated that general knowledge was a very important or moderately important goal. Almost equal numbers of respondents (96.5%) reported their extent of progress toward this goal was good or very good.

**Table 65.** Importance of Goal: General knowledge.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	174	67.4	67.4
<b>Moderately Important</b>	77	29.8	97.3
<b>Not Important</b>	7	2.7	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	258	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	29		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 66.** Extent of Progress: General knowledge.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	88	34.0	34.0
<b>Good</b>	162	62.5	96.5
<b>Poor</b>	6	2.3	98.8
<b>Very Poor</b>	3	1.2	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	259	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	28		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Almost a third fewer respondents (69.5%) rated appreciation of the arts as moderately important or very important. However, more respondents (83.0%) reported having made good or very good progress toward meeting that goal.

**Table 67.** Importance of Goal: Appreciation of the arts.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	55	21.5	21.5
<b>Moderately Important</b>	123	48.0	69.5
<b>Not Important</b>	78	30.5	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	256	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	31		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 68.** Extent of Progress: Appreciation of the arts.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	38	15.4	15.4
Good	167	67.6	83.0
Poor	26	10.5	93.5
Very Poor	16	6.5	100.0
Sub Total	247	100.0	
Missing	40		
Total	287		

90.1% of the respondents ranked social interpersonal skills as moderately important or very important. 91.2% rated their progress toward this goal as good or very good.

**Table 69.** Importance of Goal: Social interpersonal skills.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	113	44.7	44.7
Moderately Important	115	45.5	90.1
Not Important	25	9.9	100.0
Sub Total	253	100.0	
Missing	34		
Total	287		

**Table 70.** Extent of Progress: Social interpersonal skills.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	59	23.5	23.5
Good	170	67.7	91.2
Poor	15	6.0	97.2
Very Poor	7	2.8	100.0
Sub Total	251	100.0	
Missing	36		
Total	287		

A few less respondents (88.4%) rated the goal of independence as very important or moderately important. However, more respondents (94.5%) reported their progress toward this goal as good or very good.

**Table 71.** Importance of Goal: Independence.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	123	47.7	47.7
Moderately Important	105	40.7	88.4
Not Important	30	11.6	100.0
Sub Total	258	100.0	
Missing	29		
Total	287		

**Table 72.** Extent of Progress: Independence.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	78	30.8	30.8
<b>Good</b>	161	63.6	94.5
<b>Poor</b>	10	4.0	98.4
<b>Very Poor</b>	4	1.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	253	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	34		
<b>Total</b>	287		

A large majority of respondents (89.9%) rated self-confidence as a very important or moderately important goal. About the same number of respondents (90.0%) reported good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 73.** Importance of Goal: Self confidence.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	150	58.1	58.1
<b>Moderately Important</b>	82	31.8	89.9
<b>Not Important</b>	26	10.1	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	258	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	29		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 74.** Extent of Progress: Self confidence.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	59	23.6	23.6
<b>Good</b>	166	66.4	90.0
<b>Poor</b>	17	6.8	96.8
<b>Very Poor</b>	8	3.2	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	250	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	37		
<b>Total</b>	287		

91.7% of the respondents reported that development of leadership skills was a very important or a moderately important goal. A few less respondents (88.8%) reported that their progress toward this goal was good or very good.

**Table 75.** Importance of Goal: Leadership skills.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	135	53.1	53.1
<b>Moderately Important</b>	98	38.6	91.7
<b>Not Important</b>	21	8.3	100.0
<b>Total</b>	254	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	33		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 76.** Extent of Progress: Leadership skills.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	68	27.1	27.1
<b>Good</b>	155	61.8	88.8
<b>Poor</b>	20	8.0	96.8
<b>Very Poor</b>	8	3.2	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	251	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	36		
<b>Total</b>	287		

A few less respondents (85.7%) reported that the importance of the development of sensitivity and tolerance to alternative views and cultures was moderately important or very important. However, more respondents (94.0%) reported that their progress toward this goal was good or very good.

**Table 77.** Importance of Goal: Sensitivity/tolerance to alternative views and cultures.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	107	42.5	42.5
<b>Moderately Important</b>	109	43.3	85.7
<b>Not Important</b>	36	14.3	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	252	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	35		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 78.** Extent of Progress: Sensitivity/tolerance to alternative views and cultures.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	76	30.5	30.5
<b>Good</b>	158	63.5	94.0
<b>Poor</b>	9	3.6	97.6
<b>Very Poor</b>	6	2.4	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	249	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	38		
<b>Total</b>	287		

86.4% of the respondents felt that the development of sensitivity and tolerance to others was a very important or moderately important goal. More respondents (92.3%) felt that they had made good or very good progress toward that goal.

**Table 79.** Importance of Goal: Sensitivity/tolerance to others.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	121	48.4	48.4
<b>Moderately Important</b>	95	38.0	86.4
<b>Not Important</b>	34	13.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	250	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	37		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 80.** Extent of Progress: Sensitivity/tolerance to others.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	75	30.4	30.4
<b>Good</b>	153	61.9	92.3
<b>Poor</b>	13	5.3	97.6
<b>Very Poor</b>	6	2.4	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	247	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	40		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Almost all of the respondents (98.4%) rated the development of their level of intellect as very important or moderately important. A few less respondents (93.7%) rated their progress in the development of their level of intellect as good or very good.

**Table 81.** Importance of Goal: Level of intellect.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	168	65.9	65.9
<b>Moderately Important</b>	83	32.5	98.4
<b>Not Important</b>	4	1.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	255	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	32		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 82.** Extent of Progress: Level of intellect.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	76	30.2	30.2
<b>Good</b>	160	63.5	93.7
<b>Poor</b>	13	5.2	98.8
<b>Very Poor</b>	3	1.2	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	252	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	35		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Fewer respondents (81.7%) felt that an affiliation with their department or college was moderately important or very important. Approximately the same proportion of respondents (80.5%) felt they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 83.** Importance of Goal: Affiliation with a department/program.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	79	30.7	30.7
<b>Moderately Important</b>	131	51.0	81.7
<b>Not Important</b>	47	18.3	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	257	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	30		
<b>Total</b>	287		



**Table 84.** Extent of Progress: Affiliation with a department/program.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	34	13.5	13.5
Good	168	66.9	80.5
Poor	33	13.1	93.6
Very Poor	16	6.4	100.0
Sub Total	251	100.0	
Missing	36		
Total	287		

Over half of the respondents (65.6%) rated interactions with international and minority students as moderately important or very important. A very few more respondents (67.9%) reported good or very good progress toward the goal.

**Table 85.** Importance of Goal: Interactions with international/minority students.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	52	20.3	20.3
Moderately Important	116	45.3	65.6
Not Important	88	34.4	100.0
Total	256	100.0	
Missing	31		
Total	287		

**Table 86.** Extent of Progress: Interactions with international/minority students.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	28	11.5	11.5
Good	137	56.4	67.9
Poor	54	22.2	90.1
Very Poor	24	9.9	100.0
Sub Total	243	100.0	
Missing	44		
Total	287		

About three quarters of the respondents (76.8%) cited informal interactions with professors as a moderately important or very important goal. Fewer respondents (69.1%) reported they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 87.** Importance of Goal: Informal interactions with professors.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	54	21.6	21.6
Moderately Important	138	55.2	76.8
Not Important	58	23.2	100.0
Sub Total	250	100.0	
Missing	37		
Total	287		

**Table 88.** Extent of Progress: Informal interactions with professors.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	38	15.3	15.3
<b>Good</b>	134	53.8	69.1
<b>Poor</b>	51	20.5	89.6
<b>Very Poor</b>	26	10.4	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	249	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	38		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Fewer respondents (63.4%) reported that affiliation with the USU community was a moderately important or very important goal. Fewer respondents (60.7%) reported that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal. However, 39.3% of the respondents reported that they had made poor or very poor progress toward this goal.

