

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 453 745

HE 034 070

AUTHOR MacFarland, Thomas W.
 TITLE Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey: Breakouts by Student Service Center Locations.
 INSTITUTION Nova Southeastern Univ., Ft. Lauderdale, FL. Research and Planning.
 REPORT NO NSU-RP-R-00-26
 PUB DATE 2000-12-00
 NOTE 133p.
 PUB TYPE Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *College Students; Distance Education; *Geographic Regions; Higher Education; *Satisfaction; *Student Attitudes; Student Surveys
 IDENTIFIERS Florida; *Nova Southeastern University FL

ABSTRACT

This study uses data originally gained by a fall 1999 survey process at Nova Southeastern University (NSU), Florida, to provide information about student satisfaction. In this report, survey results are broken out by the Florida geographic area at which the university offers instruction at Student Service Centers: Miami-Dade County, Palm Beach County, Orlando, Tampa, Jacksonville, and "other cluster or site." No data were available for students at the university's Student Service Center in Las Vegas, Nevada. Responses were received from 2,637 students. They were asked why they had decided to attend NSU, and the three leading responses were "convenience" (52%), programs available (52%), and location (47%). The survey was also designed to offer a sense of student library use. Only in Jacksonville did the frequency of weekly usage of the University's library infrastructure exceed 40%. The collapsed and breakout statistics in this report provide evidence that students generally have positive opinions about NSU and its many services. Program directors and administrative personnel at the individual sites will want to give specific attention to possible variations between sites. (Contains 95 tables and 13 references.) (SLD)

**FALL TERM 1999 NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS
RESPOND TO A BROAD-BASED SATISFACTION SURVEY:
BREAKOUTS BY STUDENT SERVICE
CENTER LOCATIONS**

Thomas W. MacFarland
Senior Research Associate

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Macfarland

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

**Nova Southeastern University
Research and Planning**

Report 00-26

December 2000

**FALL TERM 1999 NOVA SOUTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS
RESPOND TO A BROAD-BASED SATISFACTION SURVEY:
BREAKOUTS BY STUDENT SERVICE
CENTER LOCATIONS**

Thomas W. MacFarland
Report 00-26

Senior Research Associate
December 2000

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1996, Nova Southeastern University's Office of Research and Planning prepared an extensive series of reports relating to student satisfaction with academic resources and services. During Fall Term 1999, the common part of the various 1996 surveys was used to provide an update to the information gained from these many prior reports.

The purpose of this study was to use the data set originally gained from the Fall Term 1999 survey process and to focus on survey results for geographic areas where the University offers instruction at Student Service Centers: Miami-Dade County, Palm Beach County, Orlando, Tampa, Jacksonville, and Las Vegas. As a slight limitation to the way survey distribution was organized in October 1999, there are no results from students representing the Las Vegas, Nevada, Student Service Center.

To learn more about motivations for attending the University, survey participants were asked to respond to the statement *Why did you decide to attend NSU?* In rank order for all participants, the three leading responses were:

- Convenience 52 percent of total
- Type of programs available 52 percent of total
- Location 47 percent of total

The response *Small Class Size* also received a favorable response by participants from Miami-Dade County (53 percent) and Tampa (41 percent).

The survey was also designed to offer a sense of library use (Tables 9.A to 9.G), including the University's library infrastructure as well as other libraries. In Miami-Dade County, Palm Beach County, Orlando, and Tampa, less than 40 percent of all respondents indicated that they used the University's library infrastructure one or more times per week. Only in Jacksonville did the frequency of weekly usage of the University's library infrastructure exceed 40 percent.

Survey statements that specifically queried on issues related to student satisfaction with structure and services were prepared by tracking language from the *Criteria for Accreditation*. These statements focused on issues related to Faculty, Academic Program, Administration, Library and Information Services, and Student Services. A summary response by location was also prepared in response to the statement *Overall quality of this academic program*.

The collapsed and breakout statistics presented in this report provide evidence that students generally have positive opinions about Nova Southeastern University and the many services offered by the University. Program directors and administrative personnel with responsibilities for students at the sites mentioned in this report will, of course, want to give specific attention to possible variance between sites on the following issues:

- Process for assigning students to advisors
- Correctness of student records (including transcripts)
- Availability of computing resources
- Adequacy of computing resources
- Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)
- Infusion of information technology into the curricula
- Provisions for training in the use of technology

It may also be useful for personnel with responsibility for students at off-campus sites to carefully examine the marketing-type information gained from this survey process. It is important to note that *convenience*, *type of programs*, and *location* remain among the most frequently marked responses regarding reasons for deciding to attend the University.

The University is compelled by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to give continual attention to the issue of Institutional Effectiveness. The survey process associated with this report and the more than 20 reports prepared by the Office of Research and Planning since 1995 that relate in one form or another to distance education should help the University demonstrate its complete commitment to Institutional Effectiveness, including Institutional Effectiveness issues related to distance education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Purpose of This Study	1
METHODOLOGY	2
RESULTS	2
SUMMARY	4
REFERENCES	6
APPENDIX: Table 1 to Table 17	8

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Academic Center: Adjusted Data Set	8
2	Place of Class Attendance by Student Service Center: Respondents at All Locations	9
3.A	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level: All Respondents	10
3.B	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level: Broward County	10
3.C	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level: Miami-Dade County	11
3.D	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level: Palm Beach County	11
3.E	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level: Orlando	12
3.F	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level: Tampa	12
3.G	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level: Jacksonville	13
4.A	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender: All Respondents	14
4.B	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender: Broward County	14
4.C	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender: Miami-Dade County	15
4.D	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender: Palm Beach County	15
4.E	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender: Orlando	16
4.F	Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender: Tampa	16

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
4.G Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender: Jacksonville	17
5.A Race/Ethnic Group: Respondents at All Locations	18
5.B Race/Ethnic Group: Broward County	18
5.C Race/Ethnic Group: Miami-Dade County	19
5.D Race/Ethnic Group: Palm Beach County	19
5.E Race/Ethnic Group: Orlando	20
5.F Race/Ethnic Group: Tampa	20
5.G Race/Ethnic Group: Jacksonville	21
6 Current Age of Respondents by Student Service Center	22
7.A Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Respondents at All Locations ..	23
7.B Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Broward County	24
7.C Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Miami-Dade County	25
7.D Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Palm Beach County	26
7.E Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Orlando	27
7.F Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Tampa	28
7.G Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Jacksonville	29
8.A Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Respondents at All Locations	30
8.B Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Broward County	30
8.C Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Miami- Dade County	31
8.D Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Palm Beach County	31
8.E Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Orlando	32

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
8.F	Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Tampa 32
8.G	Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Jacksonville 33
9.A	Frequency of Library Usage: Respondents at All Locations 34
9.B	Frequency of Library Usage: Broward County 35
9.C	Frequency of Library Usage: Miami-Dade County 36
9.D	Frequency of Library Usage: Palm Beach County 37
9.E	Frequency of Library Usage: Orlando 38
9.F	Frequency of Library Usage: Tampa 39
9.G	Frequency of Library Usage: Jacksonville 40
10.A	What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended Nova Southeastern University: Respondents at All Locations 41
10.B	What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended Nova Southeastern University: Broward County 42
10.C	What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended Nova Southeastern University: Miami-Dade County 43
10.D	What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended Nova Southeastern University: Palm Beach County 44
10.E	What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended Nova Southeastern University: Orlando 45
10.F	What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended Nova Southeastern University: Tampa 46
10.G	What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended Nova Southeastern University: Jacksonville 47
11.A	Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Respondents at All Locations 48
11.B	Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Broward County 48

