



FRAMEWORKS SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT

SPRING 2014

Abstract

Data were collected from the major stakeholders of the Frameworks curriculum – students, faculty, Admissions, and Records & Registration regarding satisfaction with the Frameworks General Education curriculum. Faculty expressed satisfaction with traditional courses. All groups were unhappy with the interdisciplinary courses and the implications that arose from them.

Jeffery Fulks, Ph.D. & Linda Wellborn, Ed.D.

Frameworks Satisfaction Survey Report

Spring 2014

The Frameworks program consists of a 53 credit-hour sequence of courses designed to provide foundational knowledge and skills for Evangel University students. The program was initiated with new students entering the university in 2010. At this time all traditional undergraduate students are involved in the Frameworks courses and must meet the program requirements for graduation.

This report presents the results of an assessment of satisfaction with the curriculum plan from the perspective of the primary stakeholders; students, faculty members (advisors), admissions personnel, and the staff of the Records & Registration department. To accomplish this, two satisfaction surveys were developed and distributed. One was for students and assessed issues related to the four interdisciplinary (FRWK) courses. The other was for faculty members and assessed perceived effectiveness of the entire Frameworks curriculum in meeting the program goals as well as their level of satisfaction with the program. Assessment data were also obtained from the Admissions department and Records & Registration department in focus groups targeting each group independently.

Assessment Methods

Both students and faculty member groups received an email inviting them to participate in the online satisfaction survey. They were told the survey was anonymous and that the survey would take no more than 5 minutes of their time. They were each presented with 15-20 Likert-type items related to the Frameworks program. The faculty survey addressed Frameworks as a whole, while the student survey primarily addressed the four interdisciplinary FRWK courses: FRWK 220 Order, FRWK 230 Humanity, FRWK 240 Culture, and FRWK 320 Pentecost. Each group was given two weeks to respond to the survey.

The Admissions and Records & Registration focus groups were conducted by the director of Institutional Effectiveness and the Director of Adult & Graduate Studies. Neither individual teaches undergraduate courses and both are experienced in conducting institutional research. The focus groups met for approximately one hour each and addressed questions regarding how the Frameworks curriculum has been received by prospective students, current students, and former students who have either graduated or are considering transferring to another institution.

Report on the Student Assessment

Responses were obtained from 248 students or about 15% of the traditional undergraduate student body. While 248 students responded to the survey request, responses were recorded for 198 to 231 students, depending upon the item. Of these 248 students, 36 were dismissed from the data collection process when they indicated they had not taken a FRWK course. Thus they could not knowledgeably respond to the satisfaction items.

Demographic information was collected from the students regarding the specific FRWK courses they had taken (see table 1), the department of their primary major (see table 2), and grade point average (see table 3). In comparing the sample to the student body, the distribution of respondents by department suggests the Behavioral Sciences department was over-represented. The Bible and Theology department was under-represented. Students in higher GPA groups appeared to have been more likely to have responded to the survey than students in the lower GPA groups.

Table 1

Distribution of Respondents by FRWK Courses Completed

Course	n	%
FRWK 220 Order	186	66%
FRWK 230 Humanity	157	55%
FRWK 240 Culture	118	42%
FRWK 320 Pentecost	105	37%
I have not taken a FRWK course	36	13%

Table 2

Distribution of Respondents by Academic Department

Department	n	%
Behavioral Sciences	52	21%
Bible & Theology	13	5%
Business	39	16%
Church Ministries	4	2%
Communication	22	9%
Education	12	5%
Humanities	18	7%
Intercultural Studies	7	3%
Kinesiology	11	4%
Music	17	7%
Science & Technology	41	17%
Social Sciences	12	5%
Total	248	100%

Table 3

Distribution of Respondents by Grade Point Average (GPA)

Grade Point Average	n	%
Less than 2.0	1	0%
2.0 - 2.49	8	3%
2.00 - 2.99	37	15%
3.00 - 3.49	65	26%
3.50 - 4.00	137	55%
Total	248	100%

Student Assessment Results

Items on the student assessment were organized into three groupings: importance of the FRWK courses, impact of the courses, and structure and satisfaction with the FRWK courses. Each of the items was presented as a 5-point scale using a Likert format.

Importance of FRWK objectives. The first group contained four items asking students to estimate the importance of objectives addressed by the FRWK courses. Response choices were distributed on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Not at all important (1) to extremely important (5). The distribution of responses to these items is presented in table 4.