**Table 89.** Importance of Goal: Affiliation with the USU community.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	40	15.7	15.7
<b>Moderately Important</b>	121	47.6	63.4
<b>Not Important</b>	93	36.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	254	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	33		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 90.** Extent of Progress: Affiliation with the USU community.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	18	7.4	7.4
<b>Good</b>	130	53.3	60.7
<b>Poor</b>	64	26.2	86.9
<b>Very Poor</b>	32	13.1	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	244	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	43		
<b>Total</b>	287		

A very large majority (92.1%) of the respondents reported that the development of verbal skills was very important or moderately important. Again, a very large majority (90.3%) reported that they had made good or very good progress toward the development of these skills.

**Table 91.** Importance of Goal: Verbal skills.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	136	53.8	53.8
<b>Moderately Important</b>	97	38.3	92.1
<b>Not Important</b>	20	7.9	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	253	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	34		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 92.** Extent of Progress: Verbal skills.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	56	22.7	22.7
Good	167	67.6	90.3
Poor	18	7.3	97.6
Very Poor	6	2.4	100.0
Sub Total	247	100.0	
Missing	40		
Total	287		

89.0% of the respondents felt that working on their time management skills was very important or moderately important. A few less (83.7%) felt that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 93.** Importance of Goal: Time management.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	142	55.7	55.7
Moderately Important	85	33.3	89.0
Not Important	28	11.0	100.0
Sub Total	255	100.0	
Missing	32		
Total	287		

**Table 94.** Extent of Progress: Time management.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	56	22.9	22.9
Good	149	60.8	83.7
Poor	32	13.1	96.7
Very Poor	8	3.3	100.0
Sub Total	245	100.0	
Missing	42		
Total	287		

91.3% of the respondents reported that the development of planning and organizational skills was very important or moderately important. Less respondents (87.4%) reported they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 95.** Importance of Goal: Planning and organizational skills.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	146	57.7	57.7
Moderately Important	85	33.6	91.3
Not Important	22	8.7	100.0
Sub Total	253	100.0	
Missing	34		
Total	287		

**Table 96.** Extent of Progress: Planning and organizational skills.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	61	24.7	24.7
<b>Good</b>	155	62.8	87.4
<b>Poor</b>	24	9.7	97.2
<b>Very Poor</b>	7	2.8	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	247	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	40		
<b>Total</b>	287		

All most all respondents (98.4%) indicated that the development of job/career skills was very important or moderately important. Fewer, but still many respondents (92.3%) indicated that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 97.** Importance of Goal: Job/Career skills.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	217	85.4	85.4
<b>Moderately Important</b>	33	13.0	98.4
<b>Not Important</b>	4	1.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	254	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	33		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 98.** Extent of Progress: Job/Career skills.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	76	30.6	30.6
<b>Good</b>	153	61.7	92.3
<b>Poor</b>	15	6.0	98.4
<b>Very Poor</b>	4	1.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	248	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	39		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Fewer respondents (82.1%) indicated that management of their personal finances was a very important or moderately important goal. Slightly fewer respondents (79.7%) indicated that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 99.** Importance of Goal: Management of personal finances.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	132	52.4	52.4
<b>Moderately Important</b>	75	29.8	82.1
<b>Not Important</b>	45	17.9	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	252	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	35		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 100.** Extent of Progress: Management of personal finances.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	47	19.8	19.8
Good	142	59.9	79.7
Poor	37	15.6	95.4
Very Poor	11	4.6	100.0
Sub Total	237	100.0	
Missing	50		
Total	287		

82.6% of the respondents reported that a personal system of values was very important or moderately important. A few more respondents (87.4%) reported that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 101.** Importance of Goal: Personal system of values.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	121	47.8	47.8
Moderately Important	88	34.8	82.6
Not Important	44	17.4	100.0
Sub Total	253	100.0	
Missing	34		
Total	287		

**Table 102.** Extent of Progress: Personal system of values.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	59	24.7	24.7
Good	150	62.8	87.4
Poor	21	8.8	96.2
Very Poor	9	3.8	100.0
Sub Total	239	100.0	
Missing	48		
Total	287		

A majority of respondents (86.5%) reported that the development of awareness of social issues was moderately important or very important. About the same proportion of respondents (87.0%) reported that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 103.** Importance of Goal: Awareness of social issues.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	103	41.0	41.0
Moderately Important	114	45.4	86.5
Not Important	34	13.5	100.0
Sub Total	251	100.0	
Missing	36		
Total	287		

**Table 104.** Extent of Progress: Awareness of social issues.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	58	23.6	23.6
<b>Good</b>	156	63.4	87.0
<b>Poor</b>	25	10.2	97.2
<b>Very Poor</b>	7	2.8	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	246	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	41		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Nearly all respondents (96.0%) reported that the development of critical thinking abilities was a very important or moderately important goal. Nearly as many respondents (93.5%) reported that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 105.** Importance of Goal: Critical thinking abilities.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	162	64.3	64.3
<b>Moderately Important</b>	80	31.7	96.0
<b>Not Important</b>	10	4.0	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	252	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	35		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 106.** Extent of Progress: Critical thinking abilities.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	72	29.1	29.1
<b>Good</b>	159	64.4	93.5
<b>Poor</b>	14	5.7	99.2
<b>Very Poor</b>	2	.8	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	247	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	40		
<b>Total</b>	287		

A majority of the respondents (82.0%) reported that having an understanding of the sciences was moderately important or very important. Fewer respondents (77.5%) reported that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 107.** Importance of Goal: Understanding of the sciences.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	81	32.4	32.4
<b>Moderately Important</b>	124	49.6	82.0
<b>Not Important</b>	45	18.0	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	250	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	37		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 108.** Extent of Progress: Understanding of the sciences.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	40	16.7	16.7
<b>Good</b>	146	60.8	77.5
<b>Poor</b>	45	18.8	96.3
<b>Very Poor</b>	9	3.8	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	240	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	47		
<b>Total</b>	287		

90.3% of the respondents reported that developing the likelihood for a promotion or salary increase was a very important or moderately important goal for their educations. Fewer respondents (82.9%) reported that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 109.** Importance of Goal: Likelihood for promotion/salary increase.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	152	61.3	61.3
<b>Moderately Important</b>	72	29.0	90.3
<b>Not Important</b>	24	9.7	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	248	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	39		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 110.** Extent of Progress: Likelihood for promotion/salary increase.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	49	20.0	20.0
<b>Good</b>	154	62.9	82.9
<b>Poor</b>	33	13.5	96.3
<b>Very Poor</b>	9	3.7	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	245	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	42		
<b>Total</b>	287		

