2017 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
What is the NSSE?
And why is it important?

National Survey of Student Engagement:
- Student Engagement Survey
  - 10 Engagement Indicators
  - 6 High-Impact Practices
- Administered every 3 years
- 20 CSU Campuses (2016-2017)

Engagement is linked to:
- Retention
- Satisfaction

Graduation Initiative 2025
- Engagement and Well-Being
NSSE Student Sample
First-Year Respondent Profile (2017)*

First-Year (n = 471)

- Female: 65%
- Male: 35%

- Full-Time: 97%
- Part-Time: 3%

First-Year Response Rate

- 2014: 11%
- 2017: 13%

Ethnicity of NSSE 2017 First-Years

- Am. Indian/Alaska Native: 22%
- Asian: 4%
- Black or African American: 1%
- Hispanic or Latino: 35%
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: 19%
- White: 0%
- Other: 11%
- Foreign/Nonresident Alien: 5%
- Two or more races/ethnicities: 4%
- Unknown: 0%

*Sample was representative of the population at SF State
NSSE Student Sample
Senior Respondent Profile (2017)*

Senior \((n = 1,490)\)

- **Female**: 57%
- **Male**: 43%
- **Full-Time**: 77%
- **Part-Time**: 23%

**Senior Response Rate**
- 2014: 16%
- 2017: 17%

**Ethnicity of NSSE 2017 Seniors**

- Am. Indian/Alaska Native: 27%
- Asian: 5%
- Black or African American: 25%
- Hispanic or Latino: Unknown
- Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander: 24%
- White: 8%
- Other: 5%
- Foreign/Nonresident Alien: 0%
- Two or more races/ethnicities: 6%
- Unknown: 1%

*Sample was representative of the population at SF State*
Engagement Indicators

**Theme 1 - Academic Challenge:**
1. **Higher-Order Learning**
   (How much has your coursework emphasized evaluating a point of view, decision or information source?)
2. **Reflective and Integrative Learning**
   (How often have you connected your learning to societal problems or issues?)
3. **Learning Strategies**
   (How often have you reviewed your notes after class?)
4. **Quantitative Reasoning**
   (How often have you used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue?)

**Theme 2 - Learning With Peers:**
5. **Collaborative Learning**
   (How often have you asked another student to help you understand course material?)
6. **Discussions with Diverse Others**
   (How often have you had discussions with people from a race or ethnicity other than your own?)
Theme 3 - Experiences with Faculty:
7. Student-Faculty Interaction
   (How often have you talked about career plans with a faculty member?)
8. Effective Teaching Practices
   (To what extent have your instructors clearly explained course goals and requirements?)

Theme 4 - Campus Environment:
9. Quality of Interactions
   (Indicate the quality of your interactions with academic advisors)
10. Supportive Environment
    (How much does your institution emphasize providing support to help students succeed academically?)
Engagement Indicators
Academic Challenge (2014 to 2017)

First-Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Challenge Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2014</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>CSU 2016-17</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Finding:
There were no significant differences between first-year SF State students and CSU students in academic challenge indicators.
### Engagement Indicators

**Academic Challenge (2014 to 2017)**

---

**Senior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Challenge Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2014</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>CSU 2016-17</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td><strong>significant (p &lt; .05)</strong></td>
<td>.08 (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>+0.3</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Key Finding:**

Senior SF State students scored significantly higher than CSU students in reflective and integrative learning indicator.
## Engagement Indicators
### Learning with Peers (2014 to 2017)

**First-Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning with Peers Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2014</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>CSU 2016-17</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>significant (p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>-0.23 (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Finding:**

There was a significant difference between first-year SF State students and CSU students in the collaborative learning indicator.
## Engagement Indicators
### Learning with Peers (2014 to 2017)

**Key Finding:**

There were significant differences between senior SF State students and CSU students in both learning with peers indicators.

### Senior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning with Peers Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2014</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>CSU 2016-17</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>significant (p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>-.13 (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>significant (p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>-.09 (small)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Engagement Indicators

**Experiences with Faculty (2014 to 2017)**

### First-Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences with Faculty Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2014</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>CSU 2016-17</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>significant (p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>-0.20 (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Finding:**

There was a significant difference between first-year SF State students and CSU students in the student-faculty interaction indicator.
### Engagement Indicators
#### Experiences with Faculty (2014 to 2017)

**Key Finding:**
There was a significant difference between senior SF State students and CSU students in the student-faculty interaction indicator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences with Faculty Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2014</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>CSU 2016-17</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>significant (p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>-.08 (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engagement Indicators
Campus Environment (2014 to 2017)

Key Finding:
There were significant differences between first-year SF State students and CSU students in campus environment indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Environment Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2014</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>CSU 2016-17</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>significant (p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>-0.27 (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Environment</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>-5.1</td>
<td>significant (p &lt; .05)</td>
<td>-0.37 (medium)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engagement Indicators
Campus Environment (2014 to 2017)

Key Finding:
There were significant differences between senior SF State students and CSU students in campus environment indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Environment Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2014</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>CSU 2016-17</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>significant (p &lt;.05)</td>
<td>-.21 (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>significant (p &lt;.05)</td>
<td>-.28 (small)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
High-Impact Practices (HIPs)

• Undergraduate opportunities which have positive associations with student learning and retention

