## RESEARCH BRIEF

# Evaluation of NOVA Education, Services, and Facilities: Comparison of Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 Ratings 

## Introduction

This Research Brief compares the Class of 2017 and the Class of 2020 on their responses to NOVA's annual graduate survey-specifically, 35 survey items that asked graduates to evaluate general education, services, and facilities at NOVA, as well as their preparedness for continued studies and employment. Ratings were assigned a numerical value (e.g., "Excellent" is equal to four points and "Poor" is equal to zero points), and a weighted average score was calculated for each evaluative survey item (see Appendix Data Tables for numerical scores). ${ }^{1}$

## Key Findings

Evaluation of NOVA Education, Services, and Facilities

- The average rating among respondents improved slightly from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2020 for educational proficiency gained in "awareness of many cultures" (from 3.3 to 3.4).
- The average rating for educational proficiency gained in "understanding mathematics" declined slightly from Class of 2017 to Class of 2020 respondents (from 2.9 to 2.8).
- The average rating among respondents improved slightly from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2020 for the registration process at the College (from 3.1 to 3.2).
Preparation for Continued Studies and Employment
- Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 graduate survey respondents' ratings ranged from "somewhat" to "very much" for the extent that they felt that their NOVA degree program academically prepared them for their present college studies and was related to their current academic program.
- The extent to which graduates felt their NOVA degree related to their current occupation declined from Class of 2017 to Class of 2020 respondents (from 2.6 to 2.2).
- The extent to which graduates felt their NOVA education helped them in the workplace declined from Class of 2017 to Class of 2020 respondents (from 2.7 to 2.4).
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## Section 1. Evaluation of NOVA Education, Services, and Facilities

## Educational Proficiency Gained

On average, Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 graduate survey respondents' ratings ranged from "good" to "excellent" for educational proficiency gained in seven out of the eight skill areas listed in Figure 1 (ratings ranged from 3.1 to 3.4). ${ }^{2}$ The average rating among respondents for educational proficiency gained in awareness of many cultures improved slightly from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2020 (from 3.3 to 3.4). Conversely, the average rating for educational proficiency gained in understanding mathematics declined slightly from Class of 2017 to Class of 2020 respondents (from 2.9 to 2.8). Differences in average ratings between Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 respondents for both educational proficiency gained in awareness of many cultures and educational proficiency gained in understanding mathematics were statistically significant; however, rating differences for the remaining skills areas listed in Figure 1 were not (see Figure 1, below). ${ }^{3}$

Figure 1. Comparison of Educational Proficiency Gained in Skill Area Ratings: Class of 2017 and Class 2020

*Difference in Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 rating is statistically significant ( $p<.001$ ).
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## Rating of NOVA Instruction and Faculty

On average, Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 graduate survey respondents' ratings ranged from "good" to "excellent" for the quality of faculty and instruction in five out of seven areas listed in Figure 2 (ratings ranged from 3.0 to 3.2). ${ }^{4}$ Ratings for the quality of faculty advisement ranged from "average" to "good" (ratings from 2.8 to 2.9). None of the differences in average ratings between Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 respondents listed in Figure 2 were statistically significant (see Figure 2, below). ${ }^{5}$

Figure 2. Comparison of Faculty and Instruction Area Ratings:
Class of 2017 and Class 2020


## Rating of NOVA Services and Facilities

On average, Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 graduate survey respondents' ratings ranged from "average" to "excellent" for performance of College services and facilities listed in Figure 3 (ratings ranged from 2.6 to 3.3 ). ${ }^{6}$ The average rating among respondents improved slightly from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2020 for the performance of the registration process at the College (from 3.1 to 3.2). This difference was statistically significant, but the remaining differences were not (see Figure 3 on the next page). ${ }^{7}$

[^2]Figure 3. Comparison of Performance of College Services and Facilities Ratings: Class of 2017 and Class 2020

*Difference in Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 ratings is statistically significant ( $p<.001$ ).

## Section 2. Preparation for Continued Studies and Employment

## Preparation for Continued Studies

Graduate survey respondents who indicated they were enrolled in another academic program at the time of the graduate survey were asked to rate how prepared they were for continued studies (see Figure 4, below). On average, the Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 graduate survey respondents' ratings ranged from "somewhat" to "very much" for the extent that they felt that their NOVA degree program prepared them academically for their present college studies (both 3.4) and the extent to which their NOVA degree related to their current academic program ( 3.4 compared to 3.5 ). ${ }^{8}$ The average rating among these respondents improved from the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2020 for the extent to which their NOVA degree related to their current academic program (from 3.4 to 3.5). The difference between Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 average ratings was statistically significant for this survey item (see Figure 4). ${ }^{9}$

Figure 4. Comparison of Preparation for Continued Studies Ratings:
Class of 2017 and Class 2020
To what extent...