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
11.C Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Miami-Dade County	49
11.D Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Palm Beach County	49
11.E Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Orlando	50
11.F Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Tampa	50
11.G Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Jacksonville	51
12.A Statements About <i>Faculty</i> : Respondents at All Locations	52
12.B Statements About <i>Faculty</i> : Broward County	53
12.C Statements About <i>Faculty</i> : Miami-Dade County	53
12.D Statements About <i>Faculty</i> : Palm Beach County	54
12.E Statements About <i>Faculty</i> : Orlando	54
12.F Statements About <i>Faculty</i> : Tampa	55
12.G Statements About <i>Faculty</i> : Jacksonville	55
13.A Statements About <i>Academic Program</i> : Respondents at All Locations	56
13.B Statements About <i>Academic Program</i> : Broward County	58
13.C Statements About <i>Academic Program</i> : Miami-Dade County	59
13.D Statements About <i>Academic Program</i> : Palm Beach County	60
13.E Statements About <i>Academic Program</i> : Orlando	61
13.F Statements About <i>Academic Program</i> : Tampa	62
13.G Statements About <i>Academic Program</i> : Jacksonville	63
14.A Statements About <i>Administration</i> : Respondents at All Locations	64
14.B Statements About <i>Administration</i> : Broward County	65
14.C Statements About <i>Administration</i> : Miami-Dade County	66
14.D Statements About <i>Administration</i> : Palm Beach County	67

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
14.E	Statements About <i>Administration</i> : Orlando	68
14.F	Statements About <i>Administration</i> : Tampa	69
14.G	Statements About <i>Administration</i> : Jacksonville	70
15.A	Statements About <i>Library and Information Services</i> : Respondents at All Locations	71
15.B	Statements About <i>Library and Information Services</i> : Broward County	73
15.C	Statements About <i>Library and Information Services</i> : Miami-Dade County	74
15.D	Statements About <i>Library and Information Services</i> : Palm Beach County	75
15.E	Statements About <i>Library and Information Services</i> : Orlando	76
15.F	Statements About <i>Library and Information Services</i> : Tampa	77
15.G	Statements About <i>Library and Information Services</i> : Jacksonville	78
16.A	Statements About <i>Student Services</i> : Respondents at All Locations	79
16.B	Statements About <i>Student Services</i> : Broward County	80
16.C	Statements About <i>Student Services</i> : Miami-Dade County	81
16.D	Statements About <i>Student Services</i> : Palm Beach County	82
16.E	Statements About <i>Student Services</i> : Orlando	83
16.F	Statements About <i>Student Services</i> : Tampa	84
16.G	Statements About <i>Student Services</i> : Jacksonville	85
17	Statements About <i>Summary Evaluation</i> by Student Service Center	86

INTRODUCTION

Background

In an effort to prepare for reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, in 1996 Nova Southeastern University's Office of Research and Planning prepared an extensive series of reports relating to student satisfaction with academic resources and services¹. During Fall Term 1999, the common part of the various 1996 surveys was used to provide an update to the information gained from these many reports and the results were presented in *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey* (2000).

Purpose of This Study

For over 25 years, the University has used distance education modalities to provide instruction at geographic locations beyond the main campus, in Broward County, Florida. In 1999 there was a level of consolidation on how off-campus activities were organized at major urban areas and the reorganization resulted in the development of "brick-and-mortar" Student Service Centers that prominently display University affiliation:

¹ The abstracts of these reports are available at Research and Planning's listing off the University's home page: <<http://www.nova.edu/cwis/urp/urp-researchreports.htm>>.

- 96-02 *Graduates of Nova Southeastern University's Undergraduate Programs Tell Us About Their Undergraduate Experience.*
- 96-05 *Graduates of the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education Reflect on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University.*
- 96-06 *Graduates of the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Reflect Upon Their Academic Experience.*
- 96-07 *Graduates of the School of Computer and Information Sciences Offer Judgment on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University.*
- 96-08 *South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey.*
- 96-12 *Students in the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students.*
- 96-13 *Students in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students.*
- 96-14 *Students in the James M. Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students.*
- 96-15 *Students in the School of Computer and Information Sciences Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: Outcomes from an Academic Center Using Computer-Mediated Communication.*
- 96-23 *July 1, 1995, to June 30, 1996, Graduates of the James M. Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies at Nova Southeastern University Offer Judgment on Their University Experience.*

- Miami-Dade County
- Palm Beach County
- Orlando
- Tampa
- Jacksonville
- Las Vegas

The purpose of this study was to use the data set originally gained from the Fall Term 1999 survey process and to focus on survey results for geographic areas where the University offers instruction at these Student Service Centers. This reporting will provide a useful set of baseline results on student satisfaction with basic organization and services immediately prior to the organization of these consolidated Student Service Centers.

As a measure of comparison, results are also presented in collapsed format for all respondents and breakout results are also presented for Broward County. As a slight limitation to the way survey distribution was originally organized in October 1999, there are no results from students representing the Las Vegas, Nevada, Student Service Center.

This process should be especially useful as the University is compelled to report to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools on its distance education activities. This issue is especially important since the survey was administered immediately before the University implemented the consolidated regional Student Service Centers. This pre-intervention benchmark measure will be especially useful when the current survey process is replicated, in either 2003 or 2004.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology for survey preparation, distribution, and analysis was fully explained in *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey* (2000). The representation of the population, invited sample, and responding sample is detailed in Table 1.

There was a wide level of attention to survey instrument distribution instructions by the many faculty, cluster coordinators, site administrators, and academic center contact people associated with this project. As presented in *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey* (2000), there was agreement that the responding sample was acceptable in terms of overall representation of the population.

RESULTS

Various characteristics of the responding sample and breakout groups are presented in Table 2 to Table 6. To learn more about motivations for attending the University, often as a distance

education student who will not visit the main campus until commencement, individual survey participants were asked to respond to the statement *Why did you decide to attend NSU?* (Tables 7.A to 7.G). In rank order for all participants, the three leading responses were:

- Convenience 52 percent of total
- Type of programs available 52 percent of total
- Location 47 percent of total

A high level of response to these constructs was also offered by participants now enrolled in areas served by the University's Student Service Center locations. However, it was interesting to note that *Small Class Size* also received a favorable response by participants from Miami-Dade County (53 percent) and Tampa (41 percent).

The survey instrument was prepared to determine if survey respondents have had sufficient course work at the University to offer a broad assessment of their experiences with services, with participants asked to mark the number of courses completed in their academic program (Tables 8.A to 8.G). Overall, nearly one-third of all respondents indicated that they had completed 9 or more courses. This level of experience with the University was uneven and less than 20 percent of all participants from Tampa and Jacksonville indicated that they had completed 9 or more courses in their current academic program.

The survey was also designed to offer a sense of library use (Tables 9.A to 9.G), including the University's library infrastructure as well as other libraries. Nearly 60 percent of all respondents indicated that they used the University's library one or more times per week. Responses to this inventory of library usage varied greatly, however, by respondents at the distant sites:

- In Miami-Dade County, Palm Beach County, Orlando, and Tampa, less than 40 percent of all respondents indicated that they used the University's library infrastructure one or more times per week.
- Only in Jacksonville did the frequency of weekly usage of the University's library infrastructure exceed 40 percent.

To gain general marketing-type information, respondents were also presented with a variety of choices on what they would have done if they had not attended the University (Tables 10.A to 10.G). Although there was certainly variance among the many choices offered, it is useful to note that approximately two-thirds of all respondents indicated that they would engage in some type of college or university attendance if they had not attended Nova Southeastern University.

