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Making Assessment Count

For at least a half century, American higher education has seen itself at the crossroads, at some pivotal point, or in a time of “crisis.” True enough, every era presents challenges and choices to colleges and universities. Over the years, our responses to these challenges have been consequential, creating and sustaining one of the most admired systems of higher learning in the world.

Still, the current environment is daunting. The premium on higher learning continues to escalate. What students know and are able to do—their ability to analyze complex issues, communicate effectively, and contribute to the welfare of society—has never been more important. Access to higher education must expand and the performance and success rates of students must improve.

Meeting those expectations, however, is a formidable challenge in the present environment. We became one of the most admired systems of higher learning in the world, at least in part, because of the United States’ comparative wealth and its capacity to invest in expanding access to higher education without compromising quality. Today, those advantages have clearly diminished.

The United States and much of the world finds itself in the grip of the deepest and most prolonged economic downturn since the Great Depression. Endowments have suffered. Virtually every public university has experienced cuts in state support. Even the most affluent independent colleges have had to tighten their belts. Tuition continues to rise as family incomes stagnate, threatening access to both public and independent campuses. One can imagine a slow but prolonged downward spiral in which both access and academic quality in American higher education are endangered.

In tough times, evidence-based decision making takes on added relevance. For more than a decade, the National Survey of Student Engagement has provided campuses a means of gathering valuable evidence about what students are doing with the resources for learning that their school provides. NSSE and other assessment data are more important than ever before, yet it is the wise use of assessment data by faculty and academic leaders that cries out for attention.

Last year, NSSE founding director George Kuh and I released a report through the National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) summarizing findings from a national survey of provosts. We found more evidence of outcomes assessment by campuses and programs than we expected, but we also found less evidence that assessment data were actually being used to make decisions and improve programs. As a consequence, we believe campuses need to shift from the routine collection of assessment data to a more thoughtful analysis and constructive use of assessment data.

In a nutshell, here is what last year’s survey revealed. About three-quarters of the institutions surveyed had a common set of learning outcomes for all students. These outcomes tended to be measured using a combination of institution- and program-level assessment approaches. While the most competitive colleges and universities appeared to collect information at similar rates to less selective institutions, they appeared not to use the results nearly as much.

Campuses claimed their assessment agendas were less driven by external state agency or regulatory pressures than by accreditation and the desire to improve. At the same time, regional and specialized accreditation was the primary use for assessment data. Campus budgets for assessment were painfully small, although, at least at that time—more than a year ago—assessment budgets seemed to be holding more or less constant despite the economic downturn.

We often parse the discussion of learning outcomes assessment into two broad categories: assessment for purposes of institutional accountability and assessment intended to guide program improvement. Peter Ewell, part of the NILOA team as well as NSSE’s design team, has written eloquently and thoughtfully about the tensions between these two uses and how they can be effectively managed.

NSSE and other assessment data are more important than ever before, yet it is the wise use of assessment data by faculty and academic leaders that cries out for attention.

Much of the threat surrounding the accountability aspect of assessment revolves around transparency. If fear of public exposure prevents campuses from asking the hard questions about how well the institution and students are performing, transparency may not always be an unmitigated good. On the other hand, sharing assessment information is helpful to trustees as they seek to become more knowledgeable about student learning; to prospective students and parents who need more and better information; to policy makers and analysts to inform decisions; and to other institutions as they search for useful and productive approaches to learning outcomes assessment.
NILOA also examined a specific aspect of transparency by scanning the institutional Web sites of a sample of 725 campuses. Comparing the 2009 NILOA survey responses with what we found on the Web sites revealed that campuses tended to report more assessment activity than what appeared online. And when campuses did have assessment results online, the information was generally not easily accessible, but typically buried in academic affairs or institutional research Web pages.

For us, at least, the key questions remain unanswered: What are the most useful venues for sharing evidence related to student learning and what are the most constructive approaches to doing so? American higher education has yet to answer those questions.

Regional and specialized accreditation will continue to play a major role in shaping the learning outcomes assessment agenda in the United States. While the details may vary, all regional accreditors expect institutions to articulate learning outcomes and assess them. When institutions fall short of these expectations, it is not unusual for accreditors to require follow-up action by campuses. Staci Provezis, another member of the NILOA team, inquired specifically into the linkage between regional accreditation and assessment, in part because campuses told us that accreditation was a driving force in their assessment agenda. She found that failure to meet expectations for learning outcomes assessment was the most common focus of follow-up letters to institutions, and that all regional accrediting groups, in their annual meetings and in other ways, were highlighting learning outcomes assessment through programs, materials, workshops, tools, and other resources to colleges to help build assessment capacity.

