

## Summary of 2014 NSSE and FSSE Responses

Every three years SF State participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). In 2014 SF State also participated in the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). Overall, 14% of the students invited to participate in the survey partially or fully completed it. The response rate was 11% among first-year students (n=640) and 16% among seniors (n=1555). Among faculty the response rate was 30% (n=647). Half (50%) of the faculty respondents were full, associate, or assistant professors, and 36% were lecturers. Seventeen other CSU campuses made up the CSU comparison group against which the SF State responses were compared. NSSE responses are summarized below.

The NSSE engagement indicator scores shown below by theme were produced by converting the response set of each item included in the indicator to a 60-point scale (e.g., Never = 0; Sometimes = 20; Often = 40; Very often = 60), then computing the mean of the rescaled items. Higher means are more desirable.

Theme	Engagement Indicator	First-Year Students				Seniors			
		SF State Mean	CSU Mean	Significant Difference	Effect size	SF State Mean	CSU Mean	Significant Difference	Effect size
Academic Challenge	Higher-Order Learning	38.6	39.4		-.06	40.0	41.3	**	-.10
	Reflective & Integrative Learning	36.8	35.8		.08	38.9	38.8		.00
	Learning Strategies	36.1	38.6	***	-.17	39.7	40.0		-.02
	Quantitative Reasoning	27.0	27.5		-.03	28.7	30.9	***	-.13
Learning with Peers	Collaborative Learning	31.6	33.2	**	-.12	32.6	35.3	***	-.20
	Discussions with Diverse Others	40.3	40.8		-.03	41.3	43.5	***	-.14
Experiences with Faculty	Student-Faculty Interaction	17.5	18.6		-.08	20.0	22.4	***	-.16
	Effective Teaching Practices	39.0	40.6	**	-.12	39.7	40.6	*	-.07
Campus Environment	Quality of Interactions	36.6	39.4	***	-.21	39.8	41.7	***	-.15
	Supportive Environment	33.1	36.8	***	-.26	29.3	32.5	***	-.22

With only the exception of the Reflective & Integrative Learning indicator in the Academic Challenge theme, the CSU comparison group means were higher than those of SF State. There were statistically significant differences among both first-year students and seniors, although the effect sizes were small/weak.

Notes:

Significant difference: \*p<.05, \*\*p<.01, \*\*\*p<.001 (2-tailed)

Effect size: NSSE provided effect size for comparisons having statistically significant and non-significant differences. Effect size “indicates the ‘practical significance’ of the difference between means and is calculated by dividing the mean difference by the pooled standard deviation.” An effect size of +/- .20 is considered small/weak, one of +/- .50 is considered moderate, and an effect size of +/- .80 is considered large/strong.

High-impact practices: Percentages are based on students who responded "Done or in progress" except for service-learning, which is the percentage who responded that at least "Some" courses included a community-based project.

As shown below, participation in high-impact practices did not differ significantly between SF State and the CSU comparison group among first-year students. There were many significant differences, however, between the two groups among seniors, with higher participation rates among students in the CSU comparison group in all but Study Abroad.

High-Impact Practice	First-Year Students				Seniors			
	SF State % Participation	CSU % Participation	Significant Difference	Effect size	SF State % Participation	CSU % Participation	Significant Difference	Effect size
Learning Community	12%	13%		-.02	18%	22%	***	-.11
Service-Learning	55%	56%		-.02	63%	66%		-.06
Research with Faculty	4%	4%		-.04	16%	20%	**	-.09
Internship or Field Experience	--	--		--	41%	45%	**	-.08
Study Abroad	--	--		--	11%	7%	***	.12
Culminating Senior Experience	--	--		--	29%	43%	***	-.29
Participated in at least one	58%	60%		-.05	83%	86%	**	-.09
Participated in two or more	9%	11%		-.05	49%	58%	***	-.18

NSSE provided other summary results (shown below) in addition to engagement indicators and high-impact practices. CSU comparison group means were higher than SF State means and, in most cases, significantly so. Higher SF State means were found in the number of hours per week of course reading required among first-year students (statistically significant) and seniors (not statistically significant) and the number of pages of course writing required per year for first-year students (not statistically significant).

Additional Results	First-Year Students				Seniors			
	SF State Mean	CSU Mean	Significant Difference	Effect size	SF State Mean	CSU Mean	Significant Difference	Effect size
Time Spent Preparing for Class (Hours/Week)	12.6	13.3		-.09	14.3	15.1	**	-.09
Course Reading (Hours/Week)	6.8	6.7		.03	7.7	7.8		.00
Course Writing (Pages/Year)	52.2	44.9	*	.12	86.2	81.3		.06
Challenging Students to Do Their Best Work (7-point scale)	5.3	5.5	***	-.19	5.5	5.7	***	-.15
Academic Emphasis (4-point scale)	3.0	3.3	***	-.31	3.0	3.3	***	-.31
Overall Experience (4-point scale)	2.9	3.1	***	-.39	3.0	3.2	***	-.25
Would Attend Institution Again (4-point scale)	3.0	3.1	***	-.18	3.0	3.2	***	-.25

NSSE provided additional item comparisons between SF State and the CSU group for first-year students and seniors. The five items that were highest- and lowest-performing relative to the CSU comparison group were specified along with the percentage point difference (shown below).

<b>Highest-Performing Relative to CSU Group</b>	
<b>First-year</b>	<b>Senior</b>
Included diverse perspectives in course discussions or assignments (+6)	Included diverse perspectives in course discussions or assignments (+5)
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues (+4)	Institution emphasis on encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (+5)
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective (+4)	Participated in a study abroad program (+3)
Discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own (+4)	Assigned more than 50 pages of writing (+1)
Spent more than 10 hours per week on assigned reading (+3)	Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective (+1)
<b>Lowest-Performing Relative to CSU Group</b>	
<b>First-year</b>	<b>Senior</b>
Reviewed your notes after class (-9)	Discussions with people with political views other than your own (-10)
Extent to which courses challenged you to do your best work (-10)	Institution emphasis on providing support for your overall well-being (-11)
Institution emphasis on providing support to help students succeed academically (-11)	Institution emphasis on using learning support services (-13)
Institution emphasis on using learning support services (-13)	Institution emphasis on attending campus activities and events (-14)
Institution emphasis on attending campus activities and events (-17)	Completed a culminating senior experience (-14)

The FSSE-NSSE Combined Report revealed that faculty and student perceptions differed considerably. In general, faculty perceived that their coursework emphasized the various engagement indicators (types of learning, interactions, practices, etc.) to a greater extent than did their students. Among all differences, the greatest were in the following areas or items:

- Faculty overestimated—and/or students underreported—the frequency of student-faculty interaction, especially discussion of course content outside of class and discussion of students’ academic performance.
- The percentages of faculty who indicated that it is important that SF State increase its emphasis on various facets of a supportive campus environment (e.g., providing support to help students succeed academically) were consistently higher than the percentages of students who indicated that SF State currently emphasizes them.
- Faculty underestimated—and/or students overreported—the extent to which memorization is emphasized in coursework.
- Faculty perceptions of the quality of student interactions with other students, faculty, and staff on campus were notably less favorable than were those of students.
- Faculty overestimated the number of hours students (especially among first-year students) work for pay off campus but *underestimated* the time students spent participating in co-curricular activities and community service and commuting to campus.