

# STMS

# Survey

# Results

1. Are you a science major? (19%); a non science major? (64%); undecided (17%).

2. How would you rate your own motivation and interest in academics? High (42%); Medium (53%); Low (5%).

3. How clearly was each block taught? (rate from 1 down to 5)

Astronomy, D. Barnes: 1) 22%; 2) 22%; 3) 26%; 4) 15%; 5) 11%; 0) 4%.

Nutrition, Wetmore: 1) 14%; 2) 24%; 3) 25%; 4) 18%; 5) 12% 0) 7%.

Ecology, Sytron: 1) 11%; 2) 23%; 3) 23%; 4) 23%; 5) 14%; 0) 6%.

Drugs, Knight: 1) 11%; 2) 27%; 3) 31%; 4) 16%; 5) 9%; 0) 6%.

Anthropology, K. Barnes: 1) 7%; 2) 15%; 3) 23%; 4) 23%; 5) 27%; 0) 5%.

4. At some schools instead of a general science course like STMS, they require a biology or a chemistry course instead. Is STMS a good alternative? Yes (75%), No (25%).

5. Was STMS as intellectually stimulating as your other courses? Yes (20%), No (80%).

6. How much effort did you put into STMS during the week? 0 hrs., 6.3%; 1 hr., 27.0%; 2 hrs., 21.4%; 4 hrs., 30.2%; 6 hrs., 10.3%; more, 4.8%.

7. What percent of the STMS assignments did you do? 0-30% (4%), 31-60% (18%), 61-100% (78%).

8. How well did you understand the objectives of the labs? Very well (18%); Somewhat (67%); Not at all (15%).

9. What portion of your STMS Knowledge did you learn from the labs? 0-20% (64%); 21-50% (32.8%); 51-100% (3.2%).

10. Do you think that the lab work should be more oriented towards understanding the lecture material? Yes (79.5%); No (19.7%); Undecided (.8%).

11. How helpful and valuable was your discussion section towards understanding the material? Very much (12%); Somewhat (57%); Not at all (31%).

12. How often on an average did you skip the discussions and lectures per week? 0 (43.2%); 1 (28%); 2 (20%); 3 (5.6%); 4 (3.2%).

13. Do you think that STMS will leave you with a basic knowledge of what science is about? Yes (62.7%); No (34.8%); Sort Of (2.5%).

14. Do you think that the library assignments were a learning experience? Yes (15.9%); No (84.1%).

15. Do you know more about the library now, after using it in STMS? Yes (54.8%); No (45.2%).

16. Would you prefer STMS more, if STMS did more work in discussion rather than in lecture? Yes (50.8%); No (49.2%).

The results of the survey showed that students had mixed attitudes towards STMS; of the class 125 students responded. When asked whether or not STMS was a good alternative to the traditional requirement of one or two semesters of a specific science, an overwhelming number though it was. Furthermore, 65.2% felt STMS would leave them with a basic knowledge of science. Only 20%, however, felt that STMS was as intellectually stimulating as other courses being taken.

Another aspect examined was the importance of the STMS laboratory, the relevance of the subject matter treated, and the students' attitudes towards their weekly laboratory sessions. When asked if they understood the objectives and purposes of their laboratory work, 82% of those polled said that they understood the objectives either somewhat or not at all. When questioned about the amount of knowledge gained from their laboratory work in comparison to the total amount learned in the whole of STMS, 97% answered that less than half of their total knowledge came from lab while 64% of that group said that they acquired only about 20% of their knowledge from lab. A large majority of those questioned (80%) said that lab work should be more closely oriented towards the work done in the discussion and lecture.

According to the poll, discussion groups have some value, but improvements and changes seem to be indicated. Some of the STMS faculty members lacked sufficient interest in the topics to make discussion interesting and helpful in learning the material. Changes could include organizing the discussion sections in such a way that they investigate more specific areas of the discipline addressed.

Were the STMS library assignments important? A large majority (84%) of the students did not seem to think so. Most thought that the assignments were 'busy work'. Also, the practice of making single assignments to the whole class results in a substantial number of students using the library simultaneously, especially on the eve of the assignment deadline. This would seem to suggest that each section or discussion group could be given an individual assignment, perhaps even with varying deadlines.

Based on the conclusions of the survey, there seems to be a definite need for improvements in Selected

Topics in Modern Science, especially in the discussion sections, the library skills assignments, and the lab sections. It is also suggested that the STMS professors should exhibit more interest in and motivation toward the material and the class and to

accept the philosophy behind STMS. It is hoped that the STMS committee will seriously consider these statistics when planning the format of STMS for the following year. The cooperation of the freshman class in this survey is appreciated.

## Professors' Grade Report

point average (GPA).

Apologies must be given to all those not included in this survey. It is recognized that there are many more worthy personnel to be evaluated, but there was a severe limit of time and staff to compile the data. An especially sincere apology is given to Coach Floyd Blackwell, who was overlooked due to a clerical error.

The chart includes the professor or administrator, their GPA, and a fraction.

This fraction represents the total number of grade points over the number of students who evaluated that person.

The top five personnel at St. Andrews according to the results are Tom Jones, an Assistant Professor with a 3.71; Dianne Braak, a Voice Instructor, with a 3.70; Neal Bushoven, Assistant Professor of Politics and Director of SAS, with a 3.69; William Alexander, Professor of Philosophy and Religion, with a 3.68; and Eugene Smith, Professor of Education, also with a 3.68.