Using evidence to inform the difficult decisions; to improve rates of persistence, graduation, and success; to help students reach their goals more quickly and efficiently; to inform new approaches to teaching and learning; to make improvement a continuous process: This is the agenda that should consume the assessment movement going forward.

Last year NSSE celebrated its 10th anniversary. In a relatively short period, NSSE and related efforts (e.g., the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, and the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement) have made a remarkable contribution to our understanding of the prevalence of effective practices in undergraduate education and campus support for learning. NSSE provides many resources to assist campuses in making effective use of their results, including some of the uses discussed above (e.g., Accreditation Toolkits and guidelines for the online reporting of results). Many campuses have gained a great deal and used their data in powerful ways, as chronicled annually in the “Using NSSE Data” section of this report and in NSSE’s biennial publication, *Lessons from the Field*. Many institutions are working to do so. Yet on too many campuses, NSSE results seem to remain unexamined and without any material consequence.

If the United States is to achieve the goals for expanded access and success that many believe are crucial, and if the quality and responsiveness of American higher education are to improve in today’s challenged environment, we need more and better assessment tools, more focused, purposeful questions, and greater actual use of the data. All of us—faculty, academic leaders, governing boards, accrediting groups, higher education associations, foundations, and others—can and must play a stronger role in moving that agenda forward.

Stanley O. Ikenberry
President Emeritus and Regent Professor, University of Illinois

NOTE: See the “References and Resources” section for the cited reports.
NSSE kicked off its second decade with the participation of 595 colleges and universities from the US and Canada, and a handful of special administrations in other countries brought the overall total to just over 600. Virtually all NSSE users employ it as part of a program of periodic assessment of the undergraduate experience: Among U.S. and Canadian participants in 2010, 99% had previously administered the survey.

From Results to Action

In the preceding pages, Stanley Ikenberry, president emeritus of the University of Illinois and past president of the American Council on Education, reminds us that to be effective, NSSE and other assessment projects must be about more than simply gathering and reporting data on the quality of undergraduate education. These projects must have a discernable impact on campus. And to have impact, results need to be examined and interpreted by campus personnel—leaders, staff, and faculty. Their meaning must be discussed and debated. And then it is time to take concrete action informed by what has been learned. While many campuses are indeed taking action based on what they learn from NSSE and other projects, many others seem to get stuck making the transition from results to action. We need to get unstuck.

I believe one way to do so is to find ways to extend the value and utility of student engagement results from top administrators and academic leaders—presidents, provosts, and deans of faculty— to the deans of schools or colleges, department chairs, and individual faculty members. Aggregate, institution-wide results may have limited value for those closest to teaching and learning, and this is especially true at large, decentralized institutions. A dean or department chair may not derive much diagnostic value from knowing the institution-wide benchmark score for student-faculty interaction, but when that information is known for a particular school or department, it gets a lot more traction. The same applies to academic leaders and individual faculty members interested in specific questions that bear on what is asked or expected of students (e.g., How often did students work harder than they thought they could to meet an instructor's expectations? How often did students come to class less than fully prepared? What fraction of students participated in various high-impact practices, such as a senior culminating experience?).

To be sure, such questions have always been answerable by disaggregating the data that NSSE provides to participating institutions, subject to available staff time, expertise, and initiative (as well as a sufficient number of respondents to permit the analysis of subgroups). Many institutions routinely do exactly that, to great advantage. Others find that the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) is an effective way to bring deans, department chairs, and faculty into the conversation about student engagement in the context of a centrally administered survey. A field-initiated approach explicitly oriented toward faculty development is the Classroom Survey of Student Engagement (CLASSE), developed by Bob Smallwood at the University of Alabama and Judy Ouimet at Indiana University Bloomington (the same creative minds behind the forerunner to FSSE). But NSSE itself must more routinely be incorporated into school- and department-level conversations about undergraduate education and its improvement.