The objectives presented for perceived importance are:

1. To understand theological concepts such as the Incarnation, the humanity and deity of Christ, and the ordinances of the church
2. To learn to analyze artistic expressions as reflections of culture and/or the human condition
3. To develop good analytical reading skills
4. To understand essential issues in human history

Table 4

Distribution of Importance Item Responses

Item	Not at all Important	Very Unimportant	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Very Important	Extremely Important	Total Responses	Mean
1	11	14	53	118	35	231	3.66
2	27	49	68	69	18	231	3.01
3	9	10	49	116	46	230	3.78
4	9	20	69	99	34	231	3.56

Item means for this group ranged from a high of 3.78 for the objective “To develop good analytical reading skills” to the lowest level of importance indicated for “To learn to analyze artistic expressions as

reflections of culture and/or the human condition” with a mean score of 3.01. The mid-point for the scales would be 3.0. Thus, for each objective more students indicated they are important than indicate they are unimportant. There was no strong endorsement for any of the objectives regarding importance.

Impact of FRWK courses. The second group of items asked students to indicate their level of agreement with the impact of the FRWK courses related to established objectives. Again, the response choices were presented as a 5-point Likert scale with possible responses ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The distribution of responses to these items is presented in table 5.

The objectives presented for program impact are:

1. They have increased my understanding of important theological issues.
2. They have increased my ability to see the bigger picture regarding the social/religious/cultural/philosophical interplay within various time periods.
3. They have increased my understanding of the impact of historical events on humanity.
4. They have improved my analytical reading skills.
5. They have increased my ability to consider the perspective of other individuals and the worldviews of other people groups.
6. They have presented meaningful ideas that impact my life.
7. They have helped me to articulate the integration of faith, learning, and life.

Table 5
Distribution of Program Impact Item Responses

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Mean
1	35	52	41	63	8	199	2.78
2	38	46	44	61	10	199	2.79
3	34	59	50	45	11	199	2.70
4	56	73	39	26	4	198	2.24
5	39	44	45	58	13	199	2.81
6	63	41	45	40	8	197	2.44
7	52	48	46	45	7	198	2.53

Responses to these items have mean scores ranging from 2.81 for the item “They have increased my ability to consider the perspective of other individuals and the worldviews of other people groups.” To a low mean score of 2.24 for the item “They have improved my analytical reading skills.” This set of mean scores suggests the average response regarding the impact of the program on objectives is in the disagree range.

The low agreement for objective 4 is particularly critical due to the corresponding response in the previous set where this item was given the highest level of importance. Further analysis suggests there

is a significant relationship between the responses to these two items. Students who believed developing analytical reading skills is important are more likely to report that the FRWK courses improved these skills ($r = .315$, $p < .001$). The chi-square test for independence on the responses to these two items was also significant with $\chi^2 (16) = 45.83$, $p < .001$.

To further test this relationship between perceived importance and perceived impact, importance and impact scores were calculated by summing the responses for each of the items for each of the four importance items and each of the six impact items. The correlation between these scores was moderate ($r = .515$, $p < .001$).

Structure and Satisfaction. The last set of four items addressed the level of satisfaction students expressed regarding the structure of the FRWK courses, the investment of time in the courses, and their overall satisfaction with them. The statements presented were:

1. The structure of the FRWK course(s) I have taken make(s) sense to me.
2. The interdisciplinary nature of the FRWK course(s) I have taken increased my interest in the topics presented.
3. The amount of time I spent studying for the FRWK course(s) I have taken was consistent with the time I spent on other general education courses.
4. Overall, I have been satisfied with the FRWK course(s) I have taken.

Once again, the response choices were presented as a 5-point Likert scale with possible responses ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The distribution of responses to these items is presented in table 6. With each item, the mean response is weighted toward the disagree side of the scale. Mean responses ranged from a high of 2.26 addressing the amount of time spent studying for the FRWK courses being consistent with time for other similar courses to a low of 2.11 for items 2 and 4 which address increased interest in topics presented and overall satisfaction with the FRWK courses they have taken. On these two items, 17.3% and 15.1% of the students indicated a level of agreement with the statements. Many more students did not agree.

Table 6
Distribution of Responses for Structure and Satisfaction Items

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Mean
1	74	52	35	31	6	198	2.21
2	80	55	28	28	6	197	2.11
3	69	60	27	32	10	198	2.26
4	83	47	38	24	6	198	2.11

Additional analyses focused on the relationship of responses to the demographic items. The first looked at the relationship between the number of FRWK courses completed and their response to each of the items. There were no significant relationships between these. A second analysis looked at the relationship between the number of courses taken and the mean scores for each of the items in structure and satisfaction block. There were no significant relationships found. While it appears that there may be a relationship, with students having taken 3 courses being less satisfied, it is not statistically significant.