94.0% of the respondents reported that staying current with job demands was a very important or moderately important goal. Fewer respondents (88.2%) reported good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 111.** Importance of Goal: Staying current with job demands.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	159	64.1	64.1
<b>Moderately Important</b>	74	29.8	94.0
<b>Not Important</b>	15	6.0	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	248	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	39		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 112.** Extent of Progress: Staying current with job demands.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	61	24.8	24.8
Good	156	63.4	88.2
Poor	24	9.8	98.0
Very Poor	5	2.0	100.0
Sub Total	246	100.0	
Missing	41		
Total	287		

94.8% of the respondents reported that development of problem solving skills was very important or moderately important. Nearly as many respondents 91.8% reported having made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 113.** Importance of Goal: Problem solving skills.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	165	65.7	65.7
Moderately Important	73	29.1	94.8
Not Important	13	5.2	100.0
Sub Total	251	100.0	
Missing	36		
Total	287		

**Table 114.** Extent of Progress: Problem solving skills.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	74	30.3	30.3
Good	150	61.5	91.8
Poor	19	7.8	99.6
Very Poor	1	.4	100.0
Sub Total	244	100.0	
Missing	43		
Total	287		

Almost all of the respondents (98.8%) reported that to obtain professional skills was a very important or moderately important goal of their educations. Fewer respondents but still more than 9 in 10 reported that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 115.** Importance of Goal: Obtain professional skills.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	193	75.7	75.7
Moderately Important	59	23.1	98.8
Not Important	3	1.2	100.0
Sub Total	255	100.0	
Missing	32		
Total	287		



**Table 116.** Extent of Progress: Obtain professional skills.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	87	35.1	35.1
<b>Good</b>	140	56.5	91.5
<b>Poor</b>	17	6.9	98.4
<b>Very Poor</b>	4	1.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	248	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	39		
<b>Total</b>	287		

93.7% of the respondents reported that acquiring skills for self-directed learning was a very important or moderately important goal. Almost as many respondents (91.4%) reported that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 117.** Importance of Goal: Acquire skills for self directed learning.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	159	63.1	63.1
<b>Moderately Important</b>	77	30.6	93.7
<b>Not Important</b>	16	6.3	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	252	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	35		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 118.** Extent of Progress: Acquire skills for self directed learning.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	81	33.2	33.2
<b>Good</b>	142	58.2	91.4
<b>Poor</b>	17	7.0	98.4
<b>Very Poor</b>	4	1.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	244	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	43		
<b>Total</b>	287		

Over one third of the respondents (38.9%) reported that finding a spouse was a very important or moderately important goal. 61.1% reported that this goal was not important. This is indicative of the adult learners in this sample. 58.7% reported that they had made good for very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 119.** Importance of Goal: Find a spouse/partner.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	51	20.6	20.6
<b>Moderately Important</b>	45	18.2	38.9
<b>Not Important</b>	151	61.1	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	247	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	40		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 120.** Extent of Progress: Find a spouse/partner.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	44	20.2	20.2
Good	84	38.5	58.7
Poor	28	12.8	71.6
Very Poor	62	28.4	100.0
Sub Total	218	100.0	
Missing	69		
Total	287		

Over half of the respondents (60.2%) reported that preparation for family life was a very important or moderately important goal. More respondents (68.6%) reported that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 121.** Importance of Goal: Prepare for family life.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	77	31.3	31.3
Moderately Important	71	28.9	60.2
Not Important	98	39.8	100.0
Sub Total	246	100.0	
Missing	41		
Total	287		

**Table 122.** Extent of Progress: Prepare for family life.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	40	17.9	17.9
Good	113	50.7	68.6
Poor	27	12.1	80.7
Very Poor	43	19.3	100.0
Sub Total	223	100.0	
Missing	64		
Total	287		

Not quite half of the respondents (45.6%) reported that participation in extracurricular activities was a moderately important or very important goal. Over half (54.4%) reported that it was not an important goal. 52.0% of the respondents reports that they had made progress toward this goal.

**Table 123.** Importance of Goal: Participate in extracurricular activities.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	44	17.7	17.7
Moderately Important	69	27.8	45.6
Not Important	135	54.4	100.0
Sub Total	248	100.0	
Missing	39		
Total	287		

**Table 124.** Extent of Progress: Participate in extracurricular activities.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	22	9.9	9.9
Good	94	42.2	52.0
Poor	41	18.4	70.4
Very Poor	66	29.6	100.0
Sub Total	223	100.0	
Missing	64		
Total	287		

A majority of respondents (84.1%) reported that learning to work well with others was a very important or moderately important goal of their educations. A few more respondents (88.0%) reported that they had made good or very good progress toward this goal.

**Table 125.** Importance of Goal: Learn to work well with others.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	129	51.4	51.4
Moderately Important	82	32.7	84.1
Not Important	40	15.9	100.0
Sub Total	251	100.0	
Missing	36		
Total	287		

**Table 126.** Extent of Progress: Learn to work well with others.

<u>Progress</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	67	27.7	27.7
Good	146	60.3	88.0
Poor	20	8.3	96.3
Very Poor	9	3.7	100.0
Sub Total	242	100.0	
Missing	45		
Total	287		

## SUPPORT SERVICES

### Importance, Use and Opinion of Services

Respondents were asked to rate the level of importance and their satisfaction with support services made available to them by the university. If they had not used the service they were to indicate "didn't use". In determining the level of satisfaction, the following calculations were made: Didn't use and no response were subtracted from the total to determine the number of respondents who used the service. The percent of satisfaction was then calculated using this figure.

A majority of respondents (84.7%) reported that the Bookstore was very important or moderately important. 17.1% had not used the Bookstore. Of those who had used this service, 77.4% were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 127.** Importance of Service: Bookstore.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	130	51.0	51.0
Moderately Important	86	33.7	84.7
Not Important	39	15.3	100.0
Sub Total	255	100.0	
Missing	32		
Total	287		

**Table 128.** Use and Opinion of Service: Bookstore.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	44	21.1	21.1
Satisfied	117	56.3	77.4
Dissatisfied	28	13.5	90.9
Very Dissatisfied	19	9.1	100.0
Total	208	100.0	

Fewer respondents (60.8%), but still a majority, reported that Career Services was a moderately important or very important service. 58.9% of the respondents had not used the service. Of those who had used this service(99), 82 (82.8%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 129.** Importance of Service: Career Services.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	72	29.4	29.4
Moderately Important	77	31.4	60.8
Not Important	96	39.2	100.0
Sub Total	245	100.0	
Missing	42		
Total	287		

**Table 130.** Use and Opinion of Service: Career Services.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	11	11.0	11.0
Satisfied	71	71.8	82.8
Dissatisfied	9	9.1	91.9
Very Dissatisfied	8	8.1	100.0
Total	99	100.0	

A slight majority of respondents (55.2%) thought that the Cashier's Office was moderately important or very important. 49.2% had not used the service. Of those who had used this service (122), 112 (91.8%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 131.** Importance of Service: Cashier's Office.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	46	19.2	19.2
Moderately Important	86	36.0	55.2
Not Important	107	44.8	100.0
Sub Total	239	100.0	
Missing	48		
Total	287		

**Table 132.** Use and Opinion of Service: Cashier's Office.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	19	15.6	15.6
Satisfied	93	76.2	91.8
Dissatisfied	6	4.9	96.7
Very Dissatisfied	4	3.3	100.0
Total	122	100.0	

