

Spring 2017 University Transfer Center Campus Visit Evaluation Results

Prepared by Diana Pineda

Purpose of Brief

The purpose of this brief is to analyze the results of the UTC campus visit pre-post evaluations completed by 24 respondents in spring 2017.

Summary of Findings

- 50% of respondents indicated that they visited historically black colleges and universities.
- After visiting, students were substantially ($ES=1.07$) and statistically significantly ($p=.001$) more likely to know a lot about the campus than prior to their visit.
- 83% of students agreed or strongly agreed they made a new connection with a student or staff member on the campus they visited.
- 75% of respondents indicated the campus visit had a significant impact on their decision to apply and transfer to the campus they visited.
- The most frequent comments ($n=10$) expressed praise for the campus visit. One respondent stated, "It was great! Tour guide was great, and CHC staff was awesome! Thank you so much!"
- Suggestions for improvement included distributing the lunch tickets at the beginning and to provide more opportunities to interact with students and faculty.

Overview

The Crafton Hills College (CHC) University Transfer Center (UTC) assists students planning to transfer to CSU, UC, private or out-of-state universities. Some of the services the UTC provides include university fieldtrips, transfer workshops, and university application/personal statement assistance. The purpose of this brief is to analyze the results of the UTC campus visit pre-post evaluations completed by 24 respondents in spring 2017. The UTC campus visits were held from February 24, 2017 to May 12, 2017.

Methodology

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning (OIERP) in collaboration with the UTC developed an online evaluation to administer to students who registered to attend university fieldtrips and a similar paper evaluation to administer to students after the university campus visit took place. The first part of the evaluations, prompted respondents to provide demographic information (e.g., name and student identification number). Next, respondents were prompted to indicate which campus they were registering to visit or which campus they visited and date of the campus visit. The online evaluation asked respondents whether it was their first time visiting the campus. Then, both evaluations prompted respondents to rate their level of agreement with 3 statements regarding knowledge about the campus, interest in transferring, and confidence in transferring. The following 4-point Likert-scale was utilized: 4=Strongly Agree, 3=Agree, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree. The paper evaluation included an additional statement for respondents to rate their level of agreement using the aforementioned Likert-scale; regarding their experience in making a new connection during the campus visit. After, only on the paper evaluation, respondents were asked what the impact, if any, the campus visit had on their decision to apply and transfer to the campus. The following 4-point Likert-scale was utilized: 4= No impact, 3= A small impact, 2= A moderate impact, 1= A significant impact. Finally, the paper evaluation provided an open-ended question where respondents had the opportunity to offer comments and/or suggestions to help improve future campus visits.

The effect size statistic was used to indicate the size of the difference on respondent's level of agreement before (online **pre**-evaluation) and after (paper **post**-evaluation) their campus visit.

Effect size is calculated by dividing the difference of the two means by the pooled standard deviation. Jacob Cohen developed one method of interpreting effect size (d) where an effect size of .20 can be considered small, an effect size of .50 can be considered medium, and an effect size of .80 can be considered large. Accordingly, using Cohen as a guide, a substantial effect would be .20 or higher. The number of students in each group does not influence effect size; whereas, when statistical significance is calculated, the number of students in each group does influence the significance level (i.e., “p” value being less than .05).

To anonymize responses, any individual names mentioned in the comments or suggestions table were replaced with “[Name]”. To organize feedback received, comments were categorized by topic. A limitation to grouping any open-ended responses into categories is that researchers may group them differently.

Findings

Tables 1 through 5 illustrate the results of the findings from the UTC campus visit pre-post evaluations in spring 2017.

Table 1 illustrates the campuses visited by respondents. Fifty percent of respondents indicated they visited historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). The HBCUs visited included Bennett College, Lincoln University, Norfolk State University, North Carolina A & T State University, Bowie State University, Hampton University, and Howard University. Twenty-nine percent of respondents visited UC Riverside, 13% visited Cal Poly Pomona, and 8% visited CSU San Bernardino.

Table 1. Campuses visited by respondents.

Campus Visited	#	Column %
Historically Black Colleges and Universities	12	50.0
University of California, Riverside	7	29.2
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona	3	12.5
California State University, San Bernardino	2	8.3
Total	24	100.0

Table 2 demonstrates respondents’ answers on the **online pre-evaluation only**, to whether or not it was their first time visiting the campus. Eighty-three percent of respondents indicated it was their first time visiting the campus they registered to visit.

Table 2. First time visits to the specified campus.

