



Needs Analysis (Faculty Perspective)
Preliminary Report

Robert Burgess
Catherine Owens

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to provide baseline data concerning the academic study needs of undergraduate students at Al Akhawayn University in Ifrane. The Centre for Academic Development and Study Skills (CADS) at AUI has for five semesters run an academic preparation program of courses that teach study skills. The research questions asked how faculty rated students' abilities in these study skills and the importance of those skills to the courses they teach. Also of interest was whether there were important differences in student skills across schools. A survey was the primary data collection tool and the main assumption underlying the study is that academic skills can be taught and will positively affect student academic performance. Results showed that faculty rate students as exhibiting above average abilities in these skills areas and that they see the skills as necessary for their courses. Results also showed some differences across schools. An aim of the CADS program is to coherently link the needs of future courses of study to its academic preparation program. From this survey, preliminary analysis of the uses and needs of study skills and critical thinking skills across the curriculum has been done, pointing to the need for further investigation into program specific skills and their individual impacts on teaching and learning.

Introduction

The effectiveness of educational programs is a function of their systematic and ongoing processes of planning, implementation, evaluation, and change. The needs analysis survey is a widely used research tool that can provide needed baseline data to support inquiry into program effectiveness. However, the widespread usage of needs analyses has led to a variety of definitions that may cause confusion as to what a needs analysis is and when one should be conducted (APSSA, 2000). For the purposes of this research, needs analysis is defined as a systematic set of procedures for identifying the knowledge and skills necessary for achieving departmental goals.

This analysis was undertaken for the purpose of setting priorities and making decisions about the Center for Academic Development and Study Skills (CADS) courses in order to improve content delivery and facilitate the allocation of resources within the program. The goal is to ensure that the CADS courses do in fact meet the specific teaching and learning requirements inherent in the Al Akhawayn University in Ifrane (AUI) environment. The results of the study will be used to strengthen individual CADS courses and the program as a whole. It may also provide a starting point for discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the AUI core curriculum. The survey is intended to answer the following research questions.

- 1) How do AUI faculty rate AUI students in various academic skills areas?
- 2) How important are these skills to individual courses?
- 3) What methods of instructional delivery are employed at AUI?
- 4) What is the academic workload for a typical AUI course/student?
- 5) Is there a difference in ratings across schools?

Literature Review

The Center for Academic Development and Study Skills at AUI was developed as a result of reported weaknesses of AUI graduates from employers, which corresponded to a perceived lack of academic skills in some AUI undergraduates. Thus, the primary mission of the CADS program is to encourage the development of these academic skills in undergraduate students. These skills include critical thinking, academic ethics, academic listening, academic reading, academic writing, note taking, studying for exams and time management.

Critical thinking has a long and illustrious history (see Foundation for Critical Thinking) and is now the focus of much attention in education. There is also a widely held belief that critical thinking is not an innate skill, but rather that it must be learned/taught. Moreover, the perceived need to include higher order thinking skills in teaching and learning is not a recent one. In 1967, Raths, Jonas, Rothstein and Wassermann (as cited by Carr, 1990) pointed out that "...memorization, drill, homework, the three Rs [and the] quiet classroom" were rewarded, while "...inquiry, reflection [and] the consideration of alternatives [were] frowned upon" (p. 1). According to Lazere (1987), the critical thinking movement finally came to the fore in 1980 with an Executive Order by the Chancellor of the California State University system requiring that critical thinking be formally taught on all campuses. This soon led to similar requirements in California community colleges and high schools. The critical thinking movement is now a powerful force in American education.

There is also a widely held belief that students often don't have the fundamental academic skills that are suddenly demanded of them at university. This could be a result of teaching and learning methods employed in national undergraduate curriculums. However, it was also noted at Dartmouth College (2001) that "...a surprising number of students from excellent public and private schools come in who did well in high school without doing much studying. They, too, need to develop study skills quickly, not because of inadequate preparation but because they have

never really been academically challenged before” (p.7). The perceived need for academic skills training can be seen in that universities worldwide have embraced academic skills programs (see Appendix A). Clearly, skills training is now considered an important part of the tertiary education system. Sometimes it is directed to students at risk, sometimes to students using English as a second or foreign language, sometimes to the whole of the student body, sometimes to faculty and sometimes to all of the above. Skills training programs are variously offered through Library Services, Counseling Services, the Faculties of Education, the Language Training Centers, Continuing Education, and sometimes through purpose designed training centers.

The underlying assumption is that critical thinking and study skills can be taught and will positively affect learning outcomes, and further, that higher level processing skills can and should be built into the study skills.

There is a growing body of research supporting this position. For example, work done by Bretzing and Kulhary in 1979 (as cited by Beecher, 1988) shows that there is an impact on test scores determined by type of note-taking. Students who take word-for-word notes do not do as well on tests as those who encode, or cognitively process, the ideas as notes. Thus the case for critical thinking is reinforced. Graham and colleagues in 1991 (as cited in Boudah & O’Neill, 1999) found that there were effective strategies that could be taught and used by learners to enhance the whole writing process. The same article by Boudah & O’Neill reports work by Palincsar and Brown which confirmed that a strategy of reciprocal teaching, whereby students take on a teaching role in the processing of information from a reading, enhances reading comprehension. Scruggs and Mastropieri (as cited in Boudah & O’Neill, 1999) found positive effects on learning by training students in the application of mnemonics.

Research in language education (Oxford, 1989) supports the evidence from other disciplines that not only are there distinct and identifiable learning styles, but that these styles or ways of understanding, can affect the learner’s use of strategies. This research also shows that language performance is enhanced by students’ use of strategies, that the strategies can be taught, and that strategy teaching seems to produce better results when embedded in the language course, rather than as a separate skills course. How generalizable this course-specific strategies training is to the sciences or humanities is not known. Oxford (1989), citing studies done on cooperative learning (Gunderson & Johnson, 1980; Sharan et al., 1985; Jacob & Mattson, 1987), also reports that cooperation, used as a mode of instruction, had the positive effect of “improvement in language skills as well as increased self-esteem, motivation, altruism, and positive attitudes toward others” (p. 2).

The validation of curriculum and syllabus design choices made by CADS is a complex and ongoing task. It is ongoing in accordance with accepted educational practice requiring courses to be dynamic. They continue to grow, and evolve, responding to changing needs and opportunities over time. Thus, they must continue to be evaluated. Syllabus design in the CADS program may also change to reflect improved entrance procedures and standards. There could also be cultural and/or local environmental issues that affect the design of CADS courses. Thus, this needs analysis will help to provide a basis for evaluating the effectiveness of the current CADS program.