Of all the demographic variables, GPA is the only one that has a statistically significant relationship with responses to particular items. There is a significant relationship between GPA and understanding important theological concepts as well as essential issues in human history.

Responses to Open-ended request for feedback. At the conclusion of the survey, students were invited to share thoughts regarding the FRWK courses. Responses were received from 84 students. Of these responses, 69 of them were evaluated as generally derisive of the FRWK courses and 12 of them were positive. Responses were further categorized regarding the nature of their opinions. Of the negative responses, the most common issues related to the program as a whole. Of the items evaluated as negative, 25 of the comments related to the program as a whole. Comments of this nature included the two below copied directly from the survey responses:

- ❖ These courses, although have a good concept, are executed terribly. Majority of teachers teaching the classes, excluding two teachers, have little concept of what they are talking about or supposed to be teaching in the class. The coursework is not representative of the "general education". I understand the concept is to have an integrated learning, but the teachers don't even know how to teach it, much less get the students to understand.
- ❖ A sibling of mine decided to not come to Evangel, one of the main reasons being how inflexible the general education classes were if she decided to transfer out. Having had two siblings attend, she had heard the terrible feedback from so many students over these past years that she did not want to come. In other words, in my opinion and every single student I have talked to about this program (at least 50-60 students), it is awful. I have not heard a single positive thing about the program from a student, having been here three years. There needs to be some major revisions for the future classes.

Another major type of negative feedback addressed course content. Examples of comments related to content are provided below.

- ❖ I think the idea of getting a little bit of everything in a Frameworks class is essentially good, but getting a little bit of everything hasn't (for me) led to much learning or growing. I still feel I don't fully comprehend the class and I'm taking it only as a requirement. I think if the classes were more focused on one subject, students would get much more out of them.

Another negative content comment is:

- ❖ These classes are a joke and ridiculous. As a student I am here to learn and these classes will help any student in no way of life. These classes are art based and if I would want to take these horrible classes I would be an art major. I am here as a business major so either let me take more business classes or classes such as math and other intellectual classes that will help me actually gain knowledge for my life. These classes need to be tossed out. I am so glad I am in my last one so I never have to take a class like this again.

A few comments (12) were positive regarding the FRWK courses. Here are examples of two of them.

- ❖ I like the idea of Frameworks, and I have been pleased with the classes I have taken so far. I wish there were some topics (like Islam) that we could have covered more in depth, but overall I have found them very helpful. A strong suggestion that I have to make them better is the organization of the classes (note that I disagreed with the question that asked me about them being well organized). I feel like a chronological approach would work better--jumping around in history has been confusing as I've tried to piece together a mental timeline of where the periods we have studied in one relate to the ones we've studied in the others. I feel that a chronological approach, such as going straight through history, would be a stronger way to tie these classes together than by tying them together based upon overarching (and in my opinion rather weak) ideas like "Order" "Humanity" and "Culture," because all of the classes touch on each of these themes anyway.
- ❖ A lot of the negative attitude is simply that, an attitude. Once I began trying to purposefully find interest in and enjoy the classes I liked them a great deal more.
A lot of the work students are given seems like busy work, but occasionally there are things which are assigned which spark interest. Apparently some of these topics have been rather controversial, but they are things, whether students realise it or not, that are important to at least have a basic understanding of when going into the working world.
Also, the classes don't really tend to seem as though they make sense while someone is taking them. They seem to make much more sense and have more impact when you look back on them after not taking them for a while.

Faculty Assessment Results

The faculty Frameworks satisfaction survey consisted of 24 items. Each of these was a 5-point Likert scale item asking for levels of agreement with the statements connected to the Frameworks program. The items were presented in four categories: general understanding of the Frameworks curriculum, an assessment of the FRWK courses, an assessment of the departmental Frameworks courses, and an overall assessment of the Frameworks program. At the end of the assessment, faculty members were encouraged to add general comments regarding the Frameworks program.

Responses were obtained from 94 faculty members, although 106 faculty members opened the survey. Faculty members in the sample were requested to be those who were full-time and taught or advised

traditional undergraduate students. It is possible that some faculty members looked at the survey but did not respond due to a lack of survey relevance to their academic responsibilities.