GPA	Professor/Administrator	Fraction
3.68	Alexander, William M.	206/56
2.18	Applegate, Arthur L.	144/66
3.13	Barnes, Donald G.	247/79
2.20	Barnes, Karen	101/46
3.21	Bayes, Ronald H.	154/48
3.28	Bennett, Carl D.	141/43
2.35	Betts, M. Dean	146/62
3.70	Braak, Dianne	27/10
2.04	Brown, Cheryl	55/27
3.00	Brown, Linda	3/1
2.19	Bullock, Leslie	147/67
3.69	Bushoven, Cornelius	203/55
2.55	Chay, June L.	84/33
2.75	Cobb, Barbara H.	33/12
2.49	Cobb, Jr., James V.	92/37
1.77	Coffman, Rooney L.	62/35
2.95	Crawford, Dudley	56/19
2.96	Crossley, Ronald	225/76
2.25	Curtis, Raymond	72/32
1.95	Daughtrey, John P.	41/21
2.19	Decker, Rodger W.	92/42
3.33	Ford, Brad	90/27
2.52	Fouke, George L.	136/54
2.98	Fulcher, J. Rodney	125/42
2.03	Gay, Lacy M.	65/32
3.15	Geffert, Carl W.	126/40
1.79	Harvin, Harry L.	75/42
2.57	Holmes, James D. J.	59/23
3.17	Horn, Herbert A.	73/23
0.85	Jackson, James H.	11/13
2.96	Jones, F. Whitney	160/54
3.71	Jones, Tom	54/14
2.62	Joyner, Charles W.	97/37
2.41	Knight, Judith M.	130/54
3.50	Leach, Louise	7/2
2.85	Loftus, William	114/40
2.17	Ludlow, Jr., L. Spencer	104/48
2.54	Marks, Martha	104/41
2.03	Marks, Stuart A.	71/35
3.35	McDonald, Arthur W.	164/49
2.08	McNair, David	75/36
3.12	McLean, David	178/57
2.93	Melton, George	35/29
2.33	Morgan, William	100/43
2.50	Neylans, Catherine	95/38
3.18	Patton, Elbert	35/11
3.37	Paul, Garrett	91/27
2.61	Paxton, Donald	81/31
2.45	Perkinson, Jr., A. P.	152/62
3.63	Prust, Richard	272/75
1.49	ReVelle, Jacques C.	91/61
2.62	Rogers, Helen	55/21
3.14	Rolland, William W.	110/35
1.71	Santa-Maria, Maria	135/79
3.06	Schultz, Lawrence	98/32
2.48	Smith, Alvin H.	72/29
3.68	Smith, Eugene	125/34
1.82	Smith, Julian	40/22
3.48	Smith, Mark L.	94/27
3.60	Somerville, William H.	223/62
3.04	Stephens, James F.	85/28
2.90	Tauber, Robert C.	87/30
2.32	Urie, Robert M.	88/38
2.95	Wetmore, David E.	236/80
3.09	White, W. D.	176/57
2.66	Whitely, Thomas M.	93/35
3.00	Wilkins, Alice	3/1
2.18	Wilkins, David	48/22
3.35	Williams, Jo Ann	201/60
2.45	Williams, John E.	49/20

## Spring Arts Fest Opens

MAY 1, SUNDAY - Senior Student Art Show, Vardell Gallery, Afternoon Reception.

MAY 2, MONDAY - Daniel Cheney, Pianist, Senior recital Vardell Building, 8:00 p.m.

MAY 3, TUESDAY - Joan Miller, Soprano Guest artist, Vardell Building, 8:00 p.m.

MAY 4, WEDNESDAY - Student Poetry Reading - Vardell Building, 8:00 p.m.

MAY 5, THURSDAY - Faculty/Student Spring Concert - St. Andrews Faculty Trio will present a joint concert with a flute-piano trio composed of St. Andrews music majors. The program will include works by Mozart, Telemann, Milhaud, and Cimerosa. The Faculty Trio includes Dave Wilkins, clarinet; Margaret Rehdor, violin; and Louise Leach, piano. The student members are Kathie DeVane and Walter Kunezel, flute; and Ivy Baker, piano. Vardell Building - 8:00 p.m.

MAY 6, FRIDAY - Kathy Devane, Pianist, Senior recital, Vardell Building, 8:00 p.m.

MAY 7, SATURDAY - Arts Fair, Exhibits, demonstrations, workshops, entertainment, refreshments, dances, crafts, games, etc. On and around the causewalk, All day and into the event.


MAY 8, SUNDAY - Faure Requiem. St. Andrews College Choir and Laurinburg Presbyterian Church Choir, Laurinburg Presbyterian Church, 8:00 p.m.

MAY 8-9, SUNDAY-MONDAY - Three By Three By Three\*. As If To Forget—by Steve Grissom, Directed by Danny Haley. Bare Trees—by Susan Russell, Directed by Marsha Coggins. Final Curtain—by David Miller, Directed by Jane Schwab. Lab Theatre. Liberal Arts Building, 8:00 p.m.

MAY 10, TUESDAY - Opera Theatre, Workshop scenes. Selected operas. Liberal Arts Auditorium, 8:00 p.m.

MAY 11, WEDNESDAY - Premiere of Films\*. Created by St. Andrews Students, Liberal Arts Auditorium. 8:00 p.m.

(For further information: Jack Vaughn, co-ordinator of ARTS FAIR. Arthur McDonald, co-ordinator of other events).



# THE RED LION

Now Open  
In The College  
Union  
8-12 P. M.