To help make this possible, in 2010 we made a change to our Web-only administration (used by four out of five participating institutions) by taking advantage of its inherent efficiencies. Instead of inviting a sample of first-year students and seniors to complete the survey, we invited all such students to participate. This enhances the ability to examine student engagement in schools or colleges and even departments, without additional oversampling fees. We have also introduced a new series of customized, downloadable reports that provide internal and external comparison reports containing results by groups of related majors (i.e., arts and humanities, biological sciences, business, and so on). The internal reports show how individual survey responses and benchmark scores compare among these different groups within an institution, while the external reports...
I hope the analyses presented in the following pages build interest in understanding distinctive patterns of engagement by field of study, conversations within schools and departments about what patterns may hold on a given campus, questions about what they look like at peer institutions, and what to make of these differences. And then let’s take up Ikenberry’s call to move from results to action—to make assessment count.

“NSSE 2.0” to Launch in 2013

NSSE’s founding director, George Kuh, accomplished a remarkable feat. Supported by an advisory board containing some of the best minds in U.S. higher education, he and a tiny staff sparked a revolution in a quarter-century-old movement to promote assessment for improvement in U.S. higher education. Our task in NSSE’s second decade is to sustain the same spirit of innovation and continuous improvement while maintaining our sharp focus on the activities and practices that matter to effective teaching and learning. This includes recognizing and responding to new questions, concerns, and understandings about college quality. Consequently, we are working on a revised version of the NSSE survey to be implemented in 2013. Much will remain the same, but there will be many changes as we strive to keep NSSE fresh and relevant to what's happening inside and outside college classrooms—whether physical or virtual. Refer to the “Looking Ahead” section on page 29 for more details about this important work.

NSSE and its affiliated surveys are complex projects, and their success year after year reflects dedication and collaborative effort by staff at two centers at Indiana University—the Center for Postsecondary Research and the Center for Survey Research—as well as campus contacts at each participating institution who supply the information, coordination, and local promotional efforts that are essential to a successful administration. These groups share credit for the achievements of this landmark program to enrich the national conversation about college quality by providing useful, diagnostic information that institutions can use to inform improvement efforts. It is a privilege to work with them.

Alexander C. McCormick
Director, National Survey of Student Engagement
Associate Professor, Indiana University School of Education

compare results for a given major group relative to comparison institutions. (The internal reports can be generated from the data files that participating institutions receive, but until now the external reports have only been available through extra-cost custom analyses.)

Such disaggregated analyses can substantially increase the relevance and utility of student engagement results for deans, department chairs, and individual faculty members. Situating this information relative to other majors on campus, as well as comparable majors at other institutions, can fruitfully inform school- and department-level conversations about the nature of the undergraduate experience. This, in turn, can stimulate ideas about potential avenues to improvement.

In recognition of these changes and the large share of variability in student engagement that occurs within institutions (see Annual Results 2008), this edition of Annual Results calls attention to distinctive patterns of engagement by major field of study. Some of these differences are perfectly understandable and reflect differences in the nature of study in different fields (for example, the amount of reading and writing that humanities majors do). But others raise questions about whether certain fields can do more to promote student engagement and success (for example, is the comparatively low proportion of business administration or accounting majors who complete internships or field placements, or who discuss career plans with faculty members, cause for concern?).
Survey
The NSSE survey is available in paper and Web versions and takes about 15 minutes to complete.
nsse.iub.edu/html/survey_instruments_2010.cfm

Objectives
Provide data to colleges and universities to assess and improve undergraduate education, inform state accountability and accreditation efforts, and facilitate national and sector benchmarking efforts, among others.

Partners
Established in 2000 with a grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts and sponsored by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Support for research and development projects from Lumina Foundation for Education, the Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College, the Spencer Foundation, and Teagle Foundation.

Audiences
College and university administrators, faculty members, advisors, student life staff, students, governing boards, institutional researchers, higher education scholars, accreditors, government agencies, prospective students and their families, high school counselors, and journalists.

Participating Colleges & Universities
Since its launch in 2000, more than 1,400 baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities have participated in NSSE, with 572 U.S. institutions and 23 Canadian universities in 2010. U.S. participating institutions generally mirror the national distribution of the 2005 Basic Carnegie Classification (Figure 1).

Participation Agreement
Participating colleges and universities agree that NSSE will use the data in the aggregate for national and sector reporting purposes and other undergraduate improvement initiatives. Colleges and universities can use their own data for institutional purposes. NSSE does not release results specific to each college or university and identified as such except by mutual agreement.

Administration
Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research in cooperation with the Indiana University Center for Survey Research.