Less than half of the respondents (42.0%) reported that the Cazier Science and Technology Library was moderately important or very important. However 72.1% (173) had not used the library. Of the 67 respondents who had used the library 62 (92.6%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 133.** Importance of Service: Cazier Science and Technology Library.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	42	18.2	18.2
Moderately Important	55	23.8	42.0
Not Important	134	58.0	100.0
Sub Total	231	100.0	
Missing	56		
Total	287		

**Table 134.** Use and Opinion of Service: Cazier Science and Technology Library.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	15	22.4	22.4
Satisfied	47	70.2	92.6
Dissatisfied	3	4.5	97.1
Very Dissatisfied	2	2.9	100.0
Total	67	100.0	

Only 36.3% of the respondents ranked the Disability Resource Center as a moderately important or very important service, but 184 (77.0%) respondents had not used this service. Of the 55 respondents who had used it, 48 (87.3%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 135.** Importance of Service: Disability Resource Center.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	38	16.2	16.2
Moderately Important	47	20.1	36.3
Not Important	149	63.7	100.0
Sub Total	234	100.0	
Missing	53		
Total	287		

**Table 136.** Use and Opinion of Service: Disability Resource Center.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	8	14.6	14.6
Satisfied	40	72.7	87.3
Dissatisfied	4	7.3	94.6
Very Dissatisfied	3	5.4	100.0
Total	55	100.0	

A majority of respondents (50.2%) thought that the Counseling Center was a very important or moderately important service, but 159 (67.1%) had not used it. Of those 78 respondents who reported having used the center, 60 (77.0%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 137.** Importance of Service: Counseling Center.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	63	26.8	26.8
Moderately Important	55	23.4	50.2
Not Important	117	49.8	100.0
Sub Total	235	100.0	
Missing	52		
Total	287		

**Table 138.** Use and Opinion of Service: Counseling Center.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	10	12.9	12.9
Satisfied	50	64.1	77.0
Dissatisfied	9	11.5	88.5
Very Dissatisfied	9	11.5	100.0
Total	78	100.0	

A majority of respondents (66.0%) reported that the computer labs were a very important or moderately important service. 106 (44.2%) had not used this service. Of those who had 108 of 134 (80.6%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the service.

**Table 139.** Importance of Service: Computer Labs.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	105	43.6	43.6
Moderately Important	54	22.4	66.0
Not Important	82	34.0	100.0
Sub Total	241	100.0	
Missing	46		
Total	287		

**Table 140.** Use and Opinion of Service: Computer Labs.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	34	25.4	25.4
Satisfied	74	55.2	80.6
Dissatisfied	21	15.7	96.3
Very Dissatisfied	5	3.7	100.0
Total	134	100.0	

A large majority of respondents (79.7%) reported that the Distance Education Library Service was a very important or moderately important service. However, 83 (34.3%) of the respondents had not used this service. Of the 159 respondents who had used the service 136 (85.6%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 141.** Importance of Service: Distance Education Library Services.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	131	54.4	54.4
Moderately Important	61	25.3	79.7
Not Important	49	20.3	100.0
Sub Total	241	100.0	
Missing	46		
Total	287		

**Table 142.** Use and Opinion of Service: Distance Education Library Services.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	65	40.9	40.9
Satisfied	71	44.7	85.6
Dissatisfied	14	8.8	94.4
Very Dissatisfied	9	5.6	100.0
Total	159	100.0	

79.9% of the respondents indicated that the fee and tuition payment services were very important or moderately important. However, 60 (24.9%) of the respondents had not used this service. Of 181 who had used this service 157 (86.8%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 143.** Importance of Service: Fee & Tuition Payment Services.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	108	44.3	44.3
<b>Moderately Important</b>	87	35.7	79.9
<b>Not Important</b>	49	20.1	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	244	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	43		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 144.** Use and Opinion of Service: Fee & Tuition Payment Services.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	45	24.9	24.9
<b>Satisfied</b>	112	61.9	86.8
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	15	8.3	95.1
<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	9	4.9	100.0
<b>Total</b>	181	100.0	

A majority of respondents (63.0%) reported that the Financial Aid Office was very important or moderately important. However, 111 (45.9%) had not used this service. Of those who had used this service 106 of 131 (80.9%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 145.** Importance of Service: Financial Aid Office.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	94	39.5	39.5
<b>Moderately Important</b>	56	23.5	63.0
<b>Not Important</b>	88	37.0	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	238	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	49		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 146.** Use and Opinion of Service: Financial Aid Office.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	41	31.3	31.3
<b>Satisfied</b>	65	49.6	80.9
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	16	12.2	93.1
<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	9	6.9	100.0
<b>Total</b>	131	100.0	

67.5% of the respondents rated the General Registration Office as a moderately important or very important service. 97 (40.1%) had not used this service. 129 of 145 respondents (89.0%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the service. It is not clear that this question was understood by the respondents. This office serves students with low academic standing at the university, the rankings might indicate that the respondents thought this was an office servicing enrollment needs of students.



**Table 147.** Importance of Service: General Registration Office.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	75	32.1	32.1
Moderately Important	83	35.5	67.5
Not Important	76	32.5	100.0
Sub Total	234	100.0	
Missing	53		
Total	287		

**Table 148.** Use and Opinion of Service: General Registration Office.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	23	15.9	15.9
Satisfied	106	73.1	89.0
Dissatisfied	13	8.9	97.9
Very Dissatisfied	3	2.1	100.0
Total	145	100.0	

A little over half of the respondents (58.1%) ranked the Merrill Library as a moderately important or very important service. Remember that this is an off campus distance education sample, numbers are reportedly higher for the on campus population. As would be expected, 136 (56.4%) of the respondents had not used this service. Of those who had used the service 102 of 105 (97.2%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 149.** Importance of Service: Merrill Library.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	66	28.0	28.0
Moderately Important	71	30.1	58.1
Not Important	99	41.9	100.0
Sub Total	236	100.0	
Missing	51		
Total	287		

**Table 150.** Use and Opinion of Service: Merrill Library.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	36	34.3	34.3
Satisfied	66	62.9	97.2
Dissatisfied	3	2.8	100.0
Total	105	100.0	

A majority of respondents (76.1%) rated the Registration and Records Office as a moderately important or very important service. 34.3% had not used this service. Of those who had, 136 of 159 (85.6%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the service.

**Table 151.** Importance of Service: Registration & Records Office.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	71	30.3	30.3
Moderately Important	107	45.7	76.1
Not Important	56	23.9	100.0
Sub Total	234	100.0	
Missing	53		
Total	287		

**Table 152.** Use and Opinion of Service: Registration & Records Office.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	26	16.4	16.4
Satisfied	110	69.2	85.6
Dissatisfied	18	11.3	96.9
Very Dissatisfied	5	3.1	100.0
Total	159	100.0	

Less than a majority of respondents (46.2%) rated Student Orientation and Registration as a moderately important or very important program. A majority of respondents (53.8%) thought that it was not important. 142 (58.9%) of the respondents had not been involved with this program. Of those who had, 78 of 99 (78.8%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the program.

**Table 153.** Importance of Service: Student Orientation & Registration.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	47	19.9	19.9
Moderately Important	62	26.3	46.2
Not Important	127	53.8	100.0
Sub Total	236	100.0	
Missing	51		
Total	287		

**Table 154.** Use and Opinion of Service: Student Orientation & Registration.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	14	14.1	14.1
Satisfied	64	64.7	78.8
Dissatisfied	15	15.2	94.0
Very Dissatisfied	6	6.0	100.0
Total	99	100.0	

Only 40.0% of the respondents rated Touch Tone Registration as a moderately important or very important service. This is due to the fact that 173 (72.1%) of the respondents had not used this service. Of those who had used it, 62 of 67 (92.6%) were satisfied or very satisfied with the service.