Survey respondents were also asked to complete a brief inventory of all technology-based media that they may have experienced in courses (Tables 11.A to 11.G). Nearly one-half of all respondents indicated some level of experience with Electronic Mail and the World Wide Web,

but this level of response was not matched by participants at sites now served by Student Service Centers:

- Miami-Dade County 28 percent Electronic Mail
 39 percent World Wide Web

- Palm Beach County 24 percent Electronic Mail
 29 percent World Wide Web

- Orlando 27 percent Electronic Mail
 25 percent World Wide Web

- Tampa 22 percent Electronic Mail
 21 percent World Wide Web

- Jacksonville 8 percent Electronic Mail
 32 percent World Wide Web

Survey statements that specifically queried on issues related to student satisfaction with University structure and services were prepared by tracking language from the *Criteria for Accreditation* (1998). These statements focused on issues related to Faculty (Tables 12.A to 12.G), Academic Program (Tables 13.A to 13.G), Administration (Tables 14.A to 14.G), Library and Information Services (Tables 15.A to 15.G), and Student Services (Tables 16.A to 16.G). A summary response by location (Table 17) was also prepared in response to the statement *Overall quality of this academic program*.

SUMMARY

The collapsed and breakout statistics presented in this report provide evidence that students generally have positive opinions about Nova Southeastern University and the many services offered by the University. Program directors and administrative personnel with responsibilities for students at the sites mentioned in this report will, of course, want to give specific attention to the many breakout statistics related to satisfaction with services presented in Tables 12.A to 17. It may be especially useful to look at variance between sites on the following issues:

- Process for assigning students to advisors

- Correctness of student records (including transcripts)

- Availability of computing resources

- Adequacy of computing resources
- Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)
- Infusion of information technology into the curricula
- Provisions for training in the use of technology

It may also be useful for personnel with responsibility for students at off-campus sites to carefully examine the marketing-type information gained from this survey process. It is important to note that *convenience*, *type of programs*, and *location* remain among the most frequently marked responses regarding reasons for deciding to attend the University. It is also important to note that these three responses have considerable support, regardless of location of class attendance.

As planned, the data set gained from this Fall Term 1999 survey has many potential uses beyond this immediate report and the previously published *Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey* (2000).

The University's Office of Research and Planning anticipates an additional report on a comparison of satisfaction with services by Fall Term 1999 campus-based students and their distance education counterparts.

The University is compelled by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to give continual attention to the issue of Institutional Effectiveness (*Criteria for Accreditation*; 1998, pp. 19-22). The survey process associated with this report and the more than 20 reports prepared by the Office of Research and Planning since 1995 that relate in one form or another to distance education should help the University demonstrate its complete commitment to Institutional Effectiveness, including Institutional Effectiveness issues related to distance education.

REFERENCES

Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. (1998). *Criteria for Accreditation*. Decatur, Georgia.

Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey. (2000). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 00-09.

Graduates of the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education Reflect on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-05.

Graduates of Nova Southeastern University's Undergraduate Programs Tell Us About Their Undergraduate Experience. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-02.

Graduates of the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Reflect Upon Their Academic Experience. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-06.

Graduates of the School of Computer and Information Sciences Offer Judgment on Their Experience With Nova Southeastern University. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-07.

July 1, 1995, to June 30, 1996, Graduates of the James M. Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies at Nova Southeastern University Offer Judgment on Their University Experience. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-23.

Nova Southeastern University Fact Book. (2000). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 00-05.

South Florida vs. Other Locations: Comparing Student Responses to a Satisfaction Survey. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-08.

Students in the Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-12.

Students in the James M. Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-14.

Students in the School of Business and Entrepreneurship Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: A Comparison Between On-Campus Students and Off-Campus Students. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-13.

Students in the School of Computer and Information Sciences Respond to a Satisfaction Survey: Outcomes from an Academic Center Using Computer-Mediated Communication. (1996). Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Nova Southeastern University. Research and Planning Report 96-15.

APPENDIX

Table 1

Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Academic Center: Adjusted Data Set²

Academic Center	Responding Sample		Invited Sample		Population	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Fischler Graduate School of Education and Human Services	842	32	1,040	31	6,075	34
Farquhar Center for Undergraduate Studies	436	17	800	24	4,006	22
Huizenga Graduate School of Business and Entrepreneurship	258	10	440	13	2,248	13
Center for Psychological Studies	168	6	280	8	987	5
Health Professions Division	455	17	400	12	2,605	15
Shepard Broad Law Center	164	6	200	6	949	5
School of Computer and Information Sciences	208	8	120	4	683	4
School of Social and Systemic Studies	71	3	66	2	284	2
Oceanographic Center	35	1	20	<1	117	<1
Total	2,637		3,366		17,954	

Note. Fall Term 1999 enrollment population data are from *Nova Southeastern University Fact Book 2000* (2000, p. 50).

² The adjusted data set (N = 2,637) will be used for all analyses presented in this report.

Table 2

Place of Class Attendance by Student Service Center: Respondents at All Locations

Place of Class Attendance	N	%
Broward County	1,568	59
Miami-Dade County	148	6
Palm Beach County	62	2
Orlando	143	5
Tampa	108	4
Jacksonville	38	1
Other Cluster/Site	570	22
Total	2,637	

Table 3.A

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level:
All Respondents**

Degree Level	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Undergraduate	408	15
First Professional	128	5
Graduate	1,878	71
Unidentified	223	8
Total	2,637	

Table 3.B

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level:
Broward County**

Degree Level	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Undergraduate	219	14
First Professional	127	8
Graduate	1063	68
Unidentified	159	10
Total	1568	

Table 3.C

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level:
Miami-Dade County**

Degree Level	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Undergraduate	38	26
First Professional	1	<1
Graduate	103	70
Unidentified	6	4
Total	148	

Table 3.D

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level:
Palm Beach County**

Degree Level	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Undergraduate	21	34
First Professional	0	0
Graduate	37	60
Unidentified	4	6
Total	62	

Table 3.E

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level:
Orlando**

Degree Level	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Undergraduate	35	25
First Professional	0	0
Graduate	92	64
Unidentified	16	11
Total	143	

Table 3.F

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level:
Tampa**

Degree Level	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Undergraduate	41	38
First Professional	0	0
Graduate	63	58
Unidentified	4	4
Total	108	

Table 3.G

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Degree Level:
Jacksonville**

Degree Level	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Undergraduate	7	18
First Professional	0	0
Graduate	27	71
Unidentified	4	11
Total	38	

Table 4.A

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender:
All Respondents**

Gender	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Female	1,563	59
Male	926	35
Unidentified	148	6
Total	2,637	

Table 4.B

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender:
Broward County**

Gender	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Female	918	59
Male	591	38
Unidentified	59	4
Total	1568	

Table 4.C

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender:
Miami-Dade County**

Gender	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Female	98	66
Male	41	28
Unidentified	9	6
Total	148	

Table 4.D

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender:
Palm Beach County**

Gender	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Female	40	65
Male	18	29
Unidentified	4	7
Total	62	

Table 4.E

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender:
Orlando**

Gender	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Female	92	64
Male	37	26
Unidentified	14	10
Total	143	

Table 4.F

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender:
Tampa**

Gender	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Female	74	69
Male	24	22
Unidentified	10	9
Total	108	

Table 4.G

**Representation of the Fall Term 1999 Student Survey by Gender:
Jacksonville**

Gender	Responding Sample	
	N	%
Female	25	66
Male	10	26
Unidentified	3	8
Total	38	

Table 5.A

Race/Ethnic Group: Respondents at All Locations

Race/Ethnic Group	N	%
Black, non-Hispanic	407	15
American Indian or Alaskan Native	13	<1
Asian or Pacific Islander	113	4
Hispanic	338	13
White, Non-Hispanic	1,426	54
Other or Unidentified	340	13
Total	2,637	

Table 5.B

Race/Ethnic Group: Broward County

Race/Ethnic Group	N	%
Black, non-Hispanic	172	11
American Indian or Alaskan Native	8	<1
Asian or Pacific Islander	103	7
Hispanic	214	14
White, Non-Hispanic	893	57
Other or Unidentified	178	11
Total	1568	