Data Sources
Randomly selected first-year and senior students from baccalaureate-granting institutions. (“Randomly selected” includes those from census administrations.) Supplemented by other information such as institutional records, results from affiliated surveys, and data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Validity & Reliability
The NSSE survey was designed by experts and extensively tested to ensure validity and reliability as well as to minimize non-response bias and mode effects. Please see our updated Psychometric Portfolio for more information about NSSE’s commitment to data quality.
nsse.iub.edu/links/psychometric_portfolio

Response Rates
In 2010, the average institutional response rate was 37%. The average for Web-only institutions (38%) exceeded that of institutions that administered paper questionnaires (33%).
Consortia & State or University Systems

Groups of institutions and state and university systems add additional custom questions and receive group comparisons. Some groups agree to share student-level responses among member institutions.

Participation Cost & Benefits

The annual NSSE survey is supported by institutional participation fees. Institutions pay a fee ranging from $1,800 to $7,800 determined by undergraduate enrollment. Participation benefits include: uniform third-party survey administration; customizable survey recruiting materials; a student-level data file of all survey respondents; comprehensive reporting of results with frequencies, means, and benchmark scores using three self-selected comparison groups; special reports for executive leadership and prospective students; and resources for interpreting data and translating them into practice.

Current Initiatives

The NSSE Institute for Effective Educational Practice is collaborating with the Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts, Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education, and the Council of Independent Colleges Collegiate Learning Assessment consortium to explore the relationships between measures of student engagement from NSSE and a range of indicators of student learning, and has launched a Spencer Foundation-funded project, Learning to Improve: A Study of Evidence-Based Improvement in Higher Education, an investigation of institutions that show a pattern of improved performance in their NSSE results over time.

Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice

- Level of Academic Challenge
- Active and Collaborative Learning
- Student-Faculty Interaction
- Enriching Educational Experiences
- Supportive Campus Environment

Other Programs & Services

Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE), Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE), NSSE Institute workshops and Webinars, faculty and staff retreats, consulting, state system reports, data sharing, and custom analyses.
Promising and Disappointing Findings

Promising Findings

• About half of students majoring in history and political science completed a senior culminating experience, compared to the overall average of 33%.

• Three out of four seniors in nursing and physical education did service-learning as part of their coursework, well above the overall average of 49%.

• Although student veterans on average worked more hours per week and were more likely to spend time caring for dependents, they studied as many hours per week as their nonveteran peers.

• Students who engaged in learning activities with their peers were more likely to participate in other effective educational practices and had more positive views of the campus learning environment.

• Both first-year students and seniors, including nonscience majors, used quantitative information in their courses in several ways.

Disappointing Findings

• Only about two in five seniors majoring in business administration or accounting have held internships or field placements, compared to the overall average of 50%, and students of color were less likely to have held an internship or field placement compared to their white peers.

• African Americans were half as likely as their white peers to have studied abroad, and Latino students were one-third less likely to have done so.

• Students who believed they were less prepared for college and anticipated more difficulty succeeding in the first year relative to their peers were also less likely to value campus support efforts that could assist them.

• Student veterans, especially in the senior year, were generally less engaged and perceived lower levels of support from their campuses.

• Twelve percent of first-year students did none of the quantitative reasoning activities we asked about (e.g., using, interpreting, searching for, or collecting numbers, graphs, or statistics in their coursework).

These selected results are based on responses from more than 362,000 students attending 564 U.S. baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities who completed NSSE in spring 2010, as well as subsamples of this group who responded to three sets of experimental questions. Results are also included from the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE), with more than 8,000 entering students from 126 institutions, and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), with more than 19,000 faculty representing 154 institutions.

Our lead story—“Engagement within the Disciplines”—analyzes results from specific major fields to show how disciplinary influences and student characteristics affect student engagement. We show that participation in high-impact practices varied by major, and further illustrate this with analyses of seniors majoring in general biology, business, English, and psychology. These four disciplines were selected because they are fairly popular yet represent a wide spectrum of academic traditions.

The second story—“The Engagement of Student Veterans”—presents valuable new information about the learning experiences and time use of student veterans, including those who had combat experience. We show that, in certain areas, student veterans are less engaged than their peers and also perceive less support from their campus environments.