*Difference in Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 ratings is statistically significant ( $p<.001$ ).
Note: Survey items were only answered by NOVA graduates who indicated they were enrolled in another academic program at the time of the graduate survey.

## Preparation for Employment

Graduate survey respondents who indicated they were employed at the time of the graduate survey were asked to rate how prepared they were for their employment (see Figure 5, below). On average, Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 graduate survey respondents' ratings ranged from "very little" to "somewhat" for the extent that they felt that their NOVA degree program related to their current occupation (2.5 compared to 2.2). ${ }^{10}$ From the Class of 2017 to the Class of 2020, the average ratings among respondents declined for the extent to which their NOVA degree helped their performance in the workplace (from 2.7 to 2.4 ) and the extent to which their

[^3]NOVA degree related to their current occupation (from 2.7 to 2.4). Differences between Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 average ratings on these two survey items were statistically significant (see Figure 5). ${ }^{11}$

Figure 5. Comparison of Preparation for Employment Ratings: Class of 2017 and Class 2020

*Difference in Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 rating is statistically significant ( $p<.001$ ).
Note: Survey items were only answered by NOVA graduates who indicated they were employed at the time of the graduate survey.

## Section 3. Conclusion

Overall, ratings were favorable across all 35 evaluative survey items for Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 graduate survey respondents. Ratings about NOVA education, services, and facilities typically ranged from "good" to "excellent" for most evaluative survey items. However, while respondents' ratings indicated that they were "somewhat" to "very much" prepared for continued studies, respondents also signaled that they were "very little" to "somewhat" prepared for employment.

Statistically significant differences between Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 respondents' ratings were apparent for some evaluative survey items. This result suggests that there have been significant changes in respondents' evaluations of these survey items. Ratings improved from Class of 2017 to Class of 2020 respondents for educational proficiency gained in awareness of many cultures and performance of the registration process at the College. Conversely, ratings declined from Class of 2017 to Class of 2020 respondents for their educational proficiency gained in understanding mathematics, and the extent to which they felt their NOVA degree related to their current occupation and helped them in the workplace.
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## Appendix: Data Tables

Table A1. NOVA Education Ratings: Class of 2017 and Class of 2020

| Category | Class of 2017 |  | Class of 2020 |  | Score Diff. from <br> Class of 2017 to <br> Class of 2020 | Statistical <br> Analysis <br> (t-test) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{n}$ | Average <br> Rating | $\mathbf{n}$ | Average <br> Rating | $t^{(1101)}=0.23$, <br> $p=0.819 ; d=0.01$ |  |
| Appreciating Other Points of View | 495 | 3.32 | 608 | 3.33 | 0.01 | 0.10 |
| Awareness of Many Cultures* | 484 | 3.34 | 603 | 3.44 | 0.05 | $t^{(1085)}=2.01$, <br> $p=0.045 ; d=0.12$ |
| Cooperating with Others | 497 | 3.16 | 611 | 3.21 | -0.05 | $t^{(1106)}=0.96$, <br> $p=0.337 ; d=0.06$ |
| $t^{(1080)}=0.93$, <br> $p=0.353 ; d=0.06$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Speaking Effectively | 486 | 3.16 | 596 | 3.11 | 0.05 | $t^{(1021)}=0.9$, <br> $p=0.368 ; d=0.05$ |
| Technical Knowledge in Your Area <br> of Study | 503 | 3.13 | 603 | 3.18 | -0.02 | $t^{(987)}=0.39$, <br> $p=0.697 ; d=0.02$ |
| Understanding Fundamental <br> Scientific Concepts | 482 | 3.07 | 582 | 3.05 | -0.17 | $t^{(1063)}=2.60$, <br> $p=0.009 ; d=0.16$ |
| Understanding Mathematics* | 485 | 2.93 | 580 | 2.77 | -0.04 | $t^{(1088)}=0.88$, <br> $p=0.379 ; d=0.05$ |
| Writing Effectively | 490 | 3.21 | 600 | 3.17 |  |  |

*Difference in Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 rating is statistically significant ( $p<.001$ )
Note: Rating scores were calculated by assigning the following values to each response option: Excellent=4, Good=3, Average=2, Below Average=1, and Poor=0. Scores exclude respondents who indicated "no basis to judge/did not use."