**Table 155.** Importance of Service: Touch Tone Registration.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	36	15.7	15.7
<b>Moderately Important</b>	56	24.3	40.0
<b>Not Important</b>	138	60.0	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	230	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	57		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 156.** Use and Opinion of Service: Touch Tone Registration.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	16	23.9	23.9
<b>Satisfied</b>	46	68.7	92.6
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	5	7.4	100.0
<b>Total</b>	67	100.0	

Less than a majority of respondents (41.8%) rated the USU ID Card Office as a moderately important or very important service. 164 (68.3%) had not used this service. ID cards are available to distance education students who want them. They allow students to use other university libraries in closer proximity to them and also allow them to attend USU sports events. Of those respondents who had used the service, 70 of 76 (92.1%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 157.** Importance of Service: USU Card Office.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	31	13.4	13.4
<b>Moderately Important</b>	66	28.4	41.8
<b>Not Important</b>	135	58.2	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	232	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	55		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 158.** Use and Opinion of Service: USU Card Office.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	17	22.4	22.4
<b>Satisfied</b>	53	69.7	92.1
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	2	2.6	94.7
<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	4	5.3	100.0
<b>Total</b>	76	100.0	

Only 28.3% of the respondents rated Intramural and Club Sports as a moderately important or very important activity. 188 (79.3%) had not participated in these activities. Of those who had, 43 of 49 (87.7%) were satisfied or very satisfied with these activities.

**Table 159.** Importance of Service: Intramural/Club Sports.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	24	10.4	10.4
Moderately Important	41	17.8	28.3
Not Important	165	71.7	100.0
Sub Total	230	100.0	
Missing	57		
Total	287		

**Table 160.** Use and Opinion of Service: Intramural/Club Sports.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	6	12.2	12.2
Satisfied	37	75.5	87.7
Dissatisfied	2	4.1	91.8
Very Dissatisfied	4	8.2	100.0
Total	49	100.0	

Only 31.6% of the respondents rated KUSU Utah Public Radio as a moderately important or very important support service. 189 (79.1%) had not used this service. Of those who had, 47 or 50 (94.0%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 161.** Importance of Service: KUSU/Utah Public Radio.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Important	21	9.2	9.2
Moderately Important	51	22.4	31.6
Not Important	156	68.4	100.0
Sub Total	228	100.0	
Missing	59		
Total	287		

**Table 162.** Use and Opinion of Service: KUSU/Utah Public Radio.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Satisfied	11	22.0	22.0
Satisfied	36	72.0	94.0
Dissatisfied	1	2.0	96.0
Very Dissatisfied	2	4.0	100.0
Total	50	100.0	

Only 33.8% of the respondents rated the Statesman as a moderately important or very important support service. The Statesman is mailed to each distance education center each week, there is also an online version available. Which format of the Statesman the respondents were rating is not known. 172 (71.4%) of the respondents had not read the Statesman. Of those who had, 61 of 69 (88.4%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 163.** Importance of Service: Statesman.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	25	11.0	11.0
<b>Moderately Important</b>	52	22.8	33.8
<b>Not Important</b>	151	66.2	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	228	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	59		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 164.** Use and Opinion of Service: Statesman.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	13	18.8	18.8
<b>Satisfied</b>	48	69.6	88.4
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	3	4.3	92.7
<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	5	7.3	100.0
<b>Total</b>	69	100.0	

Only 30.9% of the respondents rated Varsity Athletics as a moderately important or very important service. 178 (75.1%) had not used this service. Of those who did, 53 of 59 (89.8%) were satisfied or very satisfied with it.

**Table 165.** Importance of Service: Varsity Athletics.

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Important</b>	28	12.0	12.0
<b>Moderately Important</b>	44	18.9	30.9
<b>Not Important</b>	161	69.1	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	233	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	54		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Table 166.** Use and Opinion of Service: Varsity Athletics.

<u>Satisfaction</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Satisfied</b>	13	22.0	22.0
<b>Satisfied</b>	40	67.8	89.8
<b>Dissatisfied</b>	4	6.8	96.6
<b>Very Dissatisfied</b>	2	3.4	100.0
<b>Total</b>	59	100.0	

## GENERAL EDUCATION PREPARATION

In this section the respondents were asked to rate how well the University Studies Program prepared them in the various domains of general education. Items that were rated as not applicable, not receiving their general education at USU, and those who did not respond to this item were subtracted out to determine the proportion of respondents who rated these items from very well to very poorly. Percentages are then presented based on the remaining proportion of respondents to each item.

**Communication.** There were 138 responses to this item. Of these respondents 130 (94.2%) rated their preparation as well or very well in this domain.

**Table 167.** General Education Preparation: Communication.

<u>Preparation</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Well	58	42.0	42.0
Well	72	52.2	94.2
Poorly	5	3.6	97.8
Very Poorly	3	2.2	100.0
Total	138	100.0	

**Numeracy.** There were 126 responses to this item. Of these respondents, 110 (87.3%) rated their preparation as well or very well in this domain.

**Table 168.** General Education Preparation: Numeracy.

<u>Preparation</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Well	43	34.1	34.1
Well	67	53.2	87.3
Poorly	12	9.5	96.8
Very Poorly	4	3.2	100.0
Total	126	100.0	

**Computer Literacy.** There were 138 responses to this item. Of these respondents, 123 (89.1%) rated their preparation as very well or well in this domain.

**Table 169.** General Education Preparation: Computer Literacy.

<u>Preparation</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Well	65	47.1	47.1
Well	58	42.0	89.1
Poorly	12	8.7	97.8
Very Poorly	3	2.2	100.0
Total	138	100.0	

**Humanities and Art.** There were 121 responses to this item. Of these respondents, 110 (90.9%) rated their preparation as well or very well in this domain.

**Table 170.** General Education Preparation: Humanities & Art.

<u>Preparation</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Well	41	33.9	33.9
Well	69	57.0	90.9
Poorly	8	6.6	97.5
Very Poorly	3	2.5	100.0
Total	121	100.0	

**Social Science.** There were 131 responses to this item. Of these respondents, 122 (93.1%) rated their preparation as well or very well in this domain.

**Table 171.** General Education Preparation: Social Science.

<u>Preparation</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Well	54	41.2	41.2
Well	68	51.9	93.1
Poorly	4	3.1	96.2
Very Poorly	5	3.8	100.0
<b>Total</b>	131	100.0	

**Life Science.** There were 113 responses to this item. Of these respondents, 101 (89.4%) rated their preparation as well or very well in this domain.

**Table 172.** General Education Preparation: Life Science.

<u>Preparation</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Well	31	27.4	27.4
Well	70	62.0	89.4
Poorly	6	5.3	94.7
Very Poorly	6	5.3	100.0
<b>Total</b>	113	100.0	

**Physical Science.** There were 102 responses to this item. Of these respondents, 93 (91.2%) rated their preparation as well or very well in this domain.