The first set of items addressed the faculty member's general understanding of the Frameworks curriculum and advising. The five items in this category are:

1. The Integrative Studies minor is attractive to my students.
2. I have a solid understanding of the organization of the Frameworks curriculum.
3. My students have a good understanding of the organization of the Frameworks curriculum.
4. I am confident advising my students regarding the new Frameworks curriculum.
5. As a result of the Frameworks redesign, students will graduate as more developed students than with the previous general education curriculum model.

Items related to knowledge of the specific faculty member were rated rather positively. The highest rated item was item 2 addressing the faculty member's understanding of the organization of the Frameworks curriculum. The average score was $M = 3.72$. Responses to items addressing the students were generally negative. An example of this negative orientation is for item 1, addressing the perceived attractiveness of the Integrative Studies minor with a average score of $M = 2.24$. A listing of responses to these items is provided in table 7.

Table 7
Distribution of Responses for Frameworks Overview Items

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Mean
1	24	31	31	6	1	93	2.24
2	6	10	10	45	22	93	3.72
3	11	28	29	24	1	93	2.74
4	6	14	16	43	14	93	3.48
5	24	16	26	21	7	24	2.69

Interdisciplinary Frameworks Courses (FRWK courses). The second set of items addressed the qualities of the interdisciplinary courses in the Frameworks programs. These courses are often identified with their course prefix of FRWK and were the focus of the student assessment. The specific items in this section are listed below.

6. The FRWK courses provide synergy to learning by combining material from different disciplines into one course.
7. FRWK courses provide a solid curriculum for presenting the Fundamental Truths of the Assemblies of God.

8. The FRWK courses, by nature of their content and design, provide a more holistic understanding of significant ideas for students than the previous general education curriculum.
9. The FRWK courses encompass a comprehensive exposure to history, theology, literature, and the fine arts.
10. The interdisciplinary nature of the FRWK courses adds significant value to student learning.

Responses to these items are generally on the disagree side of the continuum with average scores ranging from $M = 2.96$ and 42.6% of responses in agreement on item 6 which addressed the synergy of the interdisciplinary courses to $M = 2.43$ on item 10 and 7.7% of faculty members agreeing that the FRWK courses add significant value to student learning. The distribution of responses to these items is provided in table 8.

Table 8
Distribution of Responses for Interdisciplinary Frameworks Courses Items

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Mean
6	17	18	19	32	8	94	2.96
7	16	14	31	26	7	94	2.94
8	19	19	19	25	11	93	2.89
9	23	24	18	19	9	93	2.65
10	16	29	39	5	2	91	2.43

Departmental Frameworks Courses. The third set of items addressed the courses in the Frameworks curriculum that are provided by the individual academic departments. Some of these courses are new, e.g. the Psychology of Healthy Relationships. Others are standard courses that have been a regular part of the general education curriculum for decades, e.g. Old and New Testament Literature. The specific items are listed below with the distribution of responses provided in table 9.

11. I have seen an improvement in my students' writing and/or researching skills as a result of the new Effective Communication requirements.
12. My students report that FIN 138 Personal Finance increases their sensitivity to their role as financial stewards.
13. PSYC 138 Psychology of Healthy Relationships makes a greater difference in the well-being of students compared to previously required psychology courses.
14. The Statistics course is preferable to my students over College Algebra as a quantitative literacy proficiency requirement.
15. Retaining the 7-credit science requirement (including a lab) is valuable to my students.
16. THEO 350 Global Connections is an effective way to provide students with cross-cultural interaction.
17. Requiring BIBL 115 Old Testament Literature and BIBL 116 New Testament Literature teaches students biblical fundamentals.

18. Retaining the Bible Book Study adds to students' biblical literacy by asking them to delve deeply into one book.
19. BIBL 111 Essential Christianity remains an effective introduction for our students to the Evangel Experience.
20. University Seminar proves to be an effective retention course for our department and the University.
21. The wellness program has had a positive effect on the physical activity and wellness of the student body.

Table 9

Distribution of Responses for Departmental Frameworks Courses Items

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Mean
11	5	15	36	33	3	92	3.15
12	2	7	53	24	6	92	3.27
13	17	26	12	29	9	93	2.86
14	4	7	35	30	17	93	3.53
15	2	8	16	44	23	93	3.84
16	2	6	10	39	36	93	4.09
17	0	1	7	50	34	92	4.27
18	0	2	7	53	29	91	4.20
19	1	2	11	36	41	91	4.25
20	2	11	25	38	17	93	3.61
21	5	24	40	20	4	93	2.94

Responses to this set of items was much more positive than in the previous sets. Average scores above 4.0 were found for four of the items addressing satisfaction with courses in the School of Theology & Church Ministries – Global Connections, Old and New Testament Literature, a Bible book study, and Essential Christianity. All but Global Connections are carry-over courses from the previous general education curriculum.