Table A2. NOVA Instruction and Faculty Ratings: Class of 2017 and Class of 2020

| Category |  | Class of 2017 |  | Class of 2020 |  | Score Diff. from Class of 2017 to Class of 2020 | Statistical Analysis (t-test) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | n | Average Rating | n | Average Rating |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 든 } \\ & \text { בָㄴ } \\ & \text { Cr } \end{aligned}$ | Course Content | 519 | 3.19 | 619 | 3.16 | -0.03 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(1136)}=0.65, \\ p=0.513 ; d=0.04 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Fairness of Grading | 520 | 3.20 | 619 | 3.18 | -0.01 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(1137)}=0.2, \\ p=0.796 ; d=0.02 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Quality of Instruction | 519 | 3.14 | 620 | 3.16 | 0.02 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(1026)}=0.34 \\ p=0.738 ; d=0.02 \end{gathered}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \frac{7}{J} \\ & 0 \\ & \text { ÜII } \end{aligned}$ | Advisement | 493 | 2.78 | 600 | 2.88 | 0.10 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(1002)}=1.44, \\ p=0.151 ; d=0.09 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Availability | 511 | 3.10 | 613 | 3.12 | 0.02 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(11228)}=0.33, \\ p=0.738 ; d=0.0 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Concern for Students | 513 | 2.99 | 614 | 3.00 | 0.01 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(1050)}=0.15, \\ p=0.879 ; d=0.01 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | Teaching Ability | 519 | 3.08 | 620 | 3.07 | -0.01 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(1137)}=0.15, \\ p=0.878 ; d=0.01 \end{gathered}$ |

[^5]Table A3. Rating of NOVA Services and Facilities: Class of 2017 and Class of 2020

| Category | Class of 2017 |  | Class of 2020 |  | Score Diff. from Class of 2017 to Class of 2020 | Statistical Analysis (t-tests) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | Average Rating | n | Average Rating |  |  |
| Bookstore | 483 | 2.91 | 574 | 2.92 | 0.01 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(1055)}=0.23, \\ p=0.819 ; d=0.01 \end{gathered}$ |
| Cafeteria | 393 | 2.59 | 481 | 2.67 | 0.08 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(872)}=1.03, \\ p=0.302 ; d=0.07 \end{gathered}$ |
| Campus security services | 403 | 3.10 | 440 | 3.13 | 0.04 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(841)}=0.53, \\ p=0.594 ; d=0.04 \end{gathered}$ |
| Career and educational planning services | 428 | 2.65 | 493 | 2.74 | 0.09 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(860)}=1.07, \\ p=0.287 ; d=0.07 \end{gathered}$ |
| Computer labs and facilities | 453 | 3.21 | 539 | 3.23 | 0.03 | $\begin{gathered} t^{t(990)}=0.54, \\ p=0.589 ; d=0.03 \end{gathered}$ |
| Course and program advisement | 478 | 2.56 | 564 | 2.65 | 0.09 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(959)}=1.14, \\ p=0.253 ; d=0.07 \end{gathered}$ |
| Financial aid | 357 | 3.03 | 440 | 3.06 | 0.03 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(726)}=0.34, \\ p=0.737 ; d=0.02 \end{gathered}$ |
| Library facilities | 460 | 3.27 | 544 | 3.34 | 0.06 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(940)}=1.27, \\ p=0.206 ; d=0.08 \end{gathered}$ |
| Maintenance and custodial services | 420 | 3.24 | 537 | 3.32 | 0.07 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(849)}=1.33, \\ p=0.183 ; d=0.09 \end{gathered}$ |
| NOVA Online | 371 | 3.12 | 550 | 3.02 | -0.09 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(919)}=1.4, \\ p=0.163 ; d=0.09 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Parking | 476 | 2.71 | 569 | 2.69 | -0.02 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(1043)}=0.32, \\ p=0.752 ; d=0.02 \end{gathered}$ |
| Physical access to facilities | 428 | 3.03 | 538 | 3.13 | 0.10 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(864)}=1.64, \\ p=0.102 ; d=0.11 \end{gathered}$ |
| Registration* | 500 | 3.10 | 599 | 3.21 | 0.11 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(1097)}=2.03, \\ p=0.042 ; d=0.12 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Science labs and equipment | 430 | 3.19 | 512 | 3.19 | 0.01 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(875)}=0.10, \\ p=0.923 ; d=0.01 \end{gathered}$ |
| Student activities | 347 | 2.88 | 386 | 2.90 | 0.01 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(731)}=0.18, \\ p=0.860 ; d=0.01 \end{gathered}$ |
| Testing lab/center services | 437 | 3.13 | 543 | 3.12 | <0.01 | $\begin{gathered} t^{(978)}=0.08, \\ p=0.936 ; d=0.01 \end{gathered}$ |

*Difference in Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 rating is statistically significant ( $p<.001$ )
Note: Rating scores were calculated by assigning the following values to each response option: Excellent=4, Good=3, Average=2, Below Average=1, and Poor=0. Scores exclude respondents who indicated "no basis to judge/did not use."