Finally, “Exploring New Dimensions of Learning and Engagement” presents interesting results from three sets of experimental questions—curricular peer interaction, quantitative reasoning, and student perceptions of institutional learning goals.
Two years ago we called attention to the importance of “looking within” institutional results for a more nuanced view of institutional quality (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2008). Indeed, student experiences and outcomes vary more within institutions than between them. The studies that follow amplify one important aspect of this variation—differences in engagement by academic major—which are partly the result of traditions and standards for undergraduate education that are transmitted and reinforced in graduate education and through disciplinary associations. That is, faculty members exchange ideas with their colleagues as they design academic programs, curricula, teaching methods, and assessment practices.

High-Impact Practices by Discipline

To illustrate, consider how participation in high-impact practices varies according to specific majors (Figure 2). For example, internship or practicum experiences were most common among seniors majoring in journalism and education and least common among accounting and business administration majors. Similarly, seniors in nursing were far more likely to do service-learning in their courses than were mathematics or physics majors. Understanding this variation should help campus leaders place the student experience in context and possibly to focus campus conversations about potential changes.

Four Cases: Biology, Business Administration, English, and Psychology

Pages 11–14 closely examine the engagement of seniors within four majors: general biology, business, English, and psychology. These majors were selected because they are among the most popular majors nationally and because they span the spectrum of disciplinary domains (sciences, professions, humanities, and social sciences, respectively). Each study describes the characteristics of seniors in the major and patterns of engagement in the discipline. BCSSE and FSSE results were also used to lend context to the discussion.

Figure 3 highlights distinct engagement patterns of the four majors using 11 NSSE questions that were selected to illustrate similarities and differences among majors. For example, seniors in business administration more often made class presentations and worked with other students outside of class; biology majors reported more emphasis on memorization in their coursework; and English majors more often discussed ideas with faculty outside of class.

Selected Results: Engagement within the Disciplines

- **Figure 2: Percent of Seniors Who Participated in High-Impact Practices by Major**

- **Figure 3: Distinct Patterns of Engagement Among Seniors in Four Popular Majors**

---

*Percent responding “Done” for each activity, except service-learning, which is the percent responding at least “Sometimes.” Results are unweighted. The first four majors (shaded at top) are examined in the following sections.*
General Biology

General biology is the largest of the eight degree programs within the biological sciences in NSSE data (Figure 4) and enlists more students than any other science major. For the nearly 8,000 seniors pursuing a general biology degree who responded to NSSE 2010, results were distinctive—some positive, and some not. For example, biology seniors were much more likely to do research with a faculty member and to complete internships than students in most other disciplines (see Figure 2, p. 10). They also spent more time preparing for class, tutoring others, and talking about their future careers with faculty members (Figure 5).

In contrast, the upper-level biology classroom involved fewer student presentations and class discussions (Figure 5). It also emphasized memorization to a greater extent than other majors, which is probably a function of course content dense with scientific terminology (Figure 3, p. 10). These results might explain why seniors in biology reported greater gains in analytical skills but claimed less progress in being able to speak clearly and effectively (Figure 5). They further suggest the importance of providing greater opportunities for biology students to develop skills in speaking and presenting and are consistent with the recommendation by the Committee on Undergraduate Biology Education to Prepare Research Scientists for the 21st Century (2003) that biologists must be able to effectively communicate research findings.

Even among the biological sciences there were variations in the level of engagement in certain activities. For example, the percentage of seniors who conducted research with faculty ranged from 36% (zoology) to 62% (biochemistry or biophysics). Considerably more environmental science seniors frequently (i.e., “Very often” or “Often”) gave class presentations (62%), while those in marine science more frequently participated in class discussions. Student-faculty interaction is generally strong within the biological sciences and with one exception was significantly—and in some cases substantially—above average among the individual biology majors (Figure 6).
Business

A major in business—including general business administration and the related fields of accounting, finance, international business, marketing, or management—is one of the most common undergraduate areas of study. Nearly one in five seniors (19%) responding to NSSE 2010 was majoring in a business-related field, with the highest proportions pursuing degrees in business administration (26%) or accounting (23%).

Characteristics of Business Majors

While more women pursue baccalaureate degrees overall, proportionally more men in NSSE majored in business (22% versus 17%). In addition, seniors in business-related fields were comparatively older, which could be why they were more likely to juggle multiple roles in addition to their student responsibilities. For example, more than half of business seniors (54%)—the highest proportion of students in any field—worked more than 10 hours a week at an off-campus job, and nearly a quarter (24%) spent more than 10 hours per week caring for dependents (Table 1).