The two courses with the lowest rated satisfaction ratings in this group were the Psychology of Healthy Relationships with an average score of M = 2.86 (37.6% agreement) and the wellness program with an average score of M = 2.94 (25.8% agreement).

Overall. The last set of three items addressed the general satisfaction with the Frameworks curriculum. These three statements are listed below. Responses to these items are summarized in table 10.

22. Frameworks is a distinctive core curriculum that will aid in recruiting new students.
23. Frameworks provides a distinctive core curriculum that I respect.
24. My students share positive feedback regarding the Frameworks curriculum.

Table 10
Distribution of Responses for Overall Satisfaction Items

Item	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total Responses	Mean
22	37	21	22	8	4	92	2.14
23	25	13	19	24	11	92	2.82
24	30	31	18	12	1	92	2.16

Responses to these items suggest faculty members are not satisfied with the Frameworks curriculum. The highest level of agreement (38%) is reported for item 23, "Frameworks provides a distinctive core curriculum that I respect." This indicates that less than half respect some aspect of the curriculum. The other two items result in lower levels of agreement. Faculty members do not report that students share positive feedback regarding the Frameworks curriculum ($M = 2.16$ and 14.1% agreement), nor do they believe the curriculum aids in recruiting new students ($M = 2.14$ and 13.0% agreement).

Responses to Open-ended Request for feedback. The final item on the faculty survey invited faculty members to share feedback on the Frameworks curriculum. Responses were received from 42 people. Of these, 8 were deemed to be positive and 34 were primarily negative. Of the positive responses, 6 addressed course content issues and 2 addressed course organization. Many of the positive responses contained criticisms and suggestions for improving the program mixed with the positives. Negative responses were primarily oriented toward the program as a whole with 18 or 53% of the negative responses being in this group. Each of the other four areas had responses categorized within them. The highest of these was the course content with 6 responses. With many of the responses came suggestions for improving the curriculum. Examples of positive comments are:

- ❖ The FRWK's program provides a broad liberal arts approach to education that is essential to our students. For the most part, they don't come to us with a wide perspective of the world and if we don't offer it at Evangel, our students remain impoverished. If we don't offer it, I don't know how we can ethically call ourselves a Christian liberal arts institution.
- ❖ While I'm not sure if the Frameworks curriculum helps to recruit students, I do believe in its value to our institution as a Liberal Arts University. I also feel that sometimes students do not really understand the value of such a curriculum until they are well into their own careers when certain circumstances or life question present themselves. It is then that some of the foundations the students learned in the courses come back to them in a tangible way. To sum up, I feel that if a more diverse faculty sampling were teaching in the FRWK courses, the overall student opinion of those particular courses would be better.
- ❖ I think the Frameworks program had a rough start and we are still "paying" for that as a result. I think in time we will start to hear more positive things about the overall curriculum as the "old

"generation" moves on. I do think we need to constantly evaluate and reevaluate what is and what is not working and not be afraid to make adjustments accordingly. I think a survey such as this is a step in the right direction and I appreciate you seeking our faculty input.

There were many more comments expressing dissatisfaction with the Frameworks program. Examples of comments from this area are provided below. The first is the longest of the comments.

- ❖ I have yet to have a student state that Frameworks is effective. I did not ask for their opinions but rather, out of frustration, students have approached me with their dissatisfaction. Their reasons for their disappointment and frustrations are varied. However, here are the negative responses I have heard numerous times:
 - 1) When needing to transfer to another school, Frameworks courses, in most instances, will not transfer,
 - 2) There is redundancy throughout Frameworks which wastes time,
 - 3) Having an overview of various subjects so that it is interdisciplinary only creates a dumbing down of the material that should be taught. Since EU is a liberal arts college and since the traditional general ed courses give greater depth to subject matter, in a liberal arts setting students state that they are able to make the connections between disciplines,
 - 4) They wonder if research shows that this approach has been effective in other universities.
 - 5) They state that teachers are teaching outside their own disciplines and the material and presentation suffer which, again, seems like a dumbing down of the course material.
 - 6) Students entering masters programs have found that they have to make up course work because the graduate school does not accept the Frameworks courses.In general, from all of the negative comments I have heard from students, with no students stating that they like this approach, I am concerned that it is negative PR for EU. Our graduates will communicate their dissatisfaction. This in turn could cause prospective students to look elsewhere.
- ❖ The Interdisciplinary Courses AS ORIGINALLY INVISIONED would have been many times more synergistic than they are at present. As I understood the original idea, more than one faculty person would be involved in each class, bringing an automatic opportunity for interdisciplinary learning and teaching. As it is now, there is still value to an interdisciplinary approach, but this is hampered by the single faculty person approach rather than a team approach. The team approach actually demonstrates before the students the dynamic activity of taking from one area of learning or history and making application to another area. The closest we have come is to have "visits" from experts in certain fields devote 3-4 hours to do presentations in the FRWK courses -- on their own time -- to bring the students a level of expertise in certain fields the single faculty person is not able to do.
- ❖ I would much rather have three FRWK course requirements than four. I would keep the three-hundred level offering and remove one of the two-hundred level courses. In its place, I would suggest a two-hundred level theology course, perhaps something that addresses the fundamental truths in a more systematic manner. I am also concerned about the qualifications of some of the professors who teach FRWK. While I am sure they are excellent teachers in their fields, I wonder if they are qualified to teach in other disciplines.

