

**Department of Education
Unit Operations Survey (Undergraduate)
Pilot – Spring 2011**

Purpose and Administration

The unit operations online survey was developed to evaluate the facilities, services and procedures provided by the Department of Education in support of student learning. It was administered for the first time in the spring of 2011 to all students with education majors and others who had taken courses in the department during the 2010-11 academic year ($N = 183$). A total of 70 completed surveys were returned, yielding a response rate of 38%.

The survey contains sets of items addressing the following aspects of students and their Department of Education experience: demographics, advising, organization of learning experience, support, evaluation of performance, modeling by EMU faculty, Department of Education facilities, and facilities and services outside the Department of Education. There is also a single item allowing students to rate their overall experience on a five-point scale of “Very high quality” to “Very low quality.” Finally, each set of items is associated with a free-response item, and there are three free-response items at the end of the survey asking students to identify strengths and weaknesses and to provide any additional comments they wish to express.

Other items for which students provide ratings are summarized by topic in the table below:

Topic	Scale(s)	Points	Anchors
Advising Organization of learning experience Support	Quality and Importance	5	Very important.....Very unimportant Very good.....Very poor
Evaluation of importance	Fairness and Accuracy	4	Very fair.....Very unfair Very accurate.....Very inaccurate
EMU faculty modeling	Frequency	5	Almost always.....Almost never
Department of Education facilities Services and facilities outside dept.	Quality	5	Very good.....Very poor

Most scales included a “Not applicable” response option, and these responses are excluded from mean and frequency calculations. Means and response frequencies for all items are provided in the appendix.

Analysis and Results

Demographics (complete tabulation of demographic items provided in the appendix)

- Gender: Females were slightly overrepresented in the survey sample, providing 73% of responses.
- Class level: The majority of respondents (65%) were juniors and seniors.
- Program gates: The majority of respondents had been admitted to program (60%) and had not been admitted to student teaching (61%).
- Licensure areas: Half of respondents were seeking Secondary or PreK-12 licensure, and almost one-third (31%) were seeking PreK6 licensure.
- Number of education advisors: Half of respondents have had one education advisor and only 14% of respondents have had more than two.

Overall experience

Almost all respondents (96%, $n = 63$) rated the quality of their overall experience in the Department of Education as “Very high” or “high,” with an average rating of 4.4 on the five-point scale.

Advising, Organization of learning experience, and Support

Items rated on both Quality and Importance were analyzed by examining the mean ratings as well the “gap” between the quality and importance ratings. The significance of the magnitude of these gaps was determined by a paired samples *t*-test in combination with an effect size analysis. The table below presents the quality and importance means, and the gap between those means, for the 16 items addressing advising, organization of learning experience, and support, ordered by highest quality rating to lowest. Large negative gaps indicate items that students rated higher on the importance scale than on the quality scale. Gaps marked with an asterisk (*) were determined to be significant (i.e., statistically significant and having an effect size of $d \geq 0.5$).

On average, all items were rated at 4.0 or higher on the five-point quality scale and all items except for computer support were rated above 4.0 on the five-point importance scale. There were two significant gaps indicating that some improvement may be needed in the following areas: access to courses and preparation for student teaching.

Item	N	Quality	Importance	Gap
Overall experience with student teaching	24	4.8	4.9	-0.1
Demonstration of EMU's caring framework in Education advising	67	4.6	4.4	0.2
Availability of Education advisor	65	4.6	4.5	0.2
Clarity of written guidelines for admission to Teacher Education	65	4.5	4.6	-0.1
Accuracy of Education advising - EMU Core requirements	66	4.5	4.4	0.0
Accuracy of Education advising - program requirements	67	4.5	4.7	-0.1
Experience with practicum/preparation for student teaching	63	4.5	4.8	-0.3*
Overall interactions with faculty for support	65	4.5	4.6	-0.1
Clarity of written guidelines for admission to Student Teaching	50	4.4	4.6	-0.2
Quality of Education advising - completing requirements	67	4.4	4.7	-0.3
Support for field placement	61	4.4	4.5	-0.1
Support for students of diversity	39	4.3	4.5	-0.2
Administrative support	63	4.3	4.3	0.0
Access to the courses you need	66	4.0	4.8	-0.8*
Support for PRAXIS	40	4.0	4.2	-0.1
Computer support	53	4.0	3.8	0.2

Evaluation of performance

The table below presents the fairness and accuracy means for the four items addressing assessments. On average, all assessment items were rated as highly fair and accurate (3.5 or higher on a four-point scale), with assessments in education courses being rated the most fair and accurate.