Design

This needs analysis survey employs a questionnaire as the primary data collection tool. A survey was chosen as the data collection tool because no baseline data exists concerning student skills levels at AUI, modes of instructional delivery nor academic workloads. The survey was designed to collect a snapshot of faculty opinion concerning these issues at the undergraduate level. It is assumed that, as professional educators, faculty are informed and can accurately report how student performances match specific pedagogical objectives.

According to the American Association for Public Opinion Research (n.d.) the quality of a survey is best judged by "...how much attention is given to [preventing, measuring and] dealing with the many important problems that can arise (p.1)". This needs analysis questionnaire was initially designed and written by a CADS faculty member. Effort was taken to ensure that the questionnaire was comprehensive, clear, easily administered and the data collected easily interpreted. The questionnaire was then reviewed and proofread by the CADS staff and necessary changes were made. In order to ensure uniform delivery of the questionnaire, CADS staff were briefed on the goals of the questionnaire and on delivery techniques. The questionnaire was then piloted with four AI Akhawayn faculty and revised according to the feedback received.

There are a number of advantages and disadvantages of surveys as a data collection tool. For example, they are self-administered which allow the respondent time to carefully consider answers. It is possible to provide anonymity which can lead to more honest responses. Surveys are also relatively economical, easy to score, and analyze (Worthen & Moss-Summers). Weaknesses of survey methods include a low return rate, no assurance that the respondent understands the questions; no assurance that the intended respondent actually completed the form; and no opportunity to interact with the respondent to clarify, probe, or seek substantiation (Worthen & Moss-Summers). These problems were overcome in this survey by personally contacting and visiting each faculty member and in many cases discussing the survey questions.

One weakness of this specific questionnaire is the fact that faculty were asked to provide a composite rating of student abilities rather than a rate for each undergraduate course that they teach. This will, unfortunately, mask some detail in individual courses/fields of study. This was an administrative decision taken because some AUI faculty are teaching or have taught as many as five different courses at varying levels. It would be overly demanding to ask them to complete five separate questionnaires. Another is that respondents were reporting a general impression of their students' abilities. What is not known is whether the upper, lower or middle range of student abilities were most salient to respondents as they were responding to this questionnaire.

Decisions concerning sampling a population are as much an art as a science. In this case the population identified was the AUI faculty in the School of Science and Engineering (SSE), the School of Business Administration (SBA) and the School of Humanities and Social Sciences (SHSS). The total faculty count in those three schools was 62. This finite population was chosen because these faculty members are the end users of the CADS services. In other words, CADS is working with students to ensure that they are properly prepared to meet the academic demands of the faculty and courses in those schools.

A fundamental requirement of research is that the data collected provides an accurate view of the population surveyed. As Hill (1998) states, "The issue of determining sample size arises with regard to the investigator's wish to assure that the sample statistic (usually the sample mean) is as close to or within a specified distance from, the true statistic (mean) of the entire population under review (p.1)."

Several concepts are important to take into consideration when determining sample size: these include confidence level, confidence interval and random sampling. A confidence level of 95% shows that the researcher is 95% certain that the result lies within the confidence interval. The confidence interval or (sampling error) is the acceptable range of responses. For example, if the sample statistic says 84% of the respondents said X is true on the survey when the confidence level is 99% and the confidence interval is 5, then we are 99% sure that between 79 – 89% of the population believe X is true. The concepts of confidence level and confidence interval are only true when based on a random sample of the population – in other words every individual member of the population had an equal chance to be included in the survey.

According to Krejcie and Morgan (as cited in Hill, 1998) a representative sample of this population would require a sample size of 52 - 56. According to NCS Pearson's Sample Size

and Confidence Interval Calculator (2002) a sample size of 57 is needed at a confidence level of 99% and a confidence interval of 5. In this instance data was collected from a sample of 57. Thus, this sample is representative of the AUI population.

In addition, another purpose of this research was to investigate faculty perceptions in the different schools. The School of Science and Engineering has 24 faculty members. Thus, a representative sample would require a sample size of 21 at a confidence level of 99% and a confidence interval of 10. In this instance data was collected from a sample of 21. The School of Business has 16 faculty members. Thus, a representative sample would require a sample size of 15 at a confidence level of 99% and a confidence interval of 5. In this instance data was collected from a sample of 15. The School of Humanities and Social Sciences has 23 faculty members. Thus, a representative sample would require a sample size of 20 at a confidence level of 99% and a confidence interval of 10. In this instance data was collected from a sample of 21.

Data Gathering Tools

This needs analysis survey consisted of one questionnaire (see appendix B). The questionnaire contained 37 questions and was divided into four sections: demographic information, overall skills levels, instructional delivery, and student workload. The demographic information was collected optionally. This decision was taken to ensure maximum anonymity for the respondents. This was in fact an administrative error in that it made it difficult to ensure that the data could be separated properly when looking at the rankings for individual schools. Extra attention had to be taken to ensure that data was collated correctly.

The “overall skills” section contained fourteen questions: thirteen questions focussing on individual skills and one open question (in case the survey missed an important skills area). The questions contained three parts. The first part asked faculty to rate students according to their perceived ability on a five point scale. The second part asked faculty to rate the skill according to its perceived importance to their courses again on a five point scale. The third part asked faculty to make comments as necessary.

The “instructional delivery” section asked faculty to indicate all the modes of instructional delivery that they employed in their teaching. Once again there were fourteen choices listed: thirteen modes of delivery and one open question.

The “student workload” section asked faculty to indicate the course workload in five areas: oral, reading, listening, writing and assessment. This section is likely to be the least representative section in that requirements can vary considerably from course to course. In this section, faculty were asked to respond to whether or not they applied specific teaching and learning techniques in their courses.

Results

Overall Skills Levels

The first research question asked “How do AUI faculty rate AUI students in various skills areas?” In order to answer this question, faculty assessments of student skills and the importance of those skills to their teaching were quantified as follows:

Table 1: Quantification of Faculty Ratings

<i>Faculty ranking of Student Academic Skills</i>		<i>Faculty ranking of Importance of Academic Skills</i>	
<i>Excellent =</i>	5	<i>Extremely important =</i>	5
<i>Good =</i>	4	<i>Very important =</i>	4

<i>Average</i> =	3	Important =	3
<i>Weak</i> =	2	Somewhat important =	2
<i>Poor</i> =	1	Not important =	1

Thus it was possible to tabulate an average rating of student skills across the university as a whole and across schools. It was possible to tabulate average ratings of the importance of those skills, again across the university, and across schools. These were then ranked as follows.

