

Survey Summary

Teresa M. Woods

Overall:

1. When developing specific objectives and outcomes, the open-ended responses should be considered – there are valuable insights and thoughts.
2. There were a significant number of questions and criticism related to the survey presenting only topic headings rather than learning objectives as it claimed. Many respondents indicated their support depended on the definitions of the learning objectives. Other respondents confused the topic titles with required classes.
3. My own analysis of open-ended comments was quick and singular (i.e., not iterative, and not compared with others' analysis).
4. It is important to remember that not all respondents commented in the open-ended portions.
5. Some responses were coded in more than one category.
6. Many respondents answered with a "Yes, I support this, but"
7. Many comments, while not mentioned by a large number, are worth considering.
8. Specific summary and recommendations are made at the end of each question data.
9. How will demographic information at end be used?

Questions:

Q1. Written and Oral Communication

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
90.85%	7.19%	1.96%	0.00%	0.00%	
139	11	3	0	0	153

Total Support: 98.04%

QUAL:

It's important: 58

Students have low skills: 9

Negative / Questioning: 2

Should include more: 4

Should include visual communication

Should include both production (writing/speaking) and reception (reading/listening)

Other comments should be considered when writing objectives.

Summary: Well supported topic. Consider including visual communication, and both production (writing/speaking) and reception (reading/listening). Possibly combine reading/listening with Information Literacy (see Q3).

Q2. Quantitative and Financial Literacy

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
43.05%	37.09%	15.23%	1.99%	2.65%	
65	56	23	3	4	151

Total support: 80.14%

QUAL:

It's important: 64

Separate Quant/Financial 13

Negative / Questioning: 7

Depends on definition, etc: 11 ("Quantitative Skills" (not literacy), Should not be required at university level, Depends on major)

Summary: Well supported in a "Yes, but..." way. Recommend separating out Quantitative and Financial Literacy. Consider context of different majors.

Q3. Information and Technology Literacy

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	N
51.33%	32.67%	10.00%	3.33%	2.67%	
77	49	15	5	4	150

Total support: 84.00%

QUAL:

It's important: 36
 Need to include ethics, information processing, safety, beyond social media: 16
 Negative / Questioning: 16 (e.g., should be subsumed into others, or separated)
 Info yes, but not tech: 10
 Increase rigor: 6 (e.g., advanced research)

Summary: Well supported in a "Yes, but..." way. Recommend separating out Information and Technology. Information literacy more supported than technology (technology more discipline-specific, though also supported). Consider including information processing. Possibly combine with reading/listening and visual communication (see comments on Q1). Technology possibly combined with Q7.

Q4. Inquiry and Analysis

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	N
58.67%	28.00%	10.67%	2.00%	0.67%	
88	42	16	3	1	150

Total Support: 86.67%

QUAL:

It's important: 36
 Should be / is subsumed: 9
 Negative / Questioning: 7
 Depends on meaning: 7

Summary: Well supported. Concerns noted unclear definitions, and that this should be within the purview of the disciplines rather than at the university level.

Q7. Exploratory knowledge of human culture and the natural and physical world (i.e., sciences, humanities, social sciences, and the arts)

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
63.76%	26.17%	7.38%	2.01%	0.67%	
95	39	11	3	1	149

Total Support: 89.93%

QUAL:

It's important: 44
 Too much – needs splitting: 7
 Already integrated into other areas: 4 (e.g., global issues, civic engagement)
 Negative / Questioning: 7

Summary: Well supported. Notable numbers indicate there is too much in this, and suggest splitting into 1) human culture (humanities, arts, social sciences), and 2) natural and designed world (sciences – perhaps technology here – see Q3).

Q8. Cross-disciplinary thinking

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
38.26%	43.62%	14.09%	2.68%	1.34%	
57	65	21	4	2	149

Total Support: 81.88%

QUAL:

It's Important: 32
 Limit &/or incorporate into other areas: 10 (is this an approach vs. objective?)
 Negative / Questioning: 5
 Not relevant or important: 4

Summary: Well supported in a “Yes, but ...” type way. Main concern was that this is an approach that should be limited and/or incorporated into other areas, but not be an objective on its own.

Q9. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning (note: this includes personal wellness)

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
27.70%	39.19%	22.97%	5.41%	4.73%	
41	58	34	8	7	148

Total Support: 66.89%

QUAL:

It's important: 20
 Do not need here – embed elsewhere: 20
 Negative / Questioning: 11 current personal wellness course criticized
 Depends on meaning: 13

Summary: Generally supported in a “Yes, but ...” way. Concerns pointed to embedding in other areas, that it depended on the definition/meaning, and the current personal wellness course was criticized.

Q10. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
40.27%	45.64%	10.07%	2.68%	1.34%	
60	68	15	4	2	149

Total Support: 85.91%

QUAL:

It's important: 25
 Should embed elsewhere: 6
 Negative / Questioning: 5
 Depends on definition: 11
 Knowledge yes, not engagement: 5 (“engagement is none of our business,” engagement can be coercion, engagement encouraged but not required, separate these two)

Summary: Well supported, with qualifications regarding it depends on the definition and meaning. Several notable respondents agreed with Civic Knowledge, but not Engagement. Consider removing the Engagement part.