Table 5.C

Race/Ethnic Group: Miami-Dade County

Race/Ethnic Group	N	%
Black, non-Hispanic	20	14
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	<1
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0
Hispanic	92	62
White, Non-Hispanic	11	7
Other or Unidentified	24	16
Total	148	

Table 5.D

Race/Ethnic Group: Palm Beach County

Race/Ethnic Group	N	%
Black, non-Hispanic	15	24
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	2
Hispanic	5	8
White, Non-Hispanic	34	55
Other or Unidentified	7	11
Total	62	

Table 5.E

Race/Ethnic Group: Orlando

Race/Ethnic Group	N	%
Black, non-Hispanic	34	24
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	<1
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0
Hispanic	7	5
White, Non-Hispanic	83	58
Other or Unidentified	18	13
Total	143	

Table 5.F

Race/Ethnic Group: Tampa

Race/Ethnic Group	N	%
Black, non-Hispanic	17	16
American Indian or Alaskan Native	1	<1
Asian or Pacific Islander	3	3
Hispanic	6	6
White, Non-Hispanic	63	58
Other or Unidentified	18	17
Total	108	

Table 5.G

Race/Ethnic Group: Jacksonville

Race/Ethnic Group	N	%
Black, non-Hispanic	8	21
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0	0
Asian or Pacific Islander	1	3
Hispanic	1	3
White, Non-Hispanic	22	58
Other or Unidentified	6	16
Total	38	

Table 6
Current Age of Respondents by Student Service Center

Academic Center	N	Age			
		Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Broward County	1441	23	27	29.9	9.3
Miami-Dade County	133	27	29	31.6	7.9
Palm Beach County	51	38	39	37.4	8.0
Orlando	116	25	38	38.9	10.1
Tampa	95	27	38	38.3	9.1
Jacksonville	31	26	31	33.1	9.8
Respondents at All Locations	2,332	24	31	33.4	10.5

Table 7.A

Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU³: Respondents at All Locations

Reason	N	%
Academic reputation	876	33
Admissions standards	657	25
Advice of counselors and teachers	276	11
Availability of scholarships or financial aid	263	10
Convenience	1,358	52
Cost	174	7
Location	1,236	47
Small class size	738	28
Social atmosphere	241	9
Type of programs available	1,360	52
Other	376	14

³ Respondents were asked to mark selections against the statement “Why did you decide to attend NSU?”

Table 7.B

Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Broward County

Reason	N	%
Academic reputation	541	35
Admissions standards	408	26
Advice of counselors and teachers	150	10
Availability of scholarships or financial aid	163	10
Convenience	701	45
Cost	109	7
Location	765	49
Small class size	400	26
Social atmosphere	151	10
Type of programs available	842	54
Other	246	16

Table 7.C

Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Miami-Dade County

Reason	N	%
Academic reputation	57	39
Admissions standards	44	30
Advice of counselors and teachers	23	16
Availability of scholarships or financial aid	20	14
Convenience	90	61
Cost	9	6
Location	74	50
Small class size	78	53
Social atmosphere	16	11
Type of programs available	83	56
Other		

Table 7.D

Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Palm Beach County

Reason	N	%
Academic reputation	17	27
Admissions standards	14	23
Advice of counselors and teachers	6	10
Availability of scholarships or financial aid	6	10
Convenience	35	57
Cost	6	10
Location	25	40
Small class size	21	34
Social atmosphere	4	7
Type of programs available	26	42
Other	7	11

Table 7.E

Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Orlando

Reason	N	%
Academic reputation	39	27
Admissions standards	33	23
Advice of counselors and teachers	10	7
Availability of scholarships or financial aid	7	5
Convenience	83	58
Cost	2	1
Location	65	46
Small class size	51	36
Social atmosphere	5	4
Type of programs available	64	45
Other	20	14

Table 7.F

Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Tampa

Reason	N	%
Academic reputation	33	31
Admissions standards	28	26
Advice of counselors and teachers	14	13
Availability of scholarships or financial aid	14	13
Convenience	77	71
Cost	4	4
Location	51	47
Small class size	44	41
Social atmosphere	16	15
Type of programs available	39	36
Other	12	11

Table 7.G

Reasons for Deciding to Attend NSU: Jacksonville

Reason	N	%
Academic reputation	13	34
Admissions standards	13	34
Advice of counselors and teachers	8	21
Availability of scholarships or financial aid	4	11
Convenience	22	58
Cost	0	0
Location	18	47
Small class size	14	37
Social atmosphere	1	3
Type of programs available	20	53
Other	5	13

Table 8.A

Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Respondents at All Locations

Number of Courses	N	%	Number of Courses	N	%
0	509	19	5	115	4
1	131	5	6	179	7
2	218	8	7	109	4
3	130	5	8	142	5
4	165	6	9 or more	825	31
			Unidentified	114	4

Table 8.B

Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Broward County

Number of Courses	N	%	Number of Courses	N	%
0	368	24	5	41	3
1	83	5	6	89	6
2	162	10	7	47	3
3	78	5	8	72	5
4	54	3	9 or more	518	33
			Unidentified	56	4

Table 8.C

Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Miami-Dade County

Number of Courses	N	%	Number of Courses	N	%
0	35	24	5	7	5
1	14	10	6	11	7
2	6	4	7	7	5
3	5	3	8	6	4
4	8	5	9 or more	44	30
			Unidentified	5	3

Table 8.D

Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Palm Beach County

Number of Courses	N	%	Number of Courses	N	%
0	11	18	5	0	0
1	2	3	6	5	8
2	3	5	7	5	8
3	0	0	8	5	8
4	2	3	9 or more	29	47
			Unidentified	0	0

Table 8.E

Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Orlando

Number of Courses	N	%	Number of Courses	N	%
0	10	7	5	5	14
1	5	4	6	14	10
2	4	3	7	8	6
3	2	1	8	17	12
4	5	4	9 or more	63	44
			Unidentified	10	7

Table 8.F

Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Tampa

Number of Courses	N	%	Number of Courses	N	%
0	17	16	5	14	13
1	1	<1	6	13	12
2	6	6	7	7	7
3	3	3	8	6	6
4	15	14	9 or more	21	19
			Unidentified	5	5

Table 8.G

Number of Courses Completed in This Academic Program: Jacksonville

Number of Courses	N	%	Number of Courses	N	%
0	4	11	5	1	3
1	2	5	6	4	11
2	5	13	7	6	16
3	3	8	8	5	13
4	0	0	9 or more	6	16
			Unidentified	2	5

Table 9.A

Frequency of Library Usage: Respondents at All Locations

Library Usage Statement and Frequency of Weekly Use	N	%
During a typical term, I usually use NSU's libraries or library provided services ...		
0 times per week	552	21
1 time per week	465	18
2 times per week	340	13
3 times per week	271	10
4 times per week	125	5
5 or more times per week	290	11
No response	594	23
During a typical term, I usually use other libraries ...		
0 times per week	829	31
1 time per week	483	18
2 times per week	319	12
3 times per week	179	7
4 times per week	70	3
5 or more times per week	107	4
No response	650	25

Table 9.B

Frequency of Library Usage: Broward County

Library Usage Statement and Frequency of Weekly Use	N	%
During a typical term, I usually use NSU's libraries or library provided services ...		
0 times per week	212	14
1 time per week	283	18
2 times per week	224	14
3 times per week	192	12
4 times per week	101	6
5 or more times per week	255	16
No response	301	19
During a typical term, I usually use other libraries ...		
0 times per week	650	42
1 time per week	234	15
2 times per week	131	8
3 times per week	85	5
4 times per week	25	2
5 or more times per week	66	4
No response	377	24