<i>Assessments...</i>	N	Fairness	Accuracy
...in your Content Area/Liberal Arts courses	55	3.6	3.5
...in your Education courses	61	3.8	3.7
...used to measure your Teaching Performance	50	3.8	3.6
...used to measure your Dispositions	49	3.7	3.5

EMU faculty modeling

The table below presents the mean ratings for the six items addressing the frequency with which EMU education faculty model certain behaviors, ordered from most frequent to least ($n = 63$). On average, all behaviors were rated above 4.0 on the five-point frequency scale.

<i>EMU Faculty model appropriate ...</i>	Mean
...caring for students	4.7
...reflective practice	4.7
...classroom assessment techniques	4.6
...classroom organization, management and procedures	4.5
...pedagogy/teaching practices	4.4
...time management	4.3

Facilities and services

The table below presents the mean ratings for the 19 items addressing the quality of facilities and services, ordered from highest quality to lowest, in the categories of within and outside the Department of Education. On average, facilities and services were rated as “Good,” with range of 3.5 to 4.4 on a five-point scale. It should be noted that relatively few respondents rated the items dealing with career placement, disability support, multicultural, and conflict resolution services.

	N	Mean
<i>Department of Education</i>		
Classrooms	66	4.3
Education computer lab (Campus Center 234)	59	4.3
Library holdings for children's and young adult literature	46	4.0
Curriculum library	43	3.9
<i>Outside Department of Education</i>		
Career placement services	22	4.4
Computer labs	63	4.3
Access to technologies	62	4.2
Access to the library, media materials, and online databases	61	4.1
Student Disability Support Services	18	4.1
Building accessibility	61	4.1
Residential services	51	4.1
Opportunity to interact with diversity	58	4.0
Health Services	47	4.0
Intellectual/Spiritual experiences	57	3.9

	N	Mean
Multicultural Services	24	3.9
Conflict resolution	23	3.9
Quality of Hartzler library holdings	57	3.8
Financial services/billing	57	3.8
Parking	51	3.5

Appendix

Demographics

	N	%
Gender		
Female	51	73%
Male	19	27%
Hispanic		
Yes	2	3%
No	64	91%
Missing	4	6%
Race		
White	62	89%
Black or African American	3	4%
Asian	2	3%
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0%
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0	0%
Multi-race	1	1%
Not reported	2	3%
Class level		
FR	13	19%
SO	11	16%
JR	17	24%
SR	29	41%
Transfer		
Yes	16	23%
No	54	77%
(of Transfers) Exploring Teaching at EMU		
Yes	9	
No	7	
Admitted to Teacher Ed		
Yes	42	60%
No	28	40%
Admitted to Student Teaching		
Yes	27	39%
No	43	61%

	N	%
Majors		
Art Education	3	4%
Biology	2	3%
Early Childhood Education	2	3%
Education; Spanish	1	1%
Elementary Education	10	14%
Elementary Education and Music Education	1	1%
Elementary Education, Special Education	1	1%
English Education	5	7%
Health and Physical Education	7	10%
History and Social Science	7	10%
Liberal Arts	18	26%
Mathematics	5	7%
Music Education	3	4%
Nursing	1	1%
Special Education	1	1%
Undeclared	1	1%
Not reported	2	3%
Minor(s)		
Bible and Religion	1	1%
Bible and Religion, Political Studies	1	1%
Coaching and Exercise Science	7	10%
Communication; TESOL teaching endorsement	1	1%
Environmental sustainability, Psychology	1	1%
History	4	6%
Music	1	1%
None	3	4%
Psychology, History	1	1%
Psychology, Bible & Religion (?)	1	1%
Sociology	1	1%
Spanish	2	3%
Spanish, Political Studies	1	1%
TESOL, Political Studies	1	1%
TESOL	1	1%
TESOL, Spanish	1	1%
Writing and Journalism	1	1%
None	61	87%
Licensure		
PreK-3	6	8%
PreK-6	24	31%
Special Education	8	10%

	N	%
Secondary Education	21	27%
PreK-12	18	23%
Number of education advisors		
1	35	50%
2	25	36%
3	8	11%
4	2	3%
More than 4	0	0%

Overall Experience

	N	%	Mean
5 - Very high quality	28	44%	
4 - High quality	33	52%	
3 - Neutral	2	3%	
2 - Low quality	0	0%	
1 - Very low quality	0	0%	
Total	63		4.4