Q11. Global knowledge and intercultural competence

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
38.51%	46.62%	12.16%	2.70%	0.00%	
57	69	18	4	0	148

Total Support: 85.13%

QUAL:

It's important: 27
 Embed elsewhere: 6 (join with #10?)
 Negative / Questioning: 6 ("redundant")
 Depends on definition: 4 (separate global knowledge and intercultural competence)

Summary: Well supported. Comments suggest this is redundant and could be embedded elsewhere (e.g., Q10).

Q12. Ethical Reasoning and action

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
44.59%	46.62%	6.08%	2.03%	0.68%	
66	69	9	3	1	148

Total Support: 91.21%

QUAL:

It's important: 24
 Embed/integrate elsewhere: 9 (critical thinking, campus culture, cross-discipline,
 Negative / Questioning: 3 need content to give context)
 Depends on definition: 3
 Separate Reasoning & Action: 4 ("Reasoning, sure. Action, none of our business")
 Not imp't for all but for some: 2

Summary: Well supported in a "Yes, but ..." way, with two notable concerns. First, that this should be embedded elsewhere. Second that "Action" should be removed.

Q13. Teamwork and problem solving

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
39.46%	37.41%	16.33%	4.08%	2.72%	
58	55	24	6	4	147

Total Support: 76.87%

QUAL:

It's important: 29

Integrate/incorporate
elsewhere: 10

Negative / Questioning: 4

Depends on definition: 9

Separate concepts: 7

("Yes on problem-solving, no on teamwork." "Some of the greatest thinkers worked alone." "Individual must be elevated and held accountable...")

Summary: Well supported in a "Yes, but ..." way, especially depending on definition. Consider separating Teamwork and Problem Solving, embedding them in other constructs (courses/programs), and possibly removing Teamwork (see quotes above).

Q14. Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies (e.g., capstone experiences, etc.)

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
25.50%	35.57%	27.52%	6.04%	5.37%	
38	53	41	9	8	149

Total Support: 61.07%

QUAL:

It's important: 11

Should be in dept/program,
not university-wide: 17

Negative/questioning: 7 ("sounds like micromanaging ...")

Depends on definition: 2

Summary: Marginally supported, and in a "Yes, but ..." way. Majority of comments indicated it should be managed in programs/departments as discipline appropriate rather than through university curriculum. Reconsider this for inclusion.

Q15. Career and interpersonal skills

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
27.03%	44.59%	17.57%	4.73%	6.08%	
40	66	26	7	9	148

Total Support: 71.62%

QUAL:

It's important:	13	
Impt, but leave to dept/ programs:	14	
Already incorporated elsewhere:	10	("Redundant")
Negative / questioning:	5	
Depends on definition, separate out:	7	

Summary: Generally supported in a "Yes, but ..." way. Majority of comments indicated it is redundant, and should be incorporated elsewhere (e.g., departments, programs). Reconsider this for inclusion.

Q16. Integration with Major

Strongly Support	Support	Neither Support/Oppose	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	n
27.21%	36.73%	27.89%	2.72%	5.44%	
40	54	41	4	8	147

Total Support: 63.94%

QUAL:

It's important:	7	
Concern about lost breadth:	11	(concern about functioning as a trade school)
Negative / questioning:	10	("Redundant")
Unclear – need more info:	20	

Summary: Marginally supported in a "Yes, but ..." way. Most concerns related to lack of understanding of this, that it is redundant, and that it would indicate the university is more of a trade school than a liberal arts school.

Q17. Please indicate any other objectives not described above that you would like to see considered by the committee

Survey too vague to give meaningful feedback:	6
Writing skills very important:	3
Need to include critical reading:	2
More fine arts and diverse university fields:	2
Need to ensure more flexibility in curriculum:	2
Good job, committee:	2
Don't eliminate international studies:	1
Learning for learning's sake (e.g., nontrad. students)	1
Soft skills – table manners, prof. dress, social graces, etc.:	1
Social structure, institutions, processes, power:	1
Tolerance of cultural and sub-cultural social groups:	1
Proficiency in interacting with diverse others:	1
Gender relations:	1
Knowledge of history:	1
Megatrends:	1
Use existing objectives:	1
Cut duplication of programs/services:	1
Some objectives seem relevant only to upper division:	1
Needs a lot of intentional thought to prioritize:	1
Produce a product that has market value:	1
Creativity and curiosity get lost but are essential:	1

Q18. What is your gender?

F=53.42% (78) M=41.78% (61) Other=4.79% (7)

QUAL (Other):

Human, irrelevant, why does this matter? 7

Q19. How long have you worked at FHSU?

Less than 1 year:	8.84% (13)
1-2 years:	11.56% (17)
3-5 years:	19.05% (28)
More than 5 years:	60.54% (89)

Q20. What is your job role?

Faculty:	68.03% (100)
Staff:	14.97% (22)
Admin:	10.20% (15)
Other:	6.80% (10)

Q21. In what division do you work primarily?

College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences:	41.98% (55)
College of Business and Entrepreneurship:	9.16% (12)
College of Education:	6.11% (8)
College of Health and Behavioral Sciences:	9.16% (12)
College of Science, Technology, and Mathematics:	16.79% (22)
Division of Academic Affairs:	6.11% (8)
Division of Administration and Finance:	2.29% (3)
Division of Student Affairs:	5.34% (7)
Division of Technology:	3.05% (4)
FHSU Foundation:	0.00% (0)
Athletics:	0.00% (0)
President's Office:	0.00% (0)
Other (13)	
(University Relations & Marketing, Residential Life, Forsyth Library, Virtual College, multiple, etc.)	

How will demographic data be used?