Table 9.C

Frequency of Library Usage: Miami-Dade County

Library Usage Statement and Frequency of Weekly Use	N	%
During a typical term, I usually use NSU's libraries or library provided services ...		
0 times per week	63	43
1 time per week	22	15
2 times per week	14	10
3 times per week	11	7
4 times per week	2	1
5 or more times per week	5	3
No response	31	21
During a typical term, I usually use other libraries ...		
0 times per week	30	20
1 time per week	36	24
2 times per week	33	22
3 times per week	10	7
4 times per week	5	3
5 or more times per week	1	<1
No response	33	22

Table 9.D

Frequency of Library Usage: Palm Beach County

Library Usage Statement and Frequency of Weekly Use	N	%
During a typical term, I usually use NSU's libraries or library provided services ...		
0 times per week	23	37
1 time per week	9	15
2 times per week	8	13
3 times per week	3	5
4 times per week	1	2
5 or more times per week	1	2
No response	17	27
During a typical term, I usually use other libraries ...		
0 times per week	10	16
1 time per week	17	27
2 times per week	8	13
3 times per week	2	3
4 times per week	5	8
5 or more times per week	3	5
No response	17	27

Table 9.E

Frequency of Library Usage: Orlando

Library Usage Statement and Frequency of Weekly Use	N	%
During a typical term, I usually use NSU's libraries or library provided services ...		
0 times per week	58	41
1 time per week	16	11
2 times per week	11	8
3 times per week	13	9
4 times per week	2	1
5 or more times per week	8	6
No response	35	25
During a typical term, I usually use other libraries ...		
0 times per week	32	22
1 time per week	30	21
2 times per week	24	17
3 times per week	13	9
4 times per week	5	4
5 or more times per week	4	3
No response	35	25

Table 9.F

Frequency of Library Usage: Tampa

Library Usage Statement and Frequency of Weekly Use	N	%
During a typical term, I usually use NSU's libraries or library provided services ...		
0 times per week	57	53
1 time per week	13	12
2 times per week	2	2
3 times per week	0	0
4 times per week	0	0
5 or more times per week	1	<1
No response	35	32
During a typical term, I usually use other libraries ...		
0 times per week	13	12
1 time per week	25	23
2 times per week	20	19
3 times per week	11	10
4 times per week	4	4
5 or more times per week	3	3
No response	32	30

Table 9.G

Frequency of Library Usage: Jacksonville

Library Usage Statement and Frequency of Weekly Use	N	%
During a typical term, I usually use NSU's libraries or library provided services ...		
0 times per week	17	45
1 time per week	9	24
2 times per week	4	11
3 times per week	3	8
4 times per week	0	0
5 or more times per week	0	0
No response	5	13
During a typical term, I usually use other libraries ...		
0 times per week	3	8
1 time per week	12	32
2 times per week	4	11
3 times per week	6	16
4 times per week	3	8
5 or more times per week	1	3
No response	9	24

Table 10.A

**What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended
Nova Southeastern University⁴: Respondents at All Locations**

Response	N	%
Attend another private college or university in South Florida	383	15
Attend another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	112	4
Attend a private college or university in another state	375	14
Attend a state college or university in South Florida	300	11
Attend a state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	189	7
Attend a state college or university in another state	389	15
Not attend a college or university	226	9
Other	198	8
Unidentified	465	18

⁴ Respondents were asked to mark selections against the statement “What would you have done if you had not attended NSU?”

Table 10.B

**What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended
Nova Southeastern University: Broward County**

Response	N	%
Attend another private college or university in South Florida	259	17
Attend another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	49	3
Attend a private college or university in another state	274	18
Attend a state college or university in South Florida	203	13
Attend a state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	91	6
Attend a state college or university in another state	174	11
Not attend a college or university	101	6
Other	127	8
Unidentified	290	18

Table 10.C

**What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended
Nova Southeastern University: Miami-Dade County**

Response	N	%
Attend another private college or university in South Florida	66	45
Attend another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	1	<1
Attend a private college or university in another state	2	1
Attend a state college or university in South Florida	38	26
Attend a state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	2	1
Attend a state college or university in another state	2	1
Not attend a college or university	6	4
Other	4	3
Unidentified	27	18

Table 10.D

**What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended
Nova Southeastern University: Palm Beach County**

Response	N	%
Attend another private college or university in South Florida	14	23
Attend another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	2	3
Attend a private college or university in another state	1	2
Attend a state college or university in South Florida	21	34
Attend a state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	0	0
Attend a state college or university in another state	2	3
Not attend a college or university	7	11
Other	1	2
Unidentified	14	23

Table 10.E

**What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended
Nova Southeastern University: Orlando**

Response	N	%
Attend another private college or university in South Florida	13	9
Attend another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	32	22
Attend a private college or university in another state	3	2
Attend a state college or university in South Florida	8	6
Attend a state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	42	29
Attend a state college or university in another state	8	6
Not attend a college or university	8	6
Other	9	6
Unidentified	20	14

Table 10.F

What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended
Nova Southeastern University: Tampa

Response	N	%
Attend another private college or university in South Florida	18	17
Attend another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	12	11
Attend a private college or university in another state	0	0
Attend a state college or university in South Florida	22	20
Attend a state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	14	13
Attend a state college or university in another state	3	3
Not attend a college or university	17	16
Other	5	5
Unidentified	17	16

Table 10.G

**What Survey Respondents Would Have Done If They Had Not Attended
Nova Southeastern University: Jacksonville**

Response	N	%
Attend another private college or university in South Florida	3	8
Attend another private college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	8	21
Attend a private college or university in another state	0	0
Attend a state college or university in South Florida	1	3
Attend a state college or university in Florida, but not in South Florida	14	37
Attend a state college or university in another state	1	3
Not attend a college or university	4	11
Other	2	5
Unidentified	5	13

Table 11.A

Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Respondents at All Locations

Technology-Based Medium	N	%
Audiobridge	242	9
Compressed Video	177	7
Electronic Mail	1,233	47
Electronic Classroom	406	15
World Wide Web	1,187	45
Other	231	9

Table 11.B

Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Broward County

Technology-Based Medium	N	%
Audiobridge	111	7
Compressed Video	113	7
Electronic Mail	868	55
Electronic Classroom	315	20
World Wide Web	798	51
Other	161	10

Table 11.C

Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Miami-Dade County

Technology-Based Medium	N	%
Audiobridge	10	7
Compressed Video	9	6
Electronic Mail	41	28
Electronic Classroom	17	12
World Wide Web	58	39
Other	11	7

Table 11.D

Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Palm Beach County

Technology-Based Medium	N	%
Audiobridge	11	18
Compressed Video	4	7
Electronic Mail	15	24
Electronic Classroom	4	7
World Wide Web	18	29
Other	3	5

Table 11.E

Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Orlando

Technology-Based Medium	N	%
Audiobridge	19	13
Compressed Video	16	11
Electronic Mail	39	27
Electronic Classroom	11	8
World Wide Web	36	25
Other	6	4

Table 11.F

Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Tampa

Technology-Based Medium	N	%
Audiobridge	8	7
Compressed Video	2	2
Electronic Mail	24	22
Electronic Classroom	8	7
World Wide Web	23	21
Other	5	5

Table 11.G

Technology-Based Media Experienced in Courses: Jacksonville

Technology-Based Medium	N	%
Audiobridge	6	16
Compressed Video	1	3
Electronic Mail	3	8
Electronic Classroom	3	8
World Wide Web	12	32
Other	2	5

Table 12.A
Statements⁵ About Faculty: Respondents at All Locations

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Competency of the faculty	2,537	4	4	4.2	0.8
Access to full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means	2,394	4	4	4.0	0.9
Interaction with full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means ..	2,410	4	4	4.0	0.9

⁵ Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale for these statements:

- | | | | |
|---|---|-----|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Very Dissatisfied | N/A | Not Applicable |
| 2 | Dissatisfied | U | Unknown or Unable to Answer |
| 3 | Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied | | |
| 4 | Satisfied | | |
| 5 | Very Satisfied | | |

Table 12.B

Statements About *Faculty*: Broward County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Competency of the faculty	1519	4	4	4.1	0.8
Access to full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means	1464	4	4	4.1	0.9
Interaction with full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means ..	1475	4	4	4.0	1.0

Table 12.C

Statements About *Faculty*: Miami-Dade County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Competency of the faculty	147	5	4	4.2	0.9
Access to full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means	131	4	4	3.9	1.0
Interaction with full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means ..	128	4	4	3.8	1.0

Table 12.D

Statements About *Faculty*: Palm Beach County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Competency of the faculty	58	4	4	3.9	1.0
Access to full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means	51	4	4	3.6	1.1
Interaction with full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means	52	4	4	3.5	1.2

Table 12.E

Statements About *Faculty*: Orlando

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Competency of the faculty	137	5	4	4.1	1.0
Access to full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means	118	4	4	3.8	1.1
Interaction with full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means	122	4	4	3.7	1.0

Table 12.F

Statements About *Faculty*: Tampa

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Competency of the faculty	101	5	4	4.4	0.8
Access to full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means	91	4	4	3.9	0.9
Interaction with full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means ..	94	4	4	3.9	0.9

Table 12.G

Statements About *Faculty*: Jacksonville

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Competency of the faculty	38	5	4	4.4	0.7
Access to full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means	35	5	4	4.3	0.8
Interaction with full-time faculty, either through direct contact or other means ..	33	4	4	4.0	0.9

Table 13.A

Statements⁶ About Academic Program: Respondents at All Locations

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Opportunity for intellectual growth	2,584	5	4	4.3	0.8
Opportunity for peer interaction	2,592	5	4	4.3	0.9
Instructional methods	2,589	4	4	4.0	0.9
Delivery system	2,486	4	4	4.0	0.9
Quality of the learning environment	2,595	4	4	4.0	0.9
Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation	1,883	4	4	4.0	0.9
Length of the academic program	2,555	4	4	4.1	0.8
Length of the individual courses	2,582	4	4	4.1	0.8
Process for assigning students to advisors	2,112	4	3	3.4	1.2

⁶ Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale for these statements:

- | | | | |
|---|---|-----|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Very Dissatisfied | N/A | Not Applicable |
| 2 | Dissatisfied | U | Unknown or Unable to Answer |
| 3 | Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied | | |
| 4 | Satisfied | | |
| 5 | Very Satisfied | | |

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Quality of advising	2,187	4	4	3.4	1.2
Adequacy of classroom facilities	2,491	4	4	3.8	1.0

Table 13.B

Statements About *Academic Program*: Broward County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Opportunity for intellectual growth	1541	4	4	4.2	0.8
Opportunity for peer interaction	1548	5	4	4.2	0.9
Instructional methods	1549	4	4	3.9	0.9
Delivery system	1464	4	4	3.9	0.9
Quality of the learning environment	1547	4	4	4.0	0.9
Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation	1068	4	4	3.9	0.9
Length of the academic program	1522	4	4	4.1	0.9
Length of the individual courses	1544	4	4	4.0	0.9
Process for assigning students to advisors	1284	4	3	3.3	1.2
Quality of advising	1288	4	4	3.4	1.2
Adequacy of classroom facilities	1494	4	4	3.9	1.0



Table 13.C
Statements About Academic Program: Miami-Dade County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Opportunity for intellectual growth	145	5	4	4.3	0.8
Opportunity for peer interaction	144	5	4	4.3	0.7
Instructional methods	146	4	4	4.2	0.8
Delivery system	140	4	4	4.1	0.9
Quality of the learning environment	147	4	4	4.1	0.9
Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation	106	4	4	4.2	0.8
Length of the academic program	144	5	4	4.3	0.7
Length of the individual courses	145	5	4	4.3	0.7
Process for assigning students to advisors	128	4	3	3.3	1.2
Quality of advising	132	4	4	3.4	1.2
Adequacy of classroom facilities	139	4	4	4.0	0.9

Table 13.D

Statements About *Academic Program*: Palm Beach County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Opportunity for intellectual growth	62	4	4	4.2	0.7
Opportunity for peer interaction	62	5	4	4.3	0.7
Instructional methods	62	4	4	4.0	0.9
Delivery system	61	4	4	3.9	1.0
Quality of the learning environment	61	4	4	3.9	0.9
Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation	43	3	4	3.8	0.9
Length of the academic program	60	4	4	4.0	0.8
Length of the individual courses	61	4	4	4.0	0.8
Process for assigning students to advisors	47	1	3	2.7	1.3
Quality of advising	53	2	2	2.7	1.3
Adequacy of classroom facilities	58	4	4	3.8	1.0

Table 13.E
Statements About *Academic Program*: Orlando

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Opportunity for intellectual growth	141	5	4	4.3	0.7
Opportunity for peer interaction	141	5	4	4.4	0.7
Instructional methods	140	4	4	4.1	0.8
Delivery system	134	4	4	4.1	0.8
Quality of the learning environment	142	4	4	3.9	0.9
Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation	112	4	4	4.1	0.8
Length of the academic program	142	4	4	4.2	0.9
Length of the individual courses	141	4	4	4.2	0.8
Process for assigning students to advisors	120	3	3	3.1	1.3
Quality of advising	127	4	3	3.2	1.3
Adequacy of classroom facilities	136	4	4	3.6	1.1

Table 13.F

Statements About *Academic Program*: Tampa

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Opportunity for intellectual growth	106	5	4	4.3	0.7
Opportunity for peer interaction	104	5	4	4.5	0.6
Instructional methods	103	4	4	4.3	0.7
Delivery system	101	4	4	4.1	0.8
Quality of the learning environment	102	4	4	3.8	1.1
Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation	71	4	4	4.0	0.8
Length of the academic program	105	4	4	4.3	0.7
Length of the individual courses	105	4	4	4.4	0.7
Process for assigning students to advisors	70	4	4	3.4	1.2
Quality of advising	79	3	3	3.1	1.3
Adequacy of classroom facilities	95	4	4	3.4	1.2

Table 13.G

Statements About *Academic Program*: Jacksonville

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Opportunity for intellectual growth	36	4	4	4.3	0.6
Opportunity for peer interaction	36	5	4	4.5	0.6
Instructional methods	38	4	4	4.1	0.8
Delivery system	38	4	4	4.1	0.7
Quality of the learning environment	38	4	4	4.1	0.8
Applied nature of thesis, practicum, or dissertation	18	4	4	3.8	0.9
Length of the academic program	37	4	4	4.0	0.9
Length of the individual courses	37	4	4	4.0	0.9
Process for assigning students to advisors	30	3	4	3.4	1.3
Quality of advising	32	4	4	3.8	1.3
Adequacy of classroom facilities	35	4	4	3.9	0.8



Table 14.A

Statements⁷ About *Administration*: Respondents at All Locations

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Clarity of written admission policies	2,502	4	4	4.0	0.9
Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions	2,121	4	4	3.8	1.0
Clarity of written completion requirements	2,454	4	4	3.9	0.9
Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog	2,465	4	4	3.9	0.9
Program orientation	2,481	4	4	3.9	1.0
Course registration activities	2,513	4	4	3.8	1.0
Published grading policy	2,412	4	4	3.9	1.0
Interaction with administrative personnel	2,449	4	4	3.6	1.1
Clarity of program catalog	2,482	4	4	3.9	0.9
Correctness of student records (including transcripts)	2,190	4	4	3.6	1.2

⁷ Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale for these statements:

- | | | | |
|---|---|-----|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Very Dissatisfied | N/A | Not Applicable |
| 2 | Dissatisfied | U | Unknown or Unable to Answer |
| 3 | Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied | | |
| 4 | Satisfied | | |
| 5 | Very Satisfied | | |