Table 2: Ranking of Student Academic Skills by Faculty

<i>Ranking</i>	<i>AUI</i>	<i>Ranking</i>	<i>SSE</i>
<i>Asking Questions</i>	3.7	<i>Asking Questions</i>	3.9
<i>Computer Skills</i>	3.7	<i>Listening to Lectures</i>	3.9
<i>Listening to Lectures</i>	3.5	<i>Computer Skills</i>	3.8
<i>Speaking</i>	3.4	<i>Collaborative Learning</i>	3.7
<i>Test-Taking</i>	3.4	<i>Speaking</i>	3.6
<i>Collaborative Learning</i>	3.4	<i>Academic Ethics</i>	3.6
<i>Academic Ethics</i>	3.2	<i>Test-Taking</i>	3.5
<i>Reading Academic Texts</i>	3.1	<i>Reading Academic Texts</i>	3.3
<i>Notetaking from Academic Lectures</i>	3.1	<i>Notetaking from Academic Texts</i>	3.3
<i>Notetaking from Academic Texts</i>	3.1	<i>Notetaking from Academic Lectures</i>	3.2
<i>Independent Learning</i>	3.0	<i>Time Management</i>	3.1
<i>Writing Academic Papers</i>	2.9	<i>Independent Learning</i>	2.9
<i>Time Management</i>	2.9	<i>Writing Academic Papers</i>	2.9
<i>Average</i>	3.3	<i>Average</i>	3.4

N=58

N=21

<i>Ranking</i>	<i>SHSS</i>	<i>Ranking</i>	<i>SBA</i>
<i>Asking Questions</i>	3.7	<i>Computer Skills</i>	3.7
<i>Computer Skills</i>	3.7	<i>Listening to Lectures</i>	3.4
<i>Listening to Lectures</i>	3.4	<i>Test-Taking</i>	3.4
<i>Speaking</i>	3.4	<i>Asking Questions</i>	3.3
<i>Test-Taking</i>	3.4	<i>Collaborative Learning</i>	3.3
<i>Note-taking from Academic Texts</i>	3.4	<i>Speaking</i>	3.2
<i>Collaborative Learning</i>	3.3	<i>Reading Academic Texts</i>	3.1
<i>Reading Academic Texts</i>	3.2	<i>Note-taking from Academic Lectures</i>	3.0
<i>Note-taking from Academic Lectures</i>	3.2	<i>Academic Ethics</i>	2.9
<i>Independent Learning</i>	3.2	<i>Writing Academic Papers</i>	2.9
<i>Academic Ethics</i>	3.0	<i>Independent Learning</i>	2.8
<i>Writing Academic Papers</i>	3.0	<i>Note-taking from Academic Texts</i>	2.7
<i>Time Management</i>	3.0	<i>Time Management</i>	2.7
<i>Average</i>	3.3	<i>Average</i>	3.1

N=22

N=15

The AUI faculty rated students skills levels above average across the skills areas (see table 2). This was true for individual schools as well. The SSE rated students skills slightly higher than the university average and SBA slightly lower. Although the ratings were above “average”, none reached the level of “good” or “excellent”. Clearly more work needs to be done across the skills areas to bring the ratings into the “good” or “excellent” range. Particular attention should be paid to those skills rated below the AUI average of 3.3, such as time management and writing academic papers.

The fifth research question asked, “Is there a difference in ratings across schools?” Results showed a marked consistency across the schools in terms of the average ratings and

individual skills ratings as well. However, some differences can be noted in the relative ratings of different skills. For example, SBA rated students lower in the ability to ask questions than other schools. This may be reflected in the SBA practice of engaging students in more question and answer sessions (see table 6). SSE faculty, on the other hand, rated students higher in listening to lectures than the other schools. Ratings of academic ethics saw the most variation with SSE rating students above the AUI average and SHSS and SBA rating them below the average.

Table 3: Importance of Student Academic Skills to Faculty

Importance	Overall	Importance	SSE
<i>Academic Ethics</i>	4.5	<i>Time Management</i>	4.5
<i>Reading Academic Texts</i>	4.4	<i>Computer Skills</i>	4.5
<i>Time Management</i>	4.3	<i>Academic Ethics</i>	4.4
<i>Asking Questions</i>	4.2	<i>Asking Questions</i>	4.4
<i>Independent Learning</i>	4.2	<i>Writing Academic Papers</i>	4.3
<i>Test-Taking</i>	4.1	<i>Reading Academic Texts</i>	4.2
<i>Writing Academic Papers</i>	4.1	<i>Test-Taking</i>	4.2
<i>Listening to Lectures</i>	4.1	<i>Listening to Lectures</i>	4.1
<i>Note-taking from Academic Lectures</i>	4.1	<i>Note-taking from Academic Lectures</i>	4.1
<i>Computer Skills</i>	4.0	<i>Collaborative Learning</i>	4.1
<i>Note-taking from Academic Texts</i>	3.9	<i>Independent Learning</i>	3.9
<i>Collaborative Learning</i>	3.8	<i>Note-taking from Academic Texts</i>	3.6
<i>Speaking</i>	3.7	<i>Speaking</i>	3.5
<i>Average</i>	4.1	<i>Average</i>	4.1

N=58

Importance	SHSS	Importance	SBA
<i>Academic Ethics</i>	4.5	<i>Academic Ethics</i>	4.7
<i>Reading Academic Texts</i>	4.4	<i>Notetaking from Academic Lectures</i>	4.5
<i>Independent Learning</i>	4.3	<i>Reading Academic Texts</i>	4.4
<i>Time Management</i>	4.1	<i>Time Management</i>	4.4
<i>Test-Taking</i>	4.1	<i>Asking Questions</i>	4.4
<i>Asking Questions</i>	4.0	<i>Independent Learning</i>	4.3
<i>Writing Academic Papers</i>	4.0	<i>Listening to Lectures</i>	4.2
<i>Note-taking from Academic Texts</i>	4.0	<i>Writing Academic Papers</i>	4.1
<i>Listening to Lectures</i>	3.9	<i>Test-Taking</i>	3.9
<i>Note-taking from Academic Lectures</i>	3.8	<i>Note-taking from Academic Texts</i>	3.9
<i>Speaking</i>	3.8	<i>Collaborative Learning</i>	3.9
<i>Computer Skills</i>	3.6	<i>Computer Skills</i>	3.8
<i>Collaborative Learning</i>	3.4	<i>Speaking</i>	3.8
<i>Average</i>	4.0	<i>Average</i>	4.2

N=22

N=21

N=15

Regarding the importance of these academic skills to the courses they teach, the AUI faculty as a whole saw all of these academic skills as “very important” (see table 3). This was true for individual schools as well. Results again showed a marked consistency across the schools in terms of the average ratings of the importance of specific skills areas. It is arguable that CADS should pay particular attention to those skills rated above the AUI average of 4.1, such as academic ethics, reading academic texts and time management.

