Student Support Services Recap of 9/5/ meeting.

Present: Egger, Cockrill, Braverman, Tapella, Griffith, Davis, Camera, Cote

Absent: Harris (excused), Pantalone, Taniguchi (excused), Kent, Milsap, Gomez, Story

Guest: Sutee Sujitparapataya, IR Director

Preliminary Analysis of Survey

Sutee presented the preliminary results of the survey of summer 2001 students. He reported that 142 classes were surveyed with 92 of the 142 classes responding (65% response). The total number of individual student surveys received (2-3 more class responses still need to be entered into the database) was 1,756. This represents about 50% of the students who were enrolled in Session B/C in YRO and Sessions 2,3,5,6 in RCE courses.

Sutee also presented an item-by-item frequency distribution and we discussed each item to determine whether further analysis needed to be done to correlate different variables. The item analysis is as follows:

- most students took classes M-Th before noon (ranging from 51% to 59% depending on the day)
- a significant proportion of students took classes M-Th after 6 pm. (ranging from 26% to 30% depending on the day)
- students taking classes M-Th after noon and before 6 pm. ranged from 27% to 35% depending on the day
- relatively small proportion of students took classes on Friday/Saturday (ranging from 9% on Fri morning to 3% after 6 pm. on Fri and 4% on Sat morning to 1% after 6 pm. on Sat)
- when asked which services were needed but not available because they were not open, the top 5 responses were: "food service" (35%), "university union" (17%), "advising in your major" (16%), "adm & rec counter" (10%) and "acad advising ctr" (9%).
- when asked which three services were most essential to have open evenings and Saturdays during summer, the top 5 responses were: "food service" (45%), "adm & rec counter" (38%), "university union" (29%), "advising in your major" (23%) and "acad advising ctr" (23%)
- when asked what other services the students would like to see open (other than the ones listed as "essential", the top 5 responses were: "food service" (20%), "advising in your major" (19%), "university union" (18%), "acad advising ctr" (18%), "adm & rec counter" (17%)
- when asked where the student would most likely live if they attend summer in 2002, the responses were as follows: "my of my family's house" (50%), "apartment or house rental" (49%), "campus residence hall" (1%)
- when asked whether the student was able to get all the classes needed, the responses were: "yes" (54%), "yes, but with some substitutions" (31%), "no, this isn't what I intended to take" (15%)
- when asked what is your impression of the availability of course offerings in this year's summer semester, the responses were: 'there are enough classes for everyone" (12%), "there are enough classes for most students" (16%), "some more classes are needed" (54%), "a lot more classes are needed" (18%)
- when asked to indicate class level, the responses were: "freshman" (2%), "sophomore" (2%), junior (16%), senior (60%), graduate (20%); this is fairly representative of all students enrolled in summer, but not representative of the Fall/Spring population
- when asked to indicate major, the top five majors lists were Business (all concentrations), Criminal Justice, Liberal Studies, Psychology and Communication Studies; these are the top five majors among all CSUS students in Fall/Spring
- when asked to indicate sex, 65% are female and 35% male; the distribution is representative of all summer students, but not representative of the academic year population
- average of the students is 27.1, slightly higher than the total academic year population; the higher average age is directly related to the class level distribution (heavily seniors and graduate students)
- self-reported ethnicity responses were as follows (with Spring 01 comparisons):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>% in Summer</th>
<th>% Spring 01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline to State &amp; No Response</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Hispanic</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date Questions and Observations**

Larry noted that the open ended comments from the survey had not been analyzed, but that we plan to hire a student assistant to read the comments and categorize them so this information can also be analyzed. Mieke Boynton, a former orientation group leader, was suggested. Larry will contact her to see if she is available. Sutee asked about a lap top computer for her to enter the information. Tom Griffith said that his office could supply that. Sutee can load the necessary software and provide training.

Food service is clearly the number one "essential" service identified by students. Leslie and others noted that students who listed the university union as an "essential" service may have done so in the context of "food service" needs, rather than other services provided by the union. It's clear that more information is needed to determine how best to deliver this service during the summer.

A point was made that the students surveyed were those who actually were enrolled in courses, so the response about access to classes (i.e., did you get what you want, were there enough classes available) do NOT include those students who withdrew because they couldn't get what they wanted. Craig Tapella note that the majority of students who requested refunds were students who could not get the course(s) they wanted. As we make judgements about course availability, we need to consider this (i.e., the proportion of students who couldn't get what they want is probably higher than the data indicates).

Questions 4 and 5 (course availability) need to be correlated with question 7 (major), so we can determine whether there are differences in responses based on the student's major. Also questions 4 and 5 need to be correlated with questions 7 to determine differences based on class level. This information should be shared with the college deans.

In the Ethnicity groupings, we agreed that "the unknown" category (those who left the response blank), should be incorporated into the "decline to state" category, since that is what is done when students respond to this question on official university documents (i.e., Application for Admission).
Under the major listing, we agreed to combine all of the "business" majors (MIS, business, marketing, accounting, accountancy, bus admin, and finance) into one category since the ones listed by students are "concentrations" not majors. We also agreed that future surveys of this type should provide a defined list of majors for the students to check rather than asking the student to "fill in the blank".

Sutee suggested a correlation between questions 1 (when students take courses) and question 2 (what services they need).

The issue of the schedule driving the types of students who enroll was brought up. It's clear that the schedule is heavily weighted at the upper division/graduate level. Will more lower division courses be offered in the future, which might change the mix of students? Larry noted that few lower division courses were offered in Summer 2001 because they had not been offered in previous summers, students could take them for less $$ at community colleges and there was a limited amount of funding available to support summer 2001. Larry has a suggested to the colleges that more high demand lower division GE courses be considered for 2002 and beyond to see if there is a market for them. Cynthia noted more lower division students in summer could impact on-campus housing differently than the current survey results would indicate.

Tom Griffith asked whether we might consider an "honors" program for lower division students who want to accelerate their programs by starting early in summer of by attending the summer after their freshman year (kind of like a Summer Bridge program for honor students). He will look into other universities that might be using this approach.

We discussed whether a similar survey should be administered to current students in the Fall semester to: 1) assess their interest in enrolling in Summer 2002, 2) determine the types of courses they would like to take, and 3) assess the kinds of services they expect. We will discuss this at our next meeting.

**Next Steps**

Sutee will incorporate our suggestions and do the correlations among the different variables that we discussed and provide a new version of the data analysis. He believes that he can deliver that by Thursday of this week. Tom Griffith, David Braverman and Larry Glasmire will meet to develop some preliminary recommendations (meeting scheduled for 9/7 at 11 am.), based on Sutee's updated data analysis. These recommendations will be presented at our next meeting. As soon as the new version of the analysis is available, Larry will forward copies to all group members.

We all agreed that all or part of the data analysis should be shared with other workgroups. The information about availability of courses by college should also be shared with the Deans as they are planning their schedules for next summer.

Our next meeting is September 19, from 10-11 am. in Lassen 3008. Our guest for that meeting is Jon Self (time certain 10-10:15) to discuss the misc. course fee proposals for the Health Center and University Union. The remainder of the meeting will include further discussion of the survey results and preliminary recommendations.

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 am.