Table 14.B
Statements About Administration: Broward County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Clarity of written admission policies	1484	4	4	4.0	0.8
Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions	1227	4	4	3.8	1.0
Clarity of written completion requirements	1457	4	4	4.0	0.9
Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog	1463	4	4	3.9	0.9
Program orientation	1481	4	4	3.9	1.0
Course registration activities	1489	4	4	3.7	1.1
Published grading policy	1432	4	4	3.9	1.0
Interaction with administrative personnel	1468	4	4	3.7	1.1
Clarity of program catalog	1482	4	4	3.9	0.9
Correctness of student records (including transcripts)	1306	4	4	3.7	1.1

Table 14.C
Statements About Administration: Miami-Dade County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Clarity of written admission policies	142	4	4	4.1	0.8
Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions	128	4	4	3.9	1.0
Clarity of written completion requirements	140	4	4	4.0	0.9
Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog	135	4	4	4.1	0.9
Program orientation	133	4	4	3.9	1.0
Course registration activities	140	4	4	3.9	1.0
Published grading policy	130	4	4	3.9	0.9
Interaction with administrative personnel	130	4	4	3.6	1.1
Clarity of program catalog	137	4	4	4.1	0.8
Correctness of student records (including transcripts)	125	4	4	3.6	1.2

Table 14.D
Statements About Administration: Palm Beach County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Clarity of written admission policies	61	4	4	3.5	1.0
Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions	54	4	4	3.4	1.0
Clarity of written completion requirements	58	4	4	3.5	1.1
Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog ...	60	4	4	3.6	0.9
Program orientation	55	4	4	3.4	1.2
Course registration activities	59	4	4	3.4	1.0
Published grading policy	55	4	4	3.6	1.0
Interaction with administrative personnel	59	4	3	3.1	1.1
Clarity of program catalog	59	4	3	3.4	0.9
Correctness of student records (including transcripts)	49	4	3	3.0	1.3

Table 14.E
Statements About Administration: Orlando

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Clarity of written admission policies	137	4	4	3.8	1.0
Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions	125	4	4	3.6	1.2
Clarity of written completion requirements	134	4	4	3.8	1.0
Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog	133	4	4	3.8	1.0
Program orientation	134	4	4	3.6	1.1
Course registration activities	139	4	4	3.7	1.1
Published grading policy	140	4	4	3.6	1.2
Interaction with administrative personnel	139	4	3	3.2	1.3
Clarity of program catalog	141	4	4	3.6	1.1
Correctness of student records (including transcripts)	130	4	3	3.2	1.4

Table 14.F
Statements About Administration: Tampa

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Clarity of written admission policies	94	4	4	3.9	0.8
Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions	86	4	4	3.6	1.1
Clarity of written completion requirements	94	4	4	3.7	1.0
Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog	95	4	4	3.8	0.9
Program orientation	97	4	4	3.8	0.9
Course registration activities	98	4	4	3.6	1.1
Published grading policy	91	4	4	3.8	1.0
Interaction with administrative personnel	92	3	3	3.1	1.2
Clarity of program catalog	93	4	4	3.7	1.0
Correctness of student records (including transcripts)	82	3	3	3.3	1.3



Table 14.G
Statements About Administration: Jacksonville

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Clarity of written admission policies	37	4	4	4.0	0.9
Clarity of written policy on transfer of credit from other institutions	34	4	4	3.8	1.0
Clarity of written completion requirements	36	4	4	4.1	0.8
Clarity of written curricular offerings, as identified in program catalog	37	4	4	4.2	0.8
Program orientation	34	4	4	3.8	1.1
Course registration activities	36	4	4	4.0	0.9
Published grading policy	37	4	4	3.9	1.1
Interaction with administrative personnel	35	4	4	3.9	1.1
Clarity of program catalog	35	4	4	4.1	0.8
Correctness of student records (including transcripts)	32	4	4	3.5	1.2

Table 15.A

Statements⁸ About *Library and Information Services*: Respondents at All Locations

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Availability of library and learning resource materials	2,348	4	4	3.9	1.1
Adequacy of library and learning resource materials	2,320	4	4	3.8	1.1
Orientation program relative to library services	2,286	4	4	3.7	1.1
Training in access to information in electronic and other formats	2,300	4	4	3.7	1.1
Availability of computing resources	2,269	4	4	3.8	1.1
Adequacy of computing resources	2,261	4	4	3.9	1.0
Access to information through technology	2,370	4	4	4.0	1.0
Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)	2,057	4	4	3.7	1.1

⁸ Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale for these statements:

- | | | | |
|---|---|-----|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Very Dissatisfied | N/A | Not Applicable |
| 2 | Dissatisfied | U | Unknown or Unable to Answer |
| 3 | Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied | | |
| 4 | Satisfied | | |
| 5 | Very Satisfied | | |

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Infusion of information technology into the curricula	2,250	4	4	3.8	1.0
Provisions for training in the use of technology	2,161	4	4	3.6	1.1

Table 15.B

Statements About *Library and Information Services*: Broward County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Availability of library and learning resource materials	1463	4	4	3.9	1.1
Adequacy of library and learning resource materials	1447	4	4	3.8	1.1
Orientation program relative to library services	1384	4	4	3.7	1.1
Training in access to information in electronic and other formats	1404	4	4	3.8	1.0
Availability of computing resources	1433	4	4	4.0	1.0
Adequacy of computing resources	1434	4	4	4.0	0.9
Access to information through technology	1461	4	4	4.1	0.9
Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)	1315	4	4	3.9	1.0
Infusion of information technology into the curricula	1394	4	4	3.9	1.0
Provisions for training in the use of technology	1338	4	4	3.7	1.0

Table 15.C

Statements About *Library and Information Services*: Miami-Dade County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Availability of library and learning resource materials	112	5	4	3.6	1.3
Adequacy of library and learning resource materials	111	5	4	3.7	1.2
Orientation program relative to library services	118	4	4	3.8	1.1
Training in access to information in electronic and other formats	115	4	4	3.9	1.1
Availability of computing resources	114	4	4	3.8	1.1
Adequacy of computing resources	113	4	4	3.8	1.1
Access to information through technology	120	4	4	3.9	1.0
Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)	105	4	4	3.6	1.1
Infusion of information technology into the curricula	111	4	4	3.8	1.0
Provisions for training in the use of technology	110	4	4	3.7	1.0

Table 15.D
Statements About Library and Information Services: Palm Beach County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Availability of library and learning resource materials	49	4	4	4.0	0.8
Adequacy of library and learning resource materials	49	4	4	3.9	0.8
Orientation program relative to library services	53	4	4	3.8	1.0
Training in access to information in electronic and other formats	52	4	4	3.7	1.0
Availability of computing resources	46	4	4	3.7	1.0
Adequacy of computing resources	47	4	4	3.7	1.0
Access to information through technology	52	4	4	3.8	1.0
Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)	44	4	3	3.3	1.1
Infusion of information technology into the curricula	47	4	4	3.6	1.0
Provisions for training in the use of technology	50	4	4	3.4	1.1

Table 15.E
Statements About Library and Information Services: Orlando

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Availability of library and learning resource materials	123	4	4	3.5	1.3
Adequacy of library and learning resource materials	121	4	4	3.6	1.2
Orientation program relative to library services	118	5	4	3.5	1.4
Training in access to information in electronic and other formats	125	4	4	3.3	1.4
Availability of computing resources	123	3	3	3.2	1.3
Adequacy of computing resources	123	4	3	3.2	1.3
Access to information through technology	130	4	4	3.5	1.3
Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)	111	3	3	2.8	1.2
Infusion of information technology into the curricula	114	4	3	3.3	1.1
Provisions for training in the use of technology	104	3	3	3.0	1.2