**Table 173.** General Education Preparation: Physical Science.

<u>Preparation</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Well	28	27.5	27.5
Well	65	63.7	91.2
Poorly	6	5.9	97.1
Very Poorly	3	2.9	100.0
<b>Total</b>	102	100.0	

## IMPRESSION OF USU

In this section the respondents were asked to give their impressions of various aspects of the university such as programs, departments, student quality, etc. Items that were rated as no opinion and no response were subtracted out to determine the proportion of respondents who rated this item from very good to poor. Percentages are then presented based on the proportion of respondents to each item.

**Undergraduate Programs.** 172 of 195 (88.2%) rated undergraduate programs as good or very good. However, 25.6% had no opinion.

**Table 174.** Impression: Undergraduate Programs.

<u>Impression</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	65	33.3	33.3
Good	107	54.9	88.2
Fair	20	10.3	98.5
Poor	3	1.5	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>195</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

**Major Department.** 201 of 237 (84.8%) rated their major department as good or very good.

**Table 175.** Impression: Major Department.

<u>Impression</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	95	40.1	40.1
Good	106	44.7	84.8
Fair	26	11.0	95.8
Poor	10	4.2	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

**Teaching Ability of Faculty.** 207 of 252 (82.1%) rated the teaching ability of faculty as good or very good.

**Table 176.** Impression: Teaching Ability of Faculty.

<u>Impression</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	95	37.7	37.7
Good	112	44.4	82.1
Fair	36	14.3	96.4
Poor	9	3.6	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

**Personal Interest of Faculty in Students.** 180 of 243 (74.1%) rated the personal interest of faculty in them as students as good or very good.

**Table 177.** Impression: Personal Interest of Faculty in Students.

<u>Impression</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Very Good	74	30.5	30.5
Good	106	43.6	74.1
Fair	53	21.8	95.9
Poor	10	4.1	100.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>100.0</b>	

**Quality of Students.** 195 of 243 (80.3%) rated the quality of their fellow students as good or very good.



**Table 178.** Impression: Quality of Students.

<u>Impression</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	58	23.9	23.9
<b>Good</b>	137	56.4	80.3
<b>Fair</b>	41	16.9	97.2
<b>Poor</b>	7	2.8	100.0
<b>Total</b>	243	100.0	

**Research Activities.** 155 of 207 (74.9%) rated research activities of the university as good or very good.

**Table 179.** Impression: Research Activities.

<u>Impression</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	43	20.8	20.8
<b>Good</b>	112	54.1	74.9
<b>Fair</b>	38	18.4	93.3
<b>Poor</b>	14	6.7	100.0
<b>Total</b>	207	100.0	

**Public Relations.** 139 of 198 (70.2%) rated the public relations of the university as good or very good.

**Table 180.** Impression: Public Relations.

<u>Impression</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Very Good</b>	39	19.7	19.7
<b>Good</b>	100	50.5	70.2
<b>Fair</b>	46	23.2	93.4
<b>Poor</b>	13	6.6	100.0
<b>Total</b>	198	100.0	

## AVAILABILITY

This section of the survey dealt with the availability of resources to distance education students. Respondents were asked to rate the following resources:

**Course Materials.** A majority of respondents (86.2%) rated course materials as usually available or always available.

**Table 181.** Availability: Course Materials.

<u>Availability</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Always Available</b>	79	30.3	30.3
<b>Usually Available</b>	146	55.9	86.2
<b>Available About ½ the Time</b>	20	7.7	93.9
<b>Unavailable More Than Available</b>	13	5.0	98.9
<b>Never Available</b>	3	1.1	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	261	100.0	

<b>Missing</b>	26
<b>Total</b>	287

**Technical Assistance.** A majority of respondents (78.4%) rated technical assistance for use with distance education was usually available or always available.

**Table 182.** Availability: Technical Assistance for Distance Education Technology.

<u>Availability</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Always Available</b>	82	31.7	31.7
<b>Usually Available</b>	121	46.7	78.4
<b>Available About ½ the Time</b>	31	12.0	90.4
<b>Unavailable More Than Available</b>	18	6.9	97.3
<b>Never Available</b>	7	2.7	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	259	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	28		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Multimedia Materials.** Fewer respondents, but still a majority (68.8%), rated multimedia materials as usually available or always available.

**Table 183.** Availability: Multimedia Materials.

<u>Availability</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Always Available</b>	54	21.6	21.6
<b>Usually Available</b>	118	47.2	68.8
<b>Available About ½ the Time</b>	44	17.6	86.4
<b>Unavailable More Than Available</b>	19	7.6	94.0
<b>Never Available</b>	15	6.0	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	250	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	37		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Library and Other Learning Resources.** A majority of respondents (71.6%) rated the library and other learning resources as usually available or always available.

**Table 184.** Availability: Library and Other Learning Resources.

<u>Availability</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Always Available</b>	69	27.6	27.6
<b>Usually Available</b>	110	44.0	71.6
<b>Available About ½ the Time</b>	30	12.0	83.6
<b>Unavailable More Than Available</b>	25	10.0	93.6
<b>Never Available</b>	16	6.4	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	250	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	37		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**Instructor (Other Than Class).** A majority of respondents (64.8%) rated the instructor as usually available or always available.

**Table 185.** Availability: Instructor (other than at class time).

<u>Availability</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Always Available	41	16.2	16.2
Usually Available	123	48.6	64.8
Available About ½ the Time	44	17.4	82.2
Unavailable More Than Available	30	11.9	94.1
Never Available	15	5.9	100.0
Sub Total	253		
Missing	34		
Total	287		

### CONDUCTIVENESS OF FACILITIES AND ENVIRONMENT

In this section the respondents were asked to rate the conduciveness of the facilities, the environment, and the technology to the learning process.

**“How conducive were the facilities (including equipment, furniture, etc.) at your site for the following?”**

**Communicating with the instructor during class.** A little over half of the respondents (53.5%) rated the conduciveness of the facilities as best or pleasant. 94.7% thought they were adequate or better.

**Table 186.** Facilities: For communicating with instructor during class.

<u>Facilities/Communicating</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Best	36	13.8	13.8
Pleasant	103	39.6	53.5
Adequate	107	41.2	94.6
Barely Tolerable	12	4.6	99.2
Worst	2	.8	100.0
Sub Total	260	100.0	
Missing	27		
Total	287		

**Communicating with Instructor After Class.** Less than half of the respondents (39.8%) rated the conduciveness of the facilities as best or pleasant with respect to furniture, etc.

**Table 187.** Facilities: For communicating with instructor after class.

<u>Facilities/Communicating</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Best	34	13.1	13.1
Pleasant	69	26.6	39.8
Adequate	109	42.1	81.9
Barely Tolerable	30	11.6	93.4
Worst	17	6.6	100.0
Sub Total	259	100.0	
Missing	28		
Total	287		

**Viewing Video Tapes and Other Multimedia Materials.** Only 39.8% of the respondents rated the facilities for viewing multimedia materials as pleasant or best, but 85.5% thought they were adequate or better.

**Table 188.** Facilities: For viewing multimedia material.

<u>Facilities/Viewing</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Best	27	10.5	10.5
Pleasant	75	29.3	39.8
Adequate	117	45.7	85.5
Barely Tolerable	28	10.9	96.5
Worst	9	3.5	100.0
Sub Total	256	100.0	
Missing	31		
Total	287		

**“How conducive was the environment (including noise, etc.) at your site for the following?”**

**Paying Attention to the Instructor.** Almost half the respondents (49.8%) rated the facilities as pleasant or best in terms of paying attention to the instructor. A majority of the respondents (83.5%) thought the facilities were adequate or better.