Focus Group Feedback

Focus groups were conducted with two additional stakeholder groups who have access to information from students and parents of undergraduate students, the Admissions team, and Records & Registration. In each focus group specific open-ended questions were asked

Questions asked of the Admissions team were:

1. What role does Evangel's general education curriculum and FRWK courses in particular, play in your recruiting efforts?
2. Generally speaking, how would you characterize responses to FRWK curriculum from parents and new students considering Evangel?
3. Generally speaking, how would you characterize responses to FRWK curriculum from parents and students considering transferring to Evangel?
4. What has been the impact of the FRWK curriculum in your recruiting efforts?
5. What, if any, impact has Frameworks had on student enrollment and retention?

Recruiting Tool. Their responses to the questions about the role of FRWK courses in recruiting provided the following:

- Most questions related to Frameworks arise following the parents panel – parents express interest; students generally express no interest in the Frameworks program.
- Parents seem receptive to Frameworks courses but have many questions regarding advanced placement, dual enrollment, etc.
- The real question they report wanting answered is, "How long will it take my student to graduate?"
- The Frameworks program was proposed as providing a competitive advantage; it has done just the opposite
- We try to avoid discussing Frameworks because it never brings value to the presentation

Impact on Admissions Process. Regarding the impact of Frameworks on the admissions process the team reported:

- Frameworks makes the process complicated and may make EU lose some students. If a student has any previous credit from any source, it usually necessitates asking for a transcript evaluation which takes up to two weeks before a prospect gets a clear transcript evaluation.
- Transferology – a data base program developed for recruiting transfers indicates to students in 30 seconds how their courses will transfer. It takes EU up to 2 weeks to answer that question for students.
- Guestimate that transfer students lose up to 25% of coursework completed when transferring to Evangel.

Impact on Admissions Counselors. When asked how the FRWK curriculum impacts their recruiting, the responses were negative. They report the following:

- Matching courses already taken to Frameworks courses slows the process.
- It is embarrassing to us as trained admissions professionals when prospects come well prepared for a campus visit with unofficial transcripts and we cannot answer basic transfer questions.

- Sharp high school juniors begin emailing asking which AP (Advanced Placement) and dual enrollment classes they can take; the answer we must provide is “minimal.”
- The concept of integrated studies is “not on the radar screen for HS students.”
- The FRWK courses create extra work for students, parents, and recruiters
- Prospective students may want to talk with current students about FRWK courses but current students have a difficult time articulating the purpose and content of the FRWK courses.
- Admissions counselors expressed frustration regarding the extra amount of time, energy and resources they are investing because of FRWK
- The admissions team consists of the full-time employees as well as student admissions counselors. The student counselors love Evangel but not Frameworks

Retention Feedback. The admissions team was also asked about the impact of FRWK courses on retention of students. They hear:

- Some students leave after one semester because the frameworks courses are confusing.
- Some are concerned that graduate school admissions transcripts will not be favorable with FRWK courses.
- Feedback on the Noel-Levitz survey indicates it is the lowest marked question
- A founder’s scholar was “talked out of leaving” because they were frustrated that FRWK would be detrimental to the grad school admissions applications
- No slight interest in integrated studies minor
- Never hear “I love it” often hear “I hate it a lot”
- A relative of one employee applied to grad school at the University of Houston and was told FRWK courses would have to be retaken as traditional general education courses

Random Comments. In wrapping up the focus group with the admissions team members, they offered the following concluding comments and questions:

- It is possible that the design was good but the execution was poor
- If it is such a great idea, why don’t any other good schools do it?
- Incongruent—we say, “It is great, and we believe it is great, but we have to keep making exceptions on a case-by-case basis. IF it is so great why are there so many exceptions?
- We hate it. They hate it. Let’s lose it

Focus Group with the Records & Registration (R & R) Team

A second focus group was conducted with members of the Records and Registration team. They were asked the questions listed below:

1. What are your experiences with FRWK courses when working with the three groups of students?
 - Transfer In to Evangel University
 - Transfer out of Evangel
 - Equivalency designation
2. Generally speaking, how would you characterize responses to FRWK transcripting from parents and students transferring into Evangel?
3. Generally speaking, how would you characterize responses to FRWK transcripting from parents and students transferring out of Evangel?
4. What communication have you had with other institutions regarding FRWK courses?

5. What specific challenges might you encounter working with FRWK courses?
6. What has been the impact of the FRWK curriculum in your department?
7. What recommendations would you have for academic affairs regarding portability of FRWK courses?

The discussion with the R & R team addressed each of the questions but was generally comprehensive with several questions being addressed with one response. Responses to the questions indicated they often have inquiries regarding Frameworks from prospective and current students, parents of prospective and current students, faculty advisors, admissions personnel and Frameworks coordinator. In general they believe the Frameworks curriculum has a generally detrimental impact on students in the following ways:

- Few CLEP exams meet EU general education requirements; bright students are unable to save money and time by CLEP exam
- Advanced placement and international baccalaureate courses completed during high school don't usually meet Frameworks requirements
- The typical transfer student has taken the traditional general education curriculum such as "Intro to" 1 and 2. When they have more than 1 semester of something it doesn't count toward general education requirements. For example, a social science 1 and 2 will bring in 6 credits, but only 3 of those count toward degree requirements. Before Frameworks this was not an issue.
- The typical student loses 25% of completed credits (around 15)
- Average turnaround time to give prospective students a clear response is 3-5 days.
- Odds are against transfer students bringing in 2nd level coursework as they are generally considered lower-level coursework at EU. For example psychopathology, economics, accounting, composition II at a community college is rarely accepted as the 2nd level requirement at EU.
- Many transfer students have taken two composition courses, which in combination with the writing proficiency met the writing requirements. Virtually nothing meets RHET205.
- Transfer students and parents look forward to bible courses, but many FRWK courses do not appear to be bible courses.
- Parents and students usually express frustration and disappointment that they planned wisely and expected to bring in most general education requirements but find that much completed coursework will not count toward specific degree requirements and are relegated to the pool of elective credits.

Furthermore, the Records & Registration team believe Frameworks has a generally detrimental impact on Evangel in the following ways:

- When a student completes an AA degree and MSU and most state and many-faith based institutions accept that AA degree as meeting all general education requirements, many students/parents are faced with making a financial decision to attend an institution which will accept all credits and enable the student to complete the degree in the shortest amount of time.
- R & R must spend an inordinate amount of time evaluating transcripts. While policy is that a student must be accepted prior to investing in transcript evaluation, MANY students/parents want a clear answer as to how long it will take to complete the degree and which courses will be needed before they make formal application. The only way to do that is to enter the student into CAMS to process the transcript. When students do not come to EU, the "clutter" must

remain in CAMS; i.e. students have an EU transcript with accepted courses in transfer when they have never attended Evangel.

- R & R personnel must spend time away from their primary jobs to evaluate prospect transcripts. They are gun-shy in making transfer decisions and often must forward transcripts to the FRWK coordinator for evaluation.
- The Frameworks committee has attempted to assist in evaluating transcripts by providing guidelines. The document 6 pages in length and to use it is time consuming and confusing to review against each transcript.
- Faculty FREQUENTLY misadvise students (through no fault of the faculty—it is just confusing) and exceptions are regularly and continually made on graduation papers.
- Service to students and efficiency to Evangel would be improved with a traditional general education core.
- We may be losing some of the “best and brightest” prospects because their AP, CLEP, IB and dual enrollment credits do not meet graduation requirements aligned with the Frameworks curriculum.

Summary and Discussion

Data was collected from each of the major stakeholders of the Frameworks program; the students ($n = 248$), faculty members ($n = 94$), and departments critical to the recruitment and matriculation of students. Each of these groups expressed significant levels of dissatisfaction with the program. While there were a few positive responses, the majority were unhappy with the interdisciplinary courses.