Nevertheless, some differences can be noted in the relative ratings of specific skills. For example, SSE faculty rated independent learning below the AUI average while SHSS and SBA rated this skill above the average. SBA faculty, on the other hand, rated note-taking from lectures higher than the other schools. SSE, perhaps understandably, rated computer skills much higher than the other two schools.

Instructional Delivery

The third research question asked “What methods of instructional delivery are employed at AUI?” Thirteen modes of delivery were listed and faculty were asked to list those that were appropriate to their teaching. The results were as follows.

Table 4: Instructional Delivery at AUI

<i>AUI Instructional Delivery</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Lecture</i>	54	95
<i>Project based</i>	36	63
<i>Problem solution</i>	36	63
<i>Slides</i>	35	61
<i>Question answer</i>	32	56
<i>Task based</i>	20	35
<i>Seminar</i>	17	30
<i>Data show</i>	16	28
<i>Computer lab</i>	16	28
<i>Video</i>	13	23
<i>Computer simulation</i>	13	23
<i>Laboratory</i>	12	21
<i>Web based</i>	9	16
<i>Other</i>	7	12

N=58

<i>SSE Instructional Delivery</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Lecture</i>	19	90
<i>Slides</i>	18	86
<i>Problem solution</i>	16	76
<i>Project based</i>	11	52
<i>Question answer</i>	11	52
<i>Laboratory</i>	11	52
<i>Data show</i>	8	38
<i>Computer lab</i>	6	29
<i>Task based</i>	5	24
<i>Computer simulation</i>	5	24
<i>Web based</i>	4	19
<i>Seminar</i>	3	14
<i>Video</i>	2	10
<i>Other</i>	1	5

N=21

<i>SHSS Instructional Delivery</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Lecture</i>	20	95
<i>Project based</i>	11	52
<i>Question answer</i>	10	48
<i>Task based</i>	8	38
<i>Slides</i>	8	38
<i>Video</i>	8	38
<i>Seminar</i>	7	33
<i>Problem solution</i>	6	29
<i>Data show</i>	5	24
<i>Computer lab</i>	5	24
<i>Other</i>	5	24
<i>Computer simulation</i>	3	14
<i>Web based</i>	1	5
<i>Laboratory</i>	1	5

N=22

<i>SBA Instructional Delivery</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Lecture</i>	15	100
<i>Project based</i>	14	93
<i>Problem solution</i>	14	93
<i>Question answer</i>	11	73
<i>Slides</i>	9	60
<i>Task based</i>	7	47
<i>Seminar</i>	7	47
<i>Computer simulation</i>	5	33
<i>Computer lab</i>	5	33
<i>Web based</i>	4	27
<i>Data show</i>	3	20
<i>Video</i>	3	20
<i>Other</i>	1	7
<i>Laboratory</i>	0	0

N=15

Lecturing is by far the most important mode of instructional delivery at AUI. The AUI average is 95 % and faculty report lecturing always or usually 80% of the time (See table 6). Clearly, understanding lectures and taking notes from lectures are important skills for AUI students. There were however some interesting differences between the different schools. In SBA there seems to be a deeper use of different modes of delivery across faculty. SBA is followed by SSE and then SHSS in this regard. It would seem, then, that SBA students will likely be faced with a wider range of instructional delivery methods than students in other schools. Some differences naturally occur as a result of the different fields of study in the different schools. There is limited to no use of laboratories in SHSS and SBA for example.

In terms of specific skills, if we take a 10% difference as a criterion, we can see that SBA reports a much higher instance of use of projects than the other two schools. Problem solution is used most frequently by SBA, followed by SSE and finally by SHSS. Slides are used most heavily by SSE, then SBA and finally SHSS. SBA reports using question answer techniques

much more frequently than the other schools¹. With tasks, SBA reports the more frequent use followed by SHH and SSE. Seminar usage is highest in SBA then SHSS and finally SSE. An SSE faculty member is more apt to employ a data show than other faculty members. Video is used most in SHSS, followed by SBA and SSE. Computer simulation use is greatest in SBA and SSE. Not surprisingly, the most laboratory use was in SSE. Finally, web based teaching dominated in SBA and SSE.

Unfortunately this category of the questionnaire was not properly piloted as faculty reported a substantial number of instructional modes not included in the survey itself. These were:

Table 5: Additional Types of Instructional Delivery at AUI

<i>Roleplay</i>	<i>Question and answer competitions</i>	<i>Field trips</i>	<i>Simulation (of crisis)</i>
<i>Debate</i>	<i>Discussion</i>	<i>Email</i>	<i>Tutorial</i>
<i>Student presentations</i>	<i>Student demonstrations</i>		

It is likely that other faculty also use these instructional delivery techniques in their teaching.

Student Workload

The fourth research question asked, “What is the workload for a typical AUI course/student? Results in this section indicate that AUI students face a substantial workload in their courses.

Table 6: Listening Workload

<i>AUI Listening Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Always lecture</i>	20	34
<i>Usually lecture</i>	21	36
<i>Often lecture</i>	7	12
<i>Sometimes lecture</i>	7	12
<i>Never lecture</i>	1	2
<i>AUI Audio/Video tapes</i>	20	34
<i>Require Notes</i>	37	64
<i>Evaluated</i>	36	62

N=58

<i>SHSS Listening Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Always lecture</i>	4	18
<i>Usually lecture</i>	10	45
<i>Often lecture</i>	4	18
<i>Sometimes lecture</i>	4	18
<i>Never lecture</i>	0	0
<i>SHSS Audio/Video tapes</i>	11	50
<i>Require Notes</i>	11	50
<i>Evaluated</i>	13	59

N=22

<i>SSE Listening Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Always lecture</i>	11	52
<i>Usually lecture</i>	4	19
<i>Often lecture</i>	2	10
<i>Sometimes lecture</i>	1	5
<i>Never lecture</i>	1	5
<i>SSE Audio/Video tapes</i>	5	24
<i>Require Notes</i>	15	71
<i>Evaluated</i>	12	57