**Table 189.** Facilities: For paying attention to the instructor.

<u>Facilities/Paying Attention</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Best	43	16.5	16.5
Pleasant	87	33.3	49.8
Adequate	88	33.7	83.5
Barely Tolerable	31	11.9	95.4
Worst	12	4.6	100.0
Sub Total	261	100.0	
Missing	26		
Total	287		

**Taking Exams.** Over half of the respondents (55.4%) rated the facilities as conducive for taking exams. A majority (90.3%) thought the facilities were adequate or better.

**Table 190.** Facilities: For taking exams.

<u>Facilities/Taking Exams</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Best	55	21.3	21.3
Pleasant	88	34.1	55.4
Adequate	90	34.9	90.3
Barely Tolerable	19	7.4	97.7
Worst	6	2.3	100.0
Sub Total	258	100.0	
Missing	29		
Total	287		

**CLASSROOM TECHNOLOGY**

This section of the survey asked the respondents to rate statements about use of technology in their classrooms by agreeing or disagreeing with particular statements.

**“The technology used enhanced my learning.”** A majority of the respondents (74.7%) agreed or strongly agreed that technology enhanced their learning.

**Table 191.** “The technology used enhanced my learning.”

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	67	25.7	25.7
<b>Agree</b>	128	49.0	74.7
<b>Undecided</b>	44	16.9	91.6
<b>Disagree</b>	15	5.7	97.3
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	7	2.7	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	261	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	26		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**“The technology used was essential to the course (it could not have been delivered otherwise).”** A greater majority of the respondents (81.2%) strongly agreed or agreed that the courses could not have been delivered without the technology used for them.

**Table 192.** “The technology used was essential to the course (it could not have been delivered otherwise).”

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	109	41.8	41.8
<b>Agree</b>	103	39.5	81.2
<b>Undecided</b>	30	11.5	92.7
<b>Disagree</b>	13	5.0	97.7
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	6	2.3	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	261	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	26		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**“The technology used was reliable.”** A majority of the respondents (76.1%) agreed or strongly agreed that the technology used in their classes was reliable.

**Table 193.** “The technology was reliable.”

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	53	20.5	20.5
<b>Agree</b>	144	55.6	76.1
<b>Undecided</b>	35	13.5	89.6
<b>Disagree</b>	21	8.1	97.7
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	6	2.3	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	259	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	28		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**“The technology actually got in the way of learning.”** Only 22.8% of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the technology interfered with the learning process.

**Table 194.** “The technology actually got in the way of learning.”

<u>Agreement</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	22	8.5	8.5
<b>Agree</b>	37	14.3	22.8
<b>Undecided</b>	45	17.4	40.2
<b>Disagree</b>	101	39.0	79.2
<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	54	20.8	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	259	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	28		
<b>Total</b>	287		

### CLASSROOM ACTIVITIES

In this section the respondents were asked to report the number of exams, papers and projects assigned per course.

**“About how many exams did you take per course?”** A majority of respondents (87.3%) reported having to take 3-4 exams per course.

**Table 195.** “About how many exams did you take per course?”

<u>Number of Exams</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>0</b>	9	3.5	3.5
<b>1</b>	16	6.2	9.7
<b>2</b>	47	18.1	27.8
<b>3</b>	71	27.4	55.2
<b>4</b>	83	32.0	87.3
<b>5</b>	27	10.4	97.7
<b>6</b>	2	.8	98.5
<b>7</b>	4	1.5	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	259	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	28		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**“About how many major papers did you write per course?”** A majority of respondents (52.0%) wrote 1 or 2 major papers per course. 71.4% wrote 1-3 papers, and only 6.6% wrote 5 - 7 papers per course.

**Table 196.** “About how many major papers did you write per course?”

<u>Number of Major Papers</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>0</b>	21	8.1	8.1
<b>1</b>	66	25.6	33.7
<b>2</b>	68	26.4	60.1
<b>3</b>	50	19.4	79.5
<b>4</b>	36	14.0	93.4
<b>5</b>	9	3.5	96.9
<b>6</b>	3	1.2	98.1
<b>7</b>	5	1.9	100.0

<b>Sub Total</b>	258	100.0
<b>Missing</b>	29	
<b>Total</b>	287	

**“About how many *minor papers* did you write per course?”** A majority of respondents (71.3%) wrote 1-4 minor papers per course. Only 12.0% wrote no minor papers.

**Table 197.** “About how many minor papers did you write per course?”

<u>Number of Minor Papers</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
0	31	12.0	12.0
1	28	10.9	22.9
2	60	23.3	46.1
3	53	20.5	66.7
4	43	16.7	83.3
5	14	5.4	88.8
6	11	4.3	93.0
7	18	7.0	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	258	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	29		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**“About how many *projects* did you do per course?”** A majority of respondents (58.7%) completed 1-2 projects per course.

**Table 198.** “About how many projects did you do per course?”

<u>Number of Projects</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
0	32	12.4	12.4
1	95	36.7	49.0
2	57	22.0	71.0
3	27	10.4	81.5
4	18	6.9	88.4
5	5	1.9	90.3
6	9	3.5	93.8
7	16	6.2	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	259	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	28		
<b>Total</b>	287		

## INTERACTION

This section asked respondents to report on their classroom interactions.

**“In your opinion how important is interaction in a university classroom?”** A majority of respondents (90.5%) rated the importance of classroom interactions as essential, very important, and important.

**Table 199.** “In your opinion how important is interaction in a university class?”

<u>Importance</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
Essential	83	31.7	31.7
Very Important	82	31.3	63.0
Important	72	27.5	90.5
Slightly Important	22	8.4	98.9
Not Important at All	3	1.1	100.0
Sub Total	262	100.0	
Missing	25		
Total	287		

“In your university experience to date, during most class sessions about how many times did you interact with....?”

**The instructors.** A majority of respondents (55.4%) reported at least one, more than two, or 1-4 interactions with instructors per term. Only 2.7% of the respondents reported no interactions with their instructors per term.

**Table 200.** Times per class interacted with: Instructors.

<u>Interactions Per Term</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
More Than 2 Per Term	42	16.2	16.2
At Least 1 Per Term	37	14.2	30.4
5-10 Per Term	109	41.9	72.3
1-4 Per Term	65	25.0	97.3
0 Per Term	7	2.7	100.0
Sub Total	260	100.0	
Missing	27		
Total	287		

**The students at your location.** A plurality of respondents (35.0%) reported at least one, two, or 1-4 interactions with other students at their location. 42.0% reported no interactions with other students.

**Table 201.** Times per class interacted with: Students at the same site.

<u>Interactions Per Term</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
More Than 2 Per Term	21	8.2	8.2
At Least 1 Per Term	24	9.3	17.5
5-10 Per Term	59	23.0	40.5
1-4 Per Term	45	17.5	58.0
0 Per Term	108	42.0	100.0
Sub Total	257	100.0	
Missing	30		
Total	287		

**The students at other locations.** Unlike the previous question, a majority of respondents (53.1%) here interacted 5-10 times per terms with students at other sites. 12.9 % had no interactions with students at other sites.