Table A4. Preparation for Continued Studies: Class of 2017 and Class of 2020

| Survey Item | Class of 2017 |  | Class of 2020 |  | Score Diff. from <br> Class of 2017 to <br> Class of 2020 | Statistical <br> Analysis <br> (t-tests) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | Average <br> Rating | n | Average <br> Rating | $t^{(747)}=0.14$, <br> $p=0.887 ; d=0.01$ |  |  |
| To what extent did your NOVA <br> degree program prepare you <br> academically for your present college <br> studies? | 317 | 3.43 | 432 | 3.43 | 0.01 |  |  |
| To what extent is your current <br> program related to your NOVA <br> degree?* | 317 | 3.40 | 432 | 3.52 | 0.12 | $t^{(747)}=2.16$, <br> $p=0.031 ; d=0.16$ |  |

*Difference in Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 rating is statistically significant ( $p<.001$ )
Note: Rating scores were calculated by assigning the following values to each response option: Very much=4, Somewhat=3, Very little=2, and Not at all=1. Survey items were only answered by respondents who indicated "Yes, I am currently enrolled at a fouryear college/university" to the survey item "Are you currently enrolled at a post-secondary institution?"

Table A5. Preparation for Employment: Class of 2017 and Class of 2020

| Survey Item | Class of 2017 |  | Class of 2020 |  | Score Diff. from <br> Class of 2017 to <br> Class of 2020 | Statistical <br> Analysis <br> (t-tests) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | Average <br> Rating | n | Average <br> Rating | ( |  |
| To what extent is your current <br> occupation related to your NOVA <br> degree?* | 373 | 2.55 | 397 | 2.23 | -0.32 | $t^{(768)}=3.59$, <br> $p<0.001 ; d=0.26$ |
| To what extent does your NOVA <br> degree help you perform in the <br> workplace?* | 373 | 2.74 | 397 | 2.44 | -0.30 | $t^{(768)}=3.72$, <br> $p<0.001 ; d=0.27$ |

*Difference in Class of 2017 and Class of 2020 rating is statistically significant ( $p<.001$ )
Note: Rating scores were calculated by assigning the following values to each response option: Very much=4, Somewhat=3, Very little=2, and Not at all=1. Survey items were only answered by respondents who indicated they were currently employed at the time of the survey.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Numerical scores exclude respondents who indicated "no basis to judge/did not use."

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ Survey items utilized a five-point rating scale (0=Poor; 1=Below average; 2=Average; 3=Good; 4=Excellent)
    ${ }^{3}$ Two-tailed, independent means difference test (t-test), $p<.001$

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Survey items utilized a five-point rating scale ( $0=$ Poor; $1=$ Below average; 2=Average; 3=Good; 4=Excellent)
    ${ }^{5}$ Two-tailed, independent means difference test (t-test), $p<.001$
    ${ }^{6}$ Survey items utilized a five-point rating scale ( $0=$ Poor; $1=$ Below average; 2=Average; 3=Good; $4=$ Excellent)
    ${ }^{7}$ Two-tailed, independent means difference test (t-test), $p<.001$

[^3]:    ${ }^{8}$ Survey items utilized a four-point rating scale ( $1=$ Not at all; 2=Somewhat; 3=Very little; 4=Very much)
    ${ }^{9}$ Two-tailed, independent means difference test (t-test), $p<.001$
    ${ }^{10}$ Survey items utilized a four-point rating scale ( $1=$ Not at all; 2=Somewhat; $3=$ Very little; $4=$ Very much

[^4]:    ${ }^{11}$ Two-tailed, independent means difference test (t-test), $p<.001$

[^5]:    Note: Rating scores were calculated by assigning the following values to each response option: Excellent=4, Good=3, Average=2, Below Average=1, and Poor=0. Scores exclude respondents who indicated "no basis to judge/did not use."