N=21

<i>SBA Listening Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Always lecture</i>	5	33
<i>Usually lecture</i>	7	47
<i>Often lecture</i>	1	7
<i>Sometimes lecture</i>	2	13
<i>Never lecture</i>	0	0
<i>SBA Audio/Video tapes</i>	4	27
<i>Require Notes</i>	11	73
<i>Evaluated</i>	11	73

N=15

As seen in Table 6, students are usually faced with a lecture mode of delivery. This means that they have to be well prepared to handle academic information presented orally and be able to comprehend this information and take notes on the relevant material. In fact 61% of faculty report requiring that students take notes from lectures. The question concerning the

¹ There is a discrepancy in the reporting of question/answer techniques. See tables 4 and 7.

evaluation of listening material is interesting but perhaps impossible to interpret at this point. The question would have been better framed in terms of being overtly evaluated and or covertly evaluated. In this case listening material would most likely be covertly evaluated in formal quizzes and exams.

Table 7: Oral Workload

<i>AUI Oral Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Seminar Presentation</i>	21	36
<i>Oral Presentation</i>	44	76
<i>Question Answer</i>	55	95
<i>Evaluated</i>	32	55

N=58

<i>SHSS Oral Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Seminar Presentation</i>	8	36
<i>Oral Presentation</i>	17	77
<i>Question Answer</i>	19	86
<i>Evaluated</i>	12	55

N=22

<i>SSE Oral Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Seminar Presentation</i>	5	24
<i>Oral Presentation</i>	13	62
<i>Question Answer</i>	21	100
<i>Evaluated</i>	9	43

N=21

<i>SBA Oral Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Seminar Presentation</i>	8	53
<i>Oral Presentation</i>	14	93
<i>Question Answer</i>	15	100
<i>Evaluated</i>	11	73

N=15

The survey results show that AUI students are confronted with oral tasks including seminar presentations, oral presentation, and question answer sessions. The only surprising result here is the fact that in SSE only 29% report using question/answer techniques – even though 90% report lecturing. Once again the evaluation question would have benefited from being framed as overt or covert. In this case evaluation may have been in either mode.

It is interesting to note that there is a discrepancy in the reporting of oral tasks across all schools. For example, in the questionnaire section on instructional delivery (see Table 4) 56% of AUI faculty report using question/answer techniques. In the questionnaire section on oral workload 95% report employing question/answer techniques (see Table 7).

Table 8: Reading Workload

<i>AUI Reading Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Textbook</i>	57	98
<i>Reading List</i>	35	60
<i>Require Reading</i>	53	91
<i>Require Notes</i>	24	41
<i>Evaluated</i>	14	24

N=58

<i>SSE Reading Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Textbook</i>	21	100
<i>Reading List</i>	9	43
<i>Require Reading</i>	18	86
<i>Require Notes</i>	6	29
<i>Evaluated</i>	4	19

N=21

<i>SHSS Reading Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Textbook</i>	21	95
<i>Reading List</i>	15	68
<i>Require Reading</i>	21	95
<i>Require Notes</i>	9	41
<i>Evaluated</i>	6	27

N=22

<i>AUI Amount</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>0-10 pages week</i>	16	28
<i>10-20 pages week</i>	19	33
<i>20-30 pages week</i>	13	22
<i>30-40 pages week</i>	5	9
<i>>40 pages week</i>	4	7

N=58

<i>SSE Amount</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>0-10 pages week</i>	8	38
<i>10-20 pages week</i>	8	38
<i>20-30 pages week</i>	4	19
<i>30-40 pages week</i>	0	0
<i>>40 pages week</i>	0	0

N=21

<i>SHSS Amount</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>0-10 pages week</i>	5	23
<i>10-20 pages week</i>	7	32
<i>20-30 pages week</i>	7	32
<i>30-40 pages week</i>	3	14
<i>>40 pages week</i>	0	0

N=22

<i>SBA Reading Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Textbook</i>	15	100
<i>Reading List</i>	11	73
<i>Require Reading</i>	14	93
<i>Require Notes</i>	9	60
<i>Evaluated</i>	4	27

N=15

<i>SBA Amount</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
0-10 pages week	3	20
10-20 pages week	4	27
20-30 pages week	2	13
30-40 pages week	2	13
>40 pages week	4	27

N=15

The reading workload, as to be expected, is substantial at AUI. Ninety-eight percent of courses report assigning a textbook and 91% require reading. The heaviest reading load is in SBA followed by SHSS and SSE. It would seem that AUI students are required to read approximately 20 pages of academic material per week in each of their courses. It is also interesting that 41% of faculty report requiring notes from readings. Once again the evaluation question is lacking in that it does not distinguish between overt and covert evaluation.

Table 9: Writing Workload

<i>AUI Writing Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Assign Academic Papers</i>	43	74
<i>Average Number</i>	2	
<i>Average Length</i>	10	
<i>Pure Research</i>	8	14
<i>Library Research</i>	25	43
<i>Applied Research</i>	24	41
<i>Assign written work</i>	53	91
<i>In class writing</i>	42	72
<i>Evaluated</i>	50	86

N=58

<i>SSE Writing Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Assign Academic Papers</i>	9	43
<i>Average Number</i>	2	
<i>Average Length</i>	9	
<i>Pure Research</i>	2	10
<i>Library Research</i>	4	19
<i>Applied Research</i>	7	33
<i>Assign written work</i>	17	81
<i>In class writing</i>	15	71
<i>Evaluated</i>	14	67

N=21

<i>SHSS Writing Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Assign Academic Papers</i>	14	67
<i>Average Number</i>	2	
<i>Average Length</i>	9	
<i>Pure Research</i>	1	5
<i>Library Research</i>	12	55
<i>Applied Research</i>	5	23
<i>Assign written work</i>	22	100
<i>In class writing</i>	15	68
<i>Evaluated</i>	22	100

N=22

<i>SBA Writing Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Assign Academic Papers</i>	14	93
<i>Average Number</i>	3	
<i>Average Length</i>	10	
<i>Pure Research</i>	5	33
<i>Library Research</i>	9	60
<i>Applied Research</i>	12	80
<i>Assign written work</i>	14	93
<i>In class writing</i>	12	80
<i>Evaluated</i>	14	93

N=15

According to this survey (see Table 9), 91% of AUI faculty assign written work – either academic papers or in-class assignments. Seventy-four percent assign two written papers in their courses. These papers are usually ten pages in length and in the majority of cases are library research papers. The SBA faculty require the most of AUI students in terms of written work. Ninety-three percent report assigning three academic papers whose average length is ten pages.