• Service-Learning
  o Courses that included a community-based project

• Learning Community
  o Formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together

• Research with Faculty
  o Work with a faculty member on a research project

• Internship or Field Experience
  o Internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement

• Study Abroad

• Culminating Senior Experience
Key Finding: Participation in one HIP increased from 2014 to 2017
Key Finding: Participation in one HIP increased from 2014 to 2017.
Preparing for Class

Average Hours per Week Spent Preparing for Class

Key Finding: Average hours spent preparing for class increased from 2014 to 2017 for first-year and senior students.
Assigned Reading
Average Hours per Week on Course Readings

Key Finding: Hours of Assigned reading remained relatively stable from 2014 to 2017
Assigned Writing

Average Pages of Assigned Writing

Key Finding: Senior commitment to developing writing skills higher than the CSU average.
Challenging Students
Extent to which courses challenge students to do their best.

Low Challenge
- 2% (SF State 2014)
- 2% (SF State 2017)
- 2% (CSU 2016-17)

Moderate Challenge
- 58% (SF State 2014)
- 66% (SF State 2017)
- 54% (CSU 2016-17)

High Challenge
- 40% (SF State 2014)
- 32% (SF State 2017)
- 44% (CSU 2016-17)

Key Finding: Majority of courses moderately challenging for students. The amount first-year students reported being highly challenged by their courses decreased from 2014 to 2017.
Challenging Students
Extent to which courses challenge students to do their best.

Key Finding: Seniors reported equal amounts of high and moderately challenging courses. Seniors reporting low challenge from courses doubled from 2014 to 2017.
Academic Emphasis
Institution Emphasis on Studying and Academic Work

First-Year
- SF State 2014: 76%
- SF State 2017: 69%
- CSU Campuses 2016-17: 81%

Senior
- SF State 2014: 75%
- SF State 2017: 76%
- CSU Campuses 2016-17: 82%

Percentage Responding "Very Much" or "Quite a Bit".

Key Finding: Students at SF State reported lower academic emphasis by the university than at other CSUs.
Item Comparisons
Top 5 Scoring Items for 2017 First-Years

4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts.

2c. Included diverse perspectives (…) in course discussions or assignments.*

4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information sources.

5d. Instructors provide feedback on a draft or work in progress.

6a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (…)

Key Finding: SF State students spent more time analyzing ideas, experiences, and reasoning than other CSU Students.

* - Also in 2014

Item - in top 5 for both First-Years and Seniors at SF State in 2017
Item Comparisons

5 Lowest Performing Items for 2017 First-Years

14h. Institution emphasis on attending campus activities and events (...)*

14e. Institution emphasis on providing opportunities to be involved socially

14f. Institution emphasis on providing support for your overall well-being

10. Extent to which courses challenged you to do your best work*

14a. Institution emphasis on studying and academic work

Key Finding: SF State is believed to emphasize campus activities less than other CSU campuses.

- Also in 2014

* Item - in bottom 5 for both First-Years and Seniors at SF State in 2017
Item Comparisons
Top 5 Scoring Items for 2017 Seniors

2c. Included diverse perspectives (….) in course discussions or assignments*

4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information sources

2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue

5d. Instructors provided feedback on a draft or work in progress

7. Assigned more than 50 pages of writing*

Key Finding: On average, SF State course discussions included more diverse perspectives than other CSU Campuses.

* - Also in 2014

Item - in top 5 for both First-Years and Seniors at SF State in 2017
Item Comparisons
5 Lowest Performing Items for 2017 Seniors

14h. Institution emphasis on attending campus activities and events (...)*

14f. Institution emphasis on providing support for your overall well-being…*  

8d. Discussions with… people with political views different than your own.*

14c. Institution emphasis on learning support services (...)*

11f. Completed a culminating senior experience (...) (HIP)*

Key Finding: Lowest performing items for Seniors were the same as in 2014.

* - Also in 2014

Item - in bottom 5 for both First-Years and Seniors at SF State in 2017
Perceived Gains
Skills and Knowledge Acquired by Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Percentage of Seniors Responding “Very much” or “Quite a bit”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THINKING CRITICALLY AND ANALYTICALLY</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERSTANDING PEOPLE OF OTHER BACKGROUNDS</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITING CLEARLY AND EFFECTIVELY</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING EFFECTIVELY WITH OTHERS</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEAKING CLEARLY AND EFFECTIVELY</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEVELOPING OR CLARIFYING A PERSONAL CODE OF VALUES AND ETHICS</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYZING NUMERICAL AND STATISTICAL INFORMATION</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEING AN INFORMED AND ACTIVE CITIZEN</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLVING COMPLEX REAL-WORLD PROBLEMS</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQUIRING JOB- OR WORK-RELATED KNOWLEDGE OR SKILLS</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Finding: Seniors rated their ability to think critically and analytically was improved by attending SF State.
Key Finding: 75% of First-Years and 76% of Seniors rated SF State “Excellent” or “Good”
Key Finding: 75% of Seniors and 74% of First-Year students would attend again.
Summary of NSSE
The State of SF State

Need for Improvement
- Below CSU peers
- Campus Environment
- Decrements from 2014
- Recurring Items

Positive Growth
- Improvements from 2014
- Reflective and Integrative Learning
- Recurrent theme of diverse perspectives
- “Good” or “Excellent”