While the focus of data collection varied depending upon the stakeholder group, all groups expressed dissatisfaction toward the four interdisciplinary courses. When asked about the importance of the objectives of the interdisciplinary courses, students were somewhat supportive of them although the support for the integration of the arts with the human condition was not endorsed as particularly important. While endorsing the value of the outcomes, they did not perceive they had been accomplished. The highest levels of dissatisfaction were associated with the overall impact of the Frameworks interdisciplinary courses in increasing their interest in the ideas presented and their overall satisfaction. They were also dissatisfied with the structure of the courses and the amount of time devoted to reading materials and fulfilling course assignments.

The faculty survey was presented more broadly by addressing Frameworks issues related to the entire 53 credit program as well as a few items focusing on the interdisciplinary courses. Faculty members confirmed that their advisees were not satisfied with the program by indicating the Integrative Studies minor was not attractive, students do not have a good understanding of the organization of the curriculum, and that the new curriculum does not produce better educated students than the previous general education curriculum.

When asked about the courses making up the Frameworks curriculum, faculty members endorsed them. The longer the course has been used, the more likely they were to endorse its positive qualities. As a result, faculty members have some support for the following courses: RHET 205 Effective

Communication, FIN 138 Personal Finance, MATH/PSYC/GOVT 210 Introduction to Statistics, general education science courses, BIBL 111 Essential Christianity, Old & New Testament Literature, Bible book studies, ICST 350 Global Connections, and University Seminar. Minimal support was given for PSYC 138 Psychology of Healthy Relationships and the current wellness program. Faculty members indicated these last two courses are not particularly better than previous methods of providing general education courses to the students.

In the last section of the faculty survey, sentiments regarding the program are similar to those of the students. They do not believe the program aids in recruiting new students, does not result in positive feedback from students, and results in a curriculum that they respect. In looking at the open-ended responses, the majority of these were negative. Faculty members express dissatisfaction with the organization of the courses and the delivery of course material by instructors who may be teaching out of their areas of expertise.

Information shared by the admissions group and the Records & Registration group are consistent with those of the students and faculty members. They believe that the curriculum is a deterrent to recruiting new students – by raising questions about how to transfer in the courses previously taken, and slowing down the admissions process. There is a frequent belief on the part of prospective students that many courses taken while in high school or to be transferred from another college will not transfer into Evangel for specific graduation requirements. It is believed that they will lose about 25% of the coursework because it will not have a place to be applied in the general education checklist. The admissions group also refers to difficulties for students when leaving Evangel University and having to repeat courses as other schools identify holes in their general education curriculum.

The Records & Registration team expressed frustration at the amount of time necessary to evaluate transcripts as well as the frequent misadvising of new students regarding credits given toward FRWK courses and others with courses transferred to the university. They also fear as does the admissions group that we lose the best and brightest students who bring advanced standing courses, dual-enrollment courses, and CLEP hours and no clear landing place for these hours as there is difficulty in aligning them with the Frameworks curriculum.

Recommendations

The results of this survey are consistent across all groups participating in this study. They report the FRWK courses are unpopular with students and impact the admissions process. Additional problems with the courses are:

- Limitations in identifying slots for courses completed prior to matriculation at EU
- Challenges in responding to potential new students regarding transfer credits
- Credibility of instructors when teaching out of their areas of expertise
- Loss of confidence among faculty members that the students have a solid foundation in Assemblies of God doctrine

- Satisfaction of students with FRWK courses
- Difficulty finding faculty members to teach the FRWK courses

It is recommended that the General Education Committee develop a plan for simplifying the Frameworks curriculum to align it more closely with the general education curriculum of our benchmark institutions. To aid in this process, the Registrar's office could identify courses students frequently wish to transfer into Evangel for which there is a limited opportunity for landing. Some of these courses could be incorporated into the new Frameworks model.

A second recommendation is to reduce the number of FRWK courses by eliminating the interdisciplinary focus of at least two of these. The content of these two courses could then be aligned with courses taught in the department with which they have been associated. For example, FRWK 220 could be returned to the Social Sciences department. FRWK 320 could be returned to the Bible and Theology department.

Low satisfaction scores were also associated with the fitness program. Consideration should be given to returning the fitness and physical well-being objective to a course that more closely tracks accomplishment of this objective with course assessments and a course grade.

Finally, in developing and implementing a plan for change, the committee should work closely with the department chairs for their input and support. If the Chairs support the change, then they are more likely to promote it with the faculty members and students of their respective departments and thus assist in creating positive momentum for implementing proposed changes.