Table 10: Assessment Workload

<i>AUI Assessment Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Midterm</i>	3	5

<i>SSE Assessment Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Midterm</i>	2	10

<i>Final</i>	3	5
<i>Both Midterm and Final</i>	46	79
<i>Objective</i>	5	9
<i>Subjective</i>	11	19
<i>Both Objective and Subjective</i>	23	40
<i>Problems</i>	28	48
<i>Calculations</i>	28	48
<i>Quizzes</i>	44	76
<i>Written Assignments</i>	49	84
<i>Oral Assignments</i>	32	55

N=58

<i>SHSS Assessment Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Midterm</i>	1	5
<i>Final</i>	1	5
<i>Both Midterm and Final</i>	14	64
<i>Objective</i>	3	14
<i>Subjective</i>	8	36
<i>Both Objective and Subjective</i>	7	32
<i>Problems</i>	2	9
<i>Calculations</i>	3	14
<i>Quizzes</i>	14	9
<i>Written Assignments</i>	18	82
<i>Oral Assignments</i>	13	59

N=22

<i>Final</i>	2	10
<i>Both Midterm and Final</i>	17	81
<i>Objective</i>	1	5
<i>Subjective</i>	1	5
<i>Both Objective and Subjective</i>	8	38
<i>Problems</i>	14	67
<i>Calculations</i>	14	67
<i>Quizzes</i>	19	90
<i>Written Assignments</i>	16	76
<i>Oral Assignments</i>	7	33

N=21

<i>SBA Assessment Workload</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percent</i>
<i>Midterm</i>	0	0
<i>Final</i>	0	0
<i>Both Midterm and Final</i>	15	100
<i>Objective</i>	1	7
<i>Subjective</i>	2	13
<i>Both Objective and Subjective</i>	8	53
<i>Problems</i>	12	80
<i>Calculations</i>	3	73
<i>Quizzes</i>	11	73
<i>Written Assignments</i>	15	100
<i>Oral Assignments</i>	13	80

N=15

AUI students are also faced with a substantial assessment workload. Seventy-nine percent of faculty assign both midterm and final exams and a further ten percent assign either a midterm or a final. Thus, AUI students must become proficient in taking exams. Moreover, these exams are often both objective and subjective (40%) while nine percent are objective only and nineteen percent are subjective only. The designation of exams as objective assumes that test questions are designed so that students must make selections from among multiple pre-written responses. Subjective exams require students to create their own responses. There is also a substantial quiz load with seventy-six percent of faculty reporting the use of quizzes.

Typical AUI Course Workload

While it is impossible to make an accurate composite of the typical student workload, the results of the survey provide data to support general estimates. The interpretations of student workloads are based on the following criteria.

Table 11: Interpretation of student workloads

<i>Faculty Response (Percentage)</i>	<i>Qualifier</i>
<i>80-100 =</i>	<i>Almost always</i>
<i>60-79 =</i>	<i>Usually</i>
<i>40-59 =</i>	<i>Frequently/often</i>
<i>20-39 =</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>
<i>0-19 =</i>	<i>Rarely =</i>

During the semester, for every course, AUI students are usually faced with a lecture (70%)² which usually requires note-taking (64%). This will often involve some sort of question

² This statement refers to Table 6 and the 70% reflects the sum of faculty reporting “always” and “usually” employing lectures in their teaching.

and answer session (56% or 95%³). Students will usually be asked to give an oral presentation (76%) but only sometimes be asked to lead a seminar (36%). Students will almost always be assigned a textbook (98%) and 10 to 20 pages of reading will be assigned per week for which notes are often required (41%). Faculty will usually assign two academic papers (74%) which will be 10 pages in length. The paper will frequently be library research (43%), frequently applied research (41%) but rarely pure research (14%). There will almost always be additional assigned written work (91%) of which a substantial amount will usually be in-class (72%). There will usually be a midterm and final exam (79%) and rarely only a midterm (5%) or final (5%). These exams will sometimes be both objective and subjective (40%) rarely objective only (9%) and rarely subjective only (19%). There will almost always be evaluated written assignments (84%) and frequently evaluated oral assignments (55%). Students will usually be given quizzes (76%) during a course.

Typical SSE Course Workload

SSE students will usually be faced with a lecture (71%) and usually note-taking is required (71%). Students will often be asked to take part in question/answer sessions (52%). They will usually be asked to give an oral presentation (62%) but only rarely to lead a seminar (24%). Students will almost always be assigned a textbook (100%) with 15 pages of required reading assigned per week with notes required sometimes (29%). Faculty will often assign two academic papers (43%) which will be nine pages in length. These papers will rarely be pure research (10%) or library research (19%) and sometimes be applied research (33%). There will almost always be additional assigned written work (81%) of which a substantial amount will usually be in-class (71%). There will almost always be a midterm and final exam (81%) and only rarely either a midterm only (10%) or a final only (10%). These exams will sometimes be both objective and subjective (38%) but rarely subjective only (5%) or objective only (5%). There will usually be evaluated written assignments (76%) and sometimes evaluated oral assignments (33%). Students will almost always be give quizzes during an SSE course (90%).

Typical SHSS Course Workload

SHSS students will usually be faced with a lecture (63%) which frequently requires note-taking (50%). There will almost always be a question/answer session (86%). Students will usually be asked to give an oral presentation (77%) and sometimes lead a seminar (36%). A textbook is almost always assigned (95%) with 25 pages of reading per week. This often requires taking notes (41%). Faculty usually assign two academic papers (67%) which are nine pages in length. These papers are often library research (55%), sometimes applied research (23%) and rarely pure research (5%). There will almost always be additional assigned written work (100%) of which a substantial amount will usually be in-class (68%). There is usually a midterm and final exam (64%). These exams will sometimes be both objective and subjective (32%), objective only rarely (14%) and subjective only sometimes (36%). There will almost always be evaluated written assignments (82%) and frequently evaluated oral assignments (59%). There will only rarely be quizzes (9%) in SHSS courses.