**Table 202.** Times per class interacted with: Students at other sites.

<u>Interactions Per Term</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
More Than 2 Per Term	41	16.0	16.0
At Least 1 Per Term	14	5.5	21.5
5-10 Per Term	136	53.1	74.6
1-4 Per Term	32	12.5	87.1
0 Per Term	33	12.9	100.0
Sub Total	256	100.0	
Missing	31		
Total	287		

“About how many times did you study with other students?” A plurality of respondents (43.7%) reported studying with other students at least one, two, or 1-4 times per term. However, 37.9% reported never having studied with other students.

**Table 203.** “About how many times did you study with other students?”

<u>Interactions Per Term</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
More Than 2 Per Term	31	11.9	11.9
At Least 1 Per Term	26	10.0	21.8
5-10 Per Term	48	18.4	40.2
1-4 Per Term	57	21.8	62.1
0 Per Term	99	37.9	100.0
Sub Total	261	100.0	
Missing	26		
Total	287		

“How many times did the instructors encourage students to comment, ask questions or otherwise interact?” A majority of respondents (62.1%) reported that instructors encouraged students to interact 5-10 times per term.

**Table 204.** “How many times did the instructor encourage students to comment, ask questions, or otherwise interact?”

<u>Interactions Per Term</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
More Than 2 Per Term	44	16.9	16.9
At Least 1 Per Term	9	3.4	20.3
5-10 Per Term	162	62.1	82.4
1-4 Per Term	42	16.1	98.5
0 Per Term	4	1.5	100.0
Sub Total	261	100.0	
Missing	26		
Total	287		

“How often did you ask questions (either to instructors or other class members?)” A plurality of respondents (43.5%) reported that they asked between 5-10 questions per term.

**Table 205.** “How often did you ask questions, (either to instructors or other class members?)”

<u>Interaction Per Term</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
More Than 2 Per Term	40	15.4	15.4
At Least 1 Per Term	22	8.5	23.8
5-10 Per Term	113	43.5	67.3
1-4 Per Term	73	28.1	95.4
0 Per Term	12	4.6	100.0
Sub Total	260	100.0	
Missing	27		
Total	287		

“About how many times did you want to ask a question, but were not able to do so?” A plurality of respondents (39.1%) reported they were unable to ask a question. However, a majority of respondents (60.9%) wanted to ask questions between 1-10 times but were not able to do so.

**Table 206.** “About how many times did you want to ask question, but were not able to?”

<u>Interactions Per Term</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
More Than 2 Per Term	26	10.0	10.0
At Least 1 Per Term	51	19.5	29.5
5-10 Per Term	31	11.9	41.4
1-4 Per Term	51	19.5	60.9
0 Per Term	102	39.1	100.0
Sub Total	261	100.0	
Missing	26		
Total	287		

#### KINDS OF QUESTIONS ASKED OVER THE SYSTEM

“Generally the kinds of questions asked over the system were...(choose one).” The majority of respondents (65.3%) asked questions about subject matter. A plurality of respondents (23.3%) asked questions about assignments.

**Table 207.** Kinds of questions asked over the system.

<u>Kinds of Questions</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
About Social Life	2	.8	.8
About Exams	23	8.8	9.5
About Assignments	61	23.3	32.8
About Conduct of the Class	5	1.9	34.7
About Subject Matter	171	65.3	100.0
Sub Total	262	100.0	
Missing	25		
Total	287		

“Generally the kinds of questions asked at the local sites were...(choose one).” A majority of respondents (52.8%) asked questions about subject matter, followed by a plurality of respondents (29.4%) who asked questions about assignments.

**Table 208.** Kinds of questions asked at the local sites.

<u>Kinds of Questions</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
About Social Life	10	4.0	4.0
About Exams	21	8.3	12.3
About Assignments	74	29.4	41.7
About Conduct of the Class	14	5.6	47.2
About Subject Matter	133	52.8	100.0
Sub Total	252	100.0	
Missing	35		
Total	287		

**PERCENT COURSES TAKEN BY RESPONDENTS IN THREE MODES**

**Face-to-face.** More than a third of the respondents (38.0%) had not taken a course with an instructor face-to-face (the principle modal frequency). A secondary modal frequency group reported that 50 percent of their courses were taken face-to-face. The median was 20 percent.

**Table 209.** Percent courses taken face-to-face.

<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
0	71	38.0	38.0
1	1	.5	38.5
2	2	1.1	39.6
5	8	4.3	43.9
8	1	.5	44.4
10	9	4.8	49.2
15	1	.5	49.7
20	7	3.7	53.5
25	7	3.7	57.2
30	11	5.9	63.1
33	1	.5	63.6
34	1	.5	64.2
40	4	2.1	66.3
45	1	.5	66.8
50	17	9.1	75.9
55	1	.5	76.5
60	1	.5	77.0
65	1	.5	77.5
70	4	2.1	79.7
75	6	3.2	82.9
80	5	2.7	85.6
85	4	2.1	87.7
88	1	.5	88.2
89	1	.5	88.8
90	12	6.4	95.2
95	1	.5	95.7
97	1	.5	96.3
98	4	2.1	98.4
99	2	1.1	99.5
100	1	.5	100.0
Sub Total	187	100.0	

<b>Missing</b>	100
<b>Total</b>	287

**Satellite delivery.** Only 2.4% of the respondents had not taken a course by satellite delivery. The modal frequency was 100 percent. The secondary modal frequency was 50 percent. The median was 98 percent.

**Table 210.** Percent courses taken by satellite delivery.

<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
0	6	2.4	2.4
1	5	2.0	4.5
2	3	1.2	5.7
5	1	.4	6.1
7	1	.4	6.5
9	1	.4	6.9
10	12	4.9	11.8
11	1	.4	12.2
12	1	.4	12.7
20	6	2.4	15.1
22	1	.4	15.5
25	7	2.9	18.4
30	4	1.6	20.0
33	1	.4	20.4
40	3	1.2	21.6
45	2	.8	22.4
49	1	.4	22.9
50	14	5.7	28.6
59	1	.4	29.0
60	4	1.6	30.6
62	1	.4	31.0
65	1	.4	31.4
68	1	.4	31.8
70	8	3.3	35.1
73	1	.4	35.5
75	8	3.3	38.8
80	6	2.4	41.2
85	2	.8	42.0
89	1	.4	42.4
90	10	4.1	46.5
95	8	3.3	49.8
98	3	1.2	51.0
99	2	.8	51.8
100	118	48.2	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	245	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	42		
<b>Total</b>	287		

**On line (web based or otherwise computer mediated).** A majority of the respondents (65.6%) had not taken a class that was on line.

**Table 211.** Percent courses taken online.

<u>Percent</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid Percent</u>	<u>Cumulative Percent</u>
<b>0</b>	105	65.6	65.6
<b>1</b>	9	5.6	71.3
<b>2</b>	5	3.1	74.4
<b>3</b>	1	.6	75.0
<b>5</b>	11	6.9	81.9
<b>6</b>	1	.6	82.5
<b>10</b>	15	9.4	91.9
<b>20</b>	1	.6	92.5
<b>25</b>	3	1.9	94.4
<b>34</b>	1	.6	95.0
<b>40</b>	1	.6	95.6
<b>50</b>	2	1.3	96.9
<b>60</b>	1	.6	97.5
<b>80</b>	1	.6	98.1
<b>90</b>	1	.6	98.8
<b>95</b>	1	.6	99.4
<b>100</b>	1	.6	100.0
<b>Sub Total</b>	160	100.0	
<b>Missing</b>	127		
<b>Total</b>	287		

- End -