Table 15.F
Statements About *Library and Information Services*: Tampa

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Availability of library and learning resource materials	73	4	4	3.5	1.3
Adequacy of library and learning resource materials	70	4	4	3.6	1.2
Orientation program relative to library services	79	4	4	3.5	1.2
Training in access to information in electronic and other formats	75	4	4	3.6	1.2
Availability of computing resources	67	4	4	3.5	1.2
Adequacy of computing resources	65	4	4	3.6	1.2
Access to information through technology	78	4	4	3.7	1.2
Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)	57	4	4	3.2	1.3
Infusion of information technology into the curricula	75	4	4	3.6	1.1
Provisions for training in the use of technology	72	4	4	3.4	1.2



Table 15.G

Statements About *Library and Information Services*: Jacksonville

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Availability of library and learning resource materials	30	4	4	3.4	1.3
Adequacy of library and learning resource materials	28	4	4	3.6	1.3
Orientation program relative to library services	30	4	4	3.6	1.2
Training in access to information in electronic and other formats	30	4	4	3.6	1.1
Availability of computing resources	26	3	3	3.2	1.1
Adequacy of computing resources	25	4	4	3.4	1.1
Access to information through technology	31	3	4	3.5	1.2
Instructional support services (e.g., educational equipment and specialized facilities such as laboratories, audio visual and duplicating services)	25	4	3	3.0	1.2
Infusion of information technology into the curricula	28	4	4	3.6	0.9
Provisions for training in the use of technology	28	3	3	3.4	1.0



Table 16.A

Statements⁹ About Student Services: Respondents at All Locations

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Student development services	1,589	4	4	3.5	1.0
Counseling and career development	1,583	3	3	3.3	1.1
Remedial services available	1,256	3	3	3.3	1.0
Student government opportunities	1,419	3	4	3.5	1.0
Student behavior policies and procedures	1,679	4	4	3.6	1.0
Financial aid services	2,086	1	3	2.8	1.4
Health services	1,259	3	3	3.4	1.1
Refund policies when withdrawing from courses	1,285	3	3	3.4	1.1
Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment	2,124	4	4	3.9	1.0

⁹

Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale for these statements:

- | | | | |
|---|---|-----|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Very Dissatisfied | N/A | Not Applicable |
| 2 | Dissatisfied | U | Unknown or Unable to Answer |
| 3 | Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied | | |
| 4 | Satisfied | | |
| 5 | Very Satisfied | | |

Table 16.B

Statements About Student Services: Broward County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Student development services	1016	4	4	3.6	1.0
Counseling and career development	1007	3	4	3.4	1.1
Remedial services available	783	3	3	3.4	1.0
Student government opportunities	1005	4	4	3.7	1.0
Student behavior policies and procedures	1120	4	4	3.7	1.0
Financial aid services	1304	1	3	2.7	1.4
Health services	890	3	4	3.4	1.1
Refund policies when withdrawing from courses	802	3	3	3.3	1.1
Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment	1384	4	4	4.0	1.0

Table 16.C

Statements About *Student Services*: Miami-Dade County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Student development services	96	3	4	3.5	1.0
Counseling and career development	108	3	3	3.3	1.1
Remedial services available	79	3	3	3.4	0.9
Student government opportunities	65	3	3	3.4	1.1
Student behavior policies and procedures	93	4	4	3.8	0.9
Financial aid services	116	4	4	3.3	1.4
Health services	66	3	3	3.4	0.9
Refund policies when withdrawing from courses	90	3	4	3.5	1.1
Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment	124	5	4	4.0	1.0

Table 16.D

Statements About Student Services: Palm Beach County

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Student development services	34	3	3	3.1	1.0
Counseling and career development	36	2	3	2.6	1.2
Remedial services available	33	3	3	3.0	1.1
Student government opportunities	28	3	3	3.0	1.1
Student behavior policies and procedures	30	3	3	3.3	1.1
Financial aid services	50	4	3	3.1	1.4
Health services	27	3	3	3.1	1.0
Refund policies when withdrawing from courses	33	3	3	3.2	1.2
Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment	47	4	4	3.8	0.9

Table 16.E

Statements About *Student Services*: Orlando

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Student development services	85	3	3	3.0	1.2
Counseling and career development	87	3	3	2.8	1.3
Remedial services available	74	3	3	3.0	1.2
Student government opportunities	63	3	3	2.9	1.2
Student behavior policies and procedures	85	3	3	3.3	1.2
Financial aid services	117	1	2	2.3	1.4
Health services	59	3	3	2.9	1.2
Refund policies when withdrawing from courses	73	3	3	3.1	1.2
Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment	116	4	4	3.6	1.2

Table 16.F
Statements About Student Services: Tampa

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Student development services	53	3	3	3.2	1.2
Counseling and career development	57	3	3	3.0	1.2
Remedial services available	46	3	3	3.3	1.0
Student government opportunities	37	3	3	3.3	1.0
Student behavior policies and procedures	46	3	4	3.6	1.0
Financial aid services	66	3	3	2.6	1.2
Health services	30	3	3	3.3	1.1
Refund policies when withdrawing from courses	40	3	3	3.4	1.1
Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment	73	5	4	3.9	1.1

Table 16.G

Statements About *Student Services*: Jacksonville

Survey Statement	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Student development services	20	3	3	3.2	1.2
Counseling and career development	20	4	4	3.8	1.2
Remedial services available	15	3	4	3.5	1.1
Student government opportunities	14	1	3	2.7	1.4
Student behavior policies and procedures	20	3	4	3.4	1.3
Financial aid services	28	4	3	2.9	1.4
Health services	12	3	3	2.9	1.2
Refund policies when withdrawing from courses	18	3	4	3.5	1.3
Safety and security of classroom buildings and the learning environment	33	5	4	4.2	0.9

Table 17
Statements About Summary Evaluation¹⁰ by Student Service Center

Academic Center	N	Mode	Median	Mean	SD
Broward County	1307	4	4	4.0	0.8
Miami-Dade County	106	4	4	4.1	0.9
Palm Beach County	46	4	4	3.7	0.9
Orlando	104	4	4	4.0	0.9
Tampa	77	4	4	4.0	0.8
Jacksonville	28	4	4	4.3	0.6
Respondents at All Locations	2,070	4	4	4.0	0.8

¹⁰

Respondents were directed to use the following rating scale to mark their level of satisfaction with the single statement: *Overall quality of this academic program.*

- | | | | |
|---|---|-----|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Very Dissatisfied | N/A | Not Applicable |
| 2 | Dissatisfied | U | Unknown or Unable to Answer |
| 3 | Neutral, Neither Satisfied Nor Dissatisfied | | |
| 4 | Satisfied | | |
| 5 | Very Satisfied | | |

133



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

HE034070



Reproduction Release
(Specific Document)




I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Fall Term 1999 Nova Southeastern University Students Respond to a Broad-Based Satisfaction Survey: Breakouts By Student Service Center Locations	
Author(s): Thomas W. MacFarland, Ed.D.	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: December 2000

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY _____ TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
		
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) and paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only
Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.		

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: <i>Thomas W. MacFarland</i>	Printed Name/Position/Title: Thomas W. MacFarland, Ed.D. Senior Research Associate	
Organization/Address: Nova Southeastern University Research and Planning 3301 College Avenue Fort Lauderdale, FL 33314	Telephone: (954) 262-5390	Fax: (954) 262-3970
	E-mail Address: tommac@nova.edu	Date: June 1, 2001

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:

Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation
1129 Shriver Laboratory (Bldg 075)
College Park, Maryland 20742

Telephone: 301-405-7449
Toll Free: 800-464-3742
Fax: 301-405-8134
ericae@ericae.net
http://ericae.net

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)