Typical SBA Course Workload

SBA students will almost always be faced with a lecture (80%) which usually requires note-taking (73%) and almost always includes a question/answer session (100%). Students will almost always be asked to give oral presentations (93%) and often asked to lead a seminar (53%). A textbook is almost always assigned (100%) with 25-30 pages required reading per week. Notes are usually required (60%). Faculty almost always assign three academic papers (93%)

³ Due to discrepancy, the use of question and answer is imprecise.

which are 10 pages in length. These papers are usually library research(60%), almost always applied research (80%) and sometimes pure research (33%). There will almost always be additional assigned written work (93%) of which a substantial amount will almost always be in-class (80%). Students will almost always be given a midterm and final exam (100%). These exams will frequently be both objective and subjective (53%) and rarely objective only (7%) and rarely subjective only (13%). There will almost always be evaluated written assignments (100%) and evaluated oral assignments (80%). There will usually be quizzes (73%) in SBA courses.

Discussion and Conclusion

A needs analysis survey is the tool of choice when faced with the task of planning, designing and implementing a new curriculum or syllabus. As stated earlier, program evaluation and renewal are key components of educational effectiveness. CADS courses have constantly been developed and it is important to judge whether changes do in fact meet the program goals and university needs.

CADS now provides a tightly integrated suite of courses aimed at developing student academic and social skills (see the [CADS website](#) for specific course syllabuses and objectives). In fact, CADS courses do provide support for students – either implicit or explicit – on all the skills identified in this survey. However, four skills have been identified by AUI faculty as being below the AUI average in student ability (see Table 2), yet above the AUI average in ranking of importance to faculty in their courses. These include: Academic ethics; Reading academic texts; Time management; and Independent learning. Writing academic papers is also of interest in that it is consistently ranked low in terms of student ability. These skills should perhaps be of most interest to CADS and the AUI community as a whole.

Academic ethics is a problem at the tertiary level throughout the world. Fortunately the AUI administration has taken a strong stand with regards to ethical issues. The CADS courses SSK1201, SSK1202, SSK1203 and SSK1204 all address issues of academic ethics – both explicitly and implicitly. The CADS course SSK1205 deals with issues of personal and interpersonal ethics and standards.

Reading academic texts is of fundamental importance to tertiary education. Knowledge and the acquisition of knowledge are assumed to be of intrinsic interest to students. In other words, faculty expect students to be interested in learning more about their particular field of study – that they will read to acquire this knowledge. This assumption is reflected in the consistently heavy reading workload assigned by faculty (see table 7). This then frees class time for higher level academic investigation such as application, analysis, evaluation, synthesis (see Bloom's taxonomy). Problems occur when students do not prepare for classes and therefore are unable to work at these levels⁴. The CADS courses SSK 1201 and 1202 attempt to deal with these issues explicitly – requiring academic reading, note-taking and critical reading.

It is impossible, however for two courses to deal adequately with problems of this scope. Partially the problem rests with the lack of a reading tradition in Moroccan culture. Partially it rests with the lack of intrinsic interest in particular courses of study. Encouraging compliance with reading requirements needs to be investigated as a boundary issue for entry and exit to the core curriculum.

Time management is taught explicitly in the CADS courses SSK1201 and SSK1204 and implicitly in SSK1202. This skill is difficult for students to grasp. This is illustrated each term by increased student stress levels and increased ethical and behavioral problems around midterm

⁴ It is assumed that students are not completing their reading assignments. However, student compliance with reading workloads needs to be addressed in a needs analysis survey from a student perspective.

and the final week of classes, when multiple assignments are due and are not adequately managed. Issues of time management need to be dealt with across the core curriculum.

Independent learning as an identified need across the curriculum is a major aim of all CADS courses. Task instructions, worksheets and resources have been specifically designed to help students see that they can depend increasingly on themselves as seekers and users of knowledge. Their reluctance to take on the responsibility for learning can only be understood as a function of their past education, and must clearly be emphasized by all members of the AUI community, both staff and faculty.

Writing academic papers is a task that is explicitly dealt with in four of the CADS courses. The foundation course, SSK1201, gives intensive instruction in the process approach to term paper completion, with the goal of behavior modification. Subsequent courses make further demands in academic writing and explicitly provide support to carry on the training initiated in 1201. It must be noted that CADS courses do not teach the sentence and paragraph structure that writing courses are responsible for, but rather the thinking, planning, organizing, researching and revising strategies that are necessary.

The data on the assessment workload is also of some concern. The data shows that AUI students are heavily assessed. Faculty report both a midterm and final exam in 79% of courses. They report holding quizzes in 76% of courses. They also report assigning two academic papers per term with an average length of 10 pages. There is frequently additional assessed oral and written work. This needs to be investigated in more detail. On the surface, it would seem that AUI students are tremendously burdened with formal assessment.

References

- Agricultural Education Faculty. (n.d) Effective Teaching in Agriculture and Life Sciences. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://www.ais.msstate.edu/TALS/>
- American Association for Public Opinion Research. (n.d.) Best Practices for Public Opinion Research. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://www.aapor.org/ethics/best.html>.
- APSSA. (2000). Needs Assessment. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://www.apssa.uiuc.edu/default.asp>
- Beecher, J. (1988). Note-taking: What do we know about the Benefits? ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading, English and Communication Digest No. 37. Retrieved April 10, 2002, from: <http://eric.indiana.edu/www/indexdb.html>
- Boudah, D. and K. O'Neill. (1999). Learning strategies. ERIC/OSEP Digest E577. Retrieved April 11, 2002, from: http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed433669.html
- Carr, K. S. (1990). How Can We Teach Critical Thinking? ERIC Digest. ERIC Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education. Urbana IL. Retrieved April 11, 2002, from: http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed326304.html
- Center for Academic Development and Study Skills. (n.d). What is CADS? Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://mail.alakhawayn.ma/~A.CADS/1202/home.html>
- Counseling Services, University of Victoria. (2002). Learning Skills Program. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://www.coun.uvic.ca/learn/>
- Dartmouth College Composition Center (2001). History. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://www.dartmouth.edu/admin/acskills/>
- Exeter University (n.d.) Study Skills Support. Retrieved April 11, 2002, from Exeter University. URL: <http://www.ex.ac.uk/wp/restorecontext.htm?http://www.ex.ac.uk/wp/support1.htm>
- Flinders University (2002). Student Learning Center. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://adminwww.flinders.edu.au/cas/LLU.html>
- Foundation for Critical Thinking. (n.d.) A Brief History of the Idea of Critical Thinking. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://www.criticalthinking.org/university/cthistory.html>.
- Hill, R. (1998). What sample size is enough in Internet Survey Research? Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://jan.ucc.nau.edu/~ipct-j/1998/n3-4/hill.html>.
- Karper, Erin and David Neyhart, (2002) Online Writing Lab. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://owl.english.purdue.edu/>
- Lancaster University. (2002). Effective Learning. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://domino.lancs.ac.uk/pub/el.nsf/home?OpenView&count=500>

- Landsburger, J., (2002) Study Guides and Strategies, Retrieved March 24, 2002, from:
<http://www.iss.stthomas.edu/studyguides/>
- Lazere, D. (1987). Critical Thinking in College English Studies. ERIC Digest. ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills. Urbana IL. Retrieved April 11, 2002, from: http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed284275.html
- The Learning Commons. (2002). Learning Services. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from Guelph University. URL: <http://www.learningcommons.uoguelph.ca/learning/index.htm>
- Learning Services (2002) Retrieved April 11, 2002, from Deakin University. URL: <http://www.deakin.edu.au/learningservices/>
- Oxford, R. (1989). The role of styles and strategies in second language learning. ERIC Digest. ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. Washington D.C. Retrieved April 11, 2002, from: http://www.ed.gov/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed317087.html
- NCS Pearson. (2002) Sample Size and Confidence Interval Calculator. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://www.ncs.com/research-notes/sample-calc.htm>
- Poser, B. (2002). Counseling and Development Center. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from York University, URL: <http://www.yorku.ca/cdc/lsp/>
- Student Development Center. (2002). Learning Skills Services. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from the University of Western Ontario. URL: <http://www.sdc.uwo.ca/learning/>
- The University of New South Wales. (2002). The Learning Center. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://www.lc.unsw.edu.au/>
- The University of Melbourne. (2001) Learning Skills Unit. Retrieved March 24, 2002, from: <http://www.services.unimelb.edu.au/lisu/index.html>
- Worthen, B. and V. Moss-Summers. (July 26-27, 2000) Eight Steps in Constructing Questionnaires. (adapted from workshop materials) Retrieved April 11, 2002, from University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, URL: <http://www.apssa.uiuc.edu/content/cs/eightsteps.html>

Appendix A: Examples of Academic Skills Programs

United States of America	University of Saint Thomas Dartmouth College Purdue University Mississippi State University
Canada	University of Victoria York University Guelph University University of Western Ontario
United Kingdom	Lancaster University Exeter University
Australia	Deakin University The University of Melbourne Flinders University The University of New South Wales

Appendix B: Needs Analysis Questionnaire



Center for Academic Development
and Study Skills

Needs Analysis (Faculty Perspective)

The aim of this analysis is to investigate the requirements of undergraduates at Al Akhawayn University in Ifrane (AIU) in order to improve academic performance. The results of the study will be used to strengthen the Center for Academic Development and Study Skills (CADS) courses. It will also provide a starting point for discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the AUI core curriculum.

Name: (optional) _____

No. of years at AUI (optional): _____ School (optional): _____

Highest Degree (optional): _____ Moroccan Non-Moroccan

Level of students _____

I – Overall Skills Levels

Please answer the following questions by placing an X in the appropriate boxes.

How would you rank AUI students in these skills areas?

1. **Speaking** Excellent Good Average Weak Poor
(oral presentation, seminar presentation)

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

2. **Asking questions in class** Excellent Good Average Weak Poor
(relevant, polite, clear)

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

3. **Listening to academic lectures** Excellent Good Average Weak Poor

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

4. Reading academic texts Excellent Good Average Weak Poor

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

5. Notetaking from academic lectures Excellent Good Average Weak Poor

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

6. Notetaking from academic texts Excellent Good Average Weak Poor

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

7. Writing academic papers Excellent Good Average Weak Poor

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

8. Test-taking Excellent Good Average Weak Poor

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

9. Computer skills Excellent Good Average Weak Poor

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

10. Independent learning Excellent Good Average Weak Poor
(Learning on one's own)

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

11. Collaborative learning Excellent Good Average Weak Poor
(Learning in pairs or small groups)

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

12. Academic ethics Excellent Good Average Weak Poor

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

13. Time Management Excellent Good Average Weak Poor

How important are student skills in this area to your course?

extremely important very important important somewhat important not important

Comments: _____

14. Other (please explain) Excellent Good Average Weak Poor

Comments: _____

II – Instructional Delivery

Please answer the following questions by placing an X in the appropriate boxes.

15. What modes of instructional delivery do you employ

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lecture | <input type="checkbox"/> Web based | <input type="checkbox"/> Computer simulation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Task based | <input type="checkbox"/> Slides | <input type="checkbox"/> Computer Lab |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Project based | <input type="checkbox"/> Data Show | <input type="checkbox"/> Laboratory |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Problem Solution | <input type="checkbox"/> Video | <input type="checkbox"/> Seminar |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Question Answer | <input type="checkbox"/> Other |

Comments: _____

III – Student Workload

Please answer the following questions by placing an X in the appropriate boxes.

Oral Workload

Do you ask your students to perform orally in these ways?

- | | |
|--|--|
| 16. Seminar presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 17. Oral presentation | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 18. Question Answer | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 19. Are oral skills evaluated and given a grade? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Comments: _____

Reading Workload

- | | |
|--|--|
| 20. Does your course have a textbook? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 21. Does your course have a reading list? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| 22. Does your course require academic reading? | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |

Approximate amount?

- 0-10 pages per week.
 10-20 pages per week.
 20-30 pages per week.
 30-40 pages per week.
 >40 pages per week.

23. Do you require students to take notes from readings? Yes No

24. Is reading evaluated and given a grade? Yes No

Comments: _____

Listening Workload

25. Do you lecture? Always usually often sometimes never
 26. Do you use audio tapes or video tapes? Yes No
 27. Do you require students to take notes from lectures? Yes No
 28. Is listening evaluated and given a grade? Yes No

Comments: _____

Writing Workload

29. Do you assign written work? Yes No

30. Written academic papers? Yes No

Number per term: _____

Length in pages: _____

Type:

- Pure Research
 Library Research
 Applied Research

31. In-class assignments Yes No

32. Individual/Group assignments Yes No

33. Is written work evaluated and given a grade? Yes No

How?:

Assessment Workload

34. Do you assess by formal tests?

- Midterm Final Both Midterm and Final
 Objective Subjective Both Objective and Subjective
 Problems Calculations
(multiple choice) (Essay questions/Short answers)

35. Do you assess by quizzes? Yes No

36. Do you assess by written assignments? Yes No

37. Do you assess by oral assignments? Yes No

Comments: _____