Is this your first time visiting this campus?	#	Column %
Yes	20	83.3
No	4	16.7
Total	24	100.0

Table 3 illustrates respondents' levels of agreement with statements before (**pre-evaluation**) and after (**post-evaluation**) their campus visit. Fifty-four percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed they knew a lot about the campus they registered to visit, and 92% agreed or strongly agreed they knew a lot about the campus after visiting. Ninety-two percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were confident in their ability to transfer to the campus they planned to visit, after the campus visit took place, and 96% agreed or strongly agreed they were confident in their ability to transfer after visiting. Ninety-two percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they were highly interested in transferring to the campus they registered to visit, and 100% agreed or strongly agreed they were highly interested in transferring after visiting.

On the **post-evaluation**, 83% of students agreed or strongly agreed they made a new connection with a student or staff member on the campus they visited.

Table 3. Pre-post respondent's level of agreement with statements regarding campus they registered to visit and then visited.

Pair	Statement	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
1	Pre: I know a lot about the campus I'm visiting.	1	4.2	12	50.0	6	25.0	5	20.8	24
	Post: I know a lot about the campus I'm visiting.	6	25.0	16	66.7	2	8.3	0	0.0	
2	Pre: I'm confident I will be able to transfer to the campus I'm visiting.	11	45.8	11	45.8	1	4.2	1	4.2	24
	Post: I'm confident I will be able to transfer to the campus I'm visiting.	11	45.8	12	50.0	1	4.2	0	0.0	
3	Pre: I'm highly interested in transferring to the campus I'm visiting.	11	45.8	11	45.8	2	8.3	0	0.0	24
	Post: I'm highly interested in transferring to the campus I'm visiting.	14	58.3	10	41.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	
	Post: I made a new connection or friendship with a fellow student or staff member on this campus visit.	14	58.3	6	25.0	4	16.7	0	0.0	24

Table 4 illustrates the change in level of agreement on statements before and after the campus visit. After visiting, students were substantially ($ES=1.07$) and statistically significantly ($p= .001$) more likely to know a lot about the campus than prior to their visit. After visiting, students were substantially ($ES=0.36$) more likely to be confident about their ability to transfer than prior to their visit.

Table 4. Pre-post respondent's level of agreement with statements regarding campus visit, averages, statistical significance, and effect sizes.

Pair	Statement	Mean	N	SD	Substantially Different	Statistically Significant
1	Pre: I know a lot about the campus I'm visiting.	2.375	24	0.875	1.07	.001
	Post: I know a lot about the campus I'm visiting.	3.167	24	0.565		
2	Pre: I'm confident I will be able to transfer to the campus I'm visiting.	3.333	24	0.761	0.36	.203
	Post: I'm confident I will be able to transfer to the campus I'm visiting.	3.417	24	0.584		
3	Pre: I'm highly interested in transferring to the campus I'm visiting.	3.375	24	0.647	0.12	.647
	Post: I'm highly interested in transferring to the campus I'm visiting.	3.583	24	0.504		

Table 4 demonstrates respondents' answers on the **post-evaluation only**, to what impact the campus visit had on their decision to apply and transfer to the campus. Seventy-five percent of respondents indicated that the campus visit had a significant impact on their decision to apply and transfer to the campus they visited.

Table 4. Respondent's answers to what impact the campus visit had on decision to apply and transfer.

What impact has today's visit had on your decision to apply and transfer to this campus?	#	Column %
A significant impact	18	75.0
A moderate impact	6	25.0
A small impact	0	0.0
No impact	0	0.0
Total	24	100.0

Table 5 includes comments/suggestions from the **post-evaluation only** provided by 14 (58%) respondents to help improve future campus visits. The most frequent comments (n=10) expressed praise for the campus visit. One respondent stated, “It was great! Tour guide was great, and CHC staff was awesome! Thank you so much!” Conversely, respondents suggested that the lunch tickets be distributed at the beginning in case the group is split up and that the visit allows for more interaction with students and faculty.

Table 5. Comments/ suggestions provided by respondents to help improve future campus visits.

Praise of visit (n=10)
All of the tour guides had the students best interest at heart. They tried their best to answer any questions that were asked.
I acquired a more complete perspective on UCR and it was an enjoyable day. Thank you.
I really enjoyed this trip because I got to tour some historical schools and I got to learn more of our history. I really hope more students get to go on this trip.
It was an amazing experience!
It was good.
It was great! Tour guide was great, and CHC staff was awesome! Thank you so much!
Since going on the trip, it inspired me so much to go on the HBCU tour because I was learning a lot and they taught me everything I needed to know. Once again I'm very thankful for gaining some new experience from my counselors and teachers.
The trip is well worth it.
This experience was one for the books, loved it.
This trip was well prepared and organized
Suggestions (n=6)
Continue to have [Name] and [Name] as chaperones.
Food to always be ready and give more time for things.
Giving out contact info and lunch tickets at the beginning just in case the group is split up.
Please no political views.
More interaction with student and faculty. It would be nice to meet with program directors.
But the availability to be flexible took a lot of stamina and grit.