Seniors majoring in general business administration participated in active and collaborative learning activities more frequently than peers in other fields (see Figure 3, p. 10). For example, business administration students more often gave class presentations and completed course projects (both inside and outside of the classroom) with their peers. However, compared to seniors in other majors, business administration students spent less time preparing for class and discussed course ideas or career plans less often with faculty.

Engagement within Different Business Degree Programs

Given the mix of degree areas within business, it is not surprising that engagement varied among seniors pursuing different business-related majors (Figure 7). For example, more than four-fifths of marketing and international business seniors frequently made class presentations, compared to their peers in accounting and finance, who did so less often. Also, while seniors in business-related fields typically worked collaboratively with peers on course assignments, the percentage who frequently worked outside of class on course assignments ranged nearly 20 percentage points between individual disciplines. Finally, the percentage of seniors who spent more than 10 hours per week preparing for classes varied from a low of about 50% for marketing and management majors to 62% for accounting majors.

“I study international business and finance, and I love the emphasis on globalization and teamwork. My school really encourages taking advantage of the location with internships, as well as everything else D.C. has to offer.”

—Senior, Business Major, American University
Selected Results: Engagement within the Disciplines (continued)

English

Majoring in English involves a considerable amount of reading and writing, as well as the ability to effectively reflect on and integrate content. Here we examine the engagement patterns of senior English majors at U.S. institutions. More than 5,000 senior English majors (3% of all senior respondents) completed NSSE in 2010. As reported on page 15, prospective English majors begin college with higher average SAT/ACT scores compared to their peers expecting to major in biology, business, or psychology. First-year English majors were also less likely to be first-generation college students and proportionately more aspired to graduate degrees.

Engagement Experiences

Senior English majors were more engaged in many expected ways. For instance, approximately 70% wrote at least five mid-length papers (5–19 pages), substantially more than most other majors. In addition, nearly all (93%) read five or more books as part of their assigned course reading, compared to 71% of seniors in other majors. Compared to seniors in biology, business, or psychology, English majors reported that they more often “included diverse perspectives in class discussions or writing assignments” and more often “discussed ideas from readings with faculty outside of class” (Figure 3, p. 10). However, English majors were not always more engaged compared to their peers. For instance, English majors were less likely to spend time working with classmates outside of class.

Senior English majors reported significantly higher levels of deep approaches to learning compared to other majors. The difference was especially noteworthy for integrative learning (effect size of 0.39, a medium effect based on NSSE’s contextual effect-size analysis). Not surprisingly, compared to their peers in biology, psychology, or business, English majors reported less class emphasis on memorization.

NSSE 2010 institutions associated with the Consortium for the Study of Writing in College added 27 questions specifically related to writing activities. This included about 21,000 seniors from 43 institutions, 3% of whom were English majors. Larger shares of English majors reported doing the following in most or all writing assignments: “arguing a position using evidence and reasoning” (65% of senior English majors vs. 39% of others) and “analyzing or evaluating something you read, researched, or observed” (77% of English majors vs. 61% of others) (Figure 8). Not surprisingly, compared to other majors, English majors were less likely to do the following in their writing assignments: include visual content such as drawings, tables, or photos; describe methods or findings related to data collected in lab or field work; create the project with multimedia; and explain in writing the meaning of numerical or statistical data.

Figure 8: Comparison of Writing Activities between Senior English Majors and All Other Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>English majors</th>
<th>All other majors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argue a position using evidence and reasoning</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze or evaluate something you read, researched, or observed</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe your methods or findings related to data</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create the project with multimedia (Web page, poster, slide presentation, etc.)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include drawings, tables, photos, screen shots, etc.</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain in writing the meaning of numerical or statistical data</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a “Most” or “All” writing assignments

“NSSE results have informed our faculty development programming, conversations about class size and pedagogy, reports on the outcomes of grant-funded projects, discussions about campus climate, and analysis of results from other assessment efforts.”

—Jo Michelle Beld, Director of Evaluation and Assessment, Professor of Political Science, St. Olaf College
Psychology

More than 25,000 seniors majoring in a social science field in the US participated in NSSE 2010, and fully 40% of them were majoring in psychology, in preparation for a wide range of career options. A psychology curriculum prepares students with the necessary skills not only for graduate programs in research and therapy, but also for employment ranging from human resources to law enforcement. About one third of psychology majors did research with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements (Figure 2, p. 10), higher than that of all other majors combined (19%). However, compared to their peers, fewer psychology majors completed an internship or practicum, which provide opportunities to improve applied skills. Given the wide range of careers available to psychology majors, more practical experiences prior to entering the workforce may enhance the marketability of the degree.

Although psychology courses emphasized numerous skills, reflective learning was a particularly common activity of these students. Reflective learning, a facet of the NSSE construct deep approaches to learning, involves investigating one’s own thinking and applying new knowledge to one’s life. For example, compared to seniors in all other majors, senior psychology majors were more likely to examine the strengths and weaknesses of their own views, try to better understand the views of others, and learn something that changed the way they understood an issue (Figure 9).

In fact, though the effects are small, senior psychology majors were significantly more engaged in all deep approaches to learning than the average student (Table 2). In addition, they experienced more challenging academic work and had more frequent interactions with faculty on substantive matters. At the same time, psychology majors lagged behind their peers in working collaboratively on course assignments and other learning opportunities.

While NSSE data are frequently used broadly by institutions, NSSE results also provide constructive feedback for improvements at the department level. For example, the psychology department at George Mason University used NSSE results to improve interactions between students and faculty. A series of departmental functions were developed in order to bring students and faculty together, and participants reported that they benefited from these experiences. The success of these functions inspired other departments in the university to do the same.

"The Psychology Department faculty are willing to spend a lot of their own time to help you not only with your current education, but also with research and making you a good candidate for graduate school."

—Senior, Psychology Major, Saint Vincent College
New Student Expectations and Beliefs

Engagement differences between majors can be explained not only by their content and pedagogy, but also by their students’ diverse backgrounds, prior academic experiences, and the varying expectations that students bring with them to college—most often expecting to be more engaged than they were in high school.

BCSSE 2009 results for the four majors featured in this report (in this case, intended majors) showed considerably more first-generation students intended to major in psychology, while those who took AP courses were more likely to major in English or biology (Table 3). Also, students intending to major in biology were more likely to have completed high school calculus, English majors had higher achievement test scores, but fewer business majors spent more than five hours per week in academic preparation in high school. Interestingly, those intending to study biology and psychology were far more likely to aspire to doctoral programs.

Perceived Academic Preparation and Difficulty

Two important types of precollege beliefs for first-year students measured by BCSSE are expected academic difficulty (e.g., During the coming school year, how difficult do you expect learning course material, managing time, etc., to be?), and perceived academic preparation (e.g., How prepared are you to write clearly, analyze math problems, etc., in your academic work?). It is crucial that institutions provide students with academic support, but students must also take responsibility to find the help and resources they need. Yet, across the four expected majors, students who perceived less preparedness and anticipated more difficulty relative to their peers were less likely to value a supportive academic environment (Figure 10). Put another way, students who were likely to need the most help were the least likely to appreciate that help or seek it out. These results varied somewhat across the four disciplines, where about half of students in English, biology, and psychology who felt less prepared and anticipated more difficulty valued academic support highly, compared to only 39% of those planning to study business.

Table 3: Beginning College Student Characteristics by Four Selected Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Biology (general)</th>
<th>Business admin.</th>
<th>Psychology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-generation</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed HS calculus</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed at least one AP course in HS</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent more than 5 hrs/wk preparing for HS classes</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT/ACT composite&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 or lower</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001 to 1200</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1201 to 1600</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest degree intended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> First-generation students are defined as having neither parent with a completed baccalaureate degree.

<sup>b</sup> SAT (verbal and quantitative) combined with ACT after conversion to SAT equivalent.

Faculty Survey Results by Major Field

NSSE findings suggest that student experiences vary by major. We also examined data from the 2010 administration of FSSE, a companion project to NSSE that institutions use to further campus-based discussions about improving undergraduate education. FSSE results show that at least some of this variation by major was because faculty used different teaching practices and held different values depending on their field (Figures 11 and 12).
For the four fields highlighted in this report, the average percentage of class time faculty members devoted to various teaching activities varied across the four fields (Figure 11). For example, the average faculty members in biology and psychology lectured at least half of the time, whereas the average faculty member in English lectured only a fifth of the time. In addition, perhaps as an indicator of a field’s values, the percentage of faculty members who believed it is important or very important for students to participate in high-impact practices varied between fields depending on the activity (Figure 12). For example, while culminating senior experiences were highly important to faculty members in all four fields, only 35% of biology faculty valued study abroad as compared to 58% of English faculty. Similarly, only a third of business administration faculty valued student research with a faculty member, compared to about three-fourths of psychology and biology faculty.

### Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE)

The Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE, pronounced “bessie”) measures entering first-year students’ high school academic and co-curricular experiences as well as their expectations for participating in educationally purposeful activities during the first year of college. BCSSE administration takes place prior to the start of fall classes so responses can be paired with NSSE in the spring. BCSSE results can aid the design of orientation programs, student service initiatives, and other programmatic efforts aimed at improving the learning experiences of first-year students. Since its launch in 2007, more than 200,000 first-year students attending 318 higher education institutions across the United States and Canada have completed the BCSSE survey.

### BCSSE 2009-NSSE 2010 Facts

- More than 73,000 first-year students enrolled at 129 institutions participated in BCSSE in the summer/fall of 2009.
- Of these 129 institutions, 98 also participated in NSSE 2010 and received the BCSSE-NSSE Combined Report.
- Of the BCSSE-NSSE schools, approximately 35% were public and 65% private, 30% were baccalaureate colleges, 40% master’s level, 17% doctorate-granting, and 11% other.

Find out more about BCSSE online.

[bcssse.iub.edu](http://bcssse.iub.edu)

### Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)

The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE, pronounced “fessie”) measures faculty members’ expectations and practices related to student engagement in educational activities that are empirically linked with high levels of learning and development. The survey also collects information about how faculty members spend their time on professorial activities and allows for comparisons by disciplinary area as well as other faculty or course characteristics. FSSE results, especially when used in combination with NSSE findings, can identify areas of institutional strength as well as aspects of the undergraduate experience that may warrant attention. The information is intended to be a catalyst for productive discussions related to teaching, learning, and the quality of students’ educational experiences.

**FSSE Facts**

- First national administration in 2003
- Administered online
- Average institutional response rate of about 50% each year
- More than 160,000 faculty respondents from 633 different institutions since 2003
- 19,399 faculty respondents from 154 institutions in 2010
- 139 of the 154 institutions also administered NSSE in 2010

Find out more about FSSE online.

/fsse.iub.edu/
Colleges and universities in the US are expecting dramatic increases in the enrollment of veterans due to the return of troops from Iraq and Afghanistan and the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 (i.e., the new G.I. Bill), which makes higher education more affordable and accessible for veterans (Radford, 2009). Though many veterans choose to attend community colleges or career and technical programs, large numbers enroll at baccalaureate-granting institutions (Radford & Wun, 2009). Yet little is known about their learning experiences or how they view the campus climate.

In 2010, NSSE surveyed nearly 11,000 self-identified veterans (3.4% of U.S. NSSE 2010 respondents), including 4,680 combat veterans—fully 44% of veterans in the sample. Senior student veterans comprised 75% of the veteran sample, with the remaining 25% being first-year student veterans.

### The Student Veteran

Student veterans were predominantly male and more likely than their peers to be older, enrolled part-time, first-generation students, transfer students, and distance learners (Table 4). Each of these characteristics was particularly evident among combat veterans. First-year veterans and nonveterans were comparable in terms of race/ethnicity, but senior veterans included proportionally more African Americans and fewer Caucasians. It is also sobering to note that approximately one in five student combat veterans reported at least one disability, compared to about one in 10 nonveterans.

Student veterans in NSSE were enrolled at all types of institutions, but they were more likely than nonveterans to attend public institutions. Veterans were also less likely than nonveterans to attend either baccalaureate arts and sciences colleges or the most research-intensive doctorate-granting universities.

---

### Table 4: Institutional and Student Characteristics by Veteran Status and Class Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nonveteran</th>
<th>Veteran, Noncombat</th>
<th>Veteran, Combat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FY Sr</td>
<td>FY Sr</td>
<td>FY Sr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Basic Carnegie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Basic Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>13 14</td>
<td>10 9</td>
<td>8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>17 18</td>
<td>16 17</td>
<td>14 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRU</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td>10 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s L</td>
<td>26 28</td>
<td>26 32</td>
<td>30 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s M</td>
<td>10 9</td>
<td>10 10</td>
<td>8 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s S</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/AIDS</td>
<td>13 11</td>
<td>7 6</td>
<td>6 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/Other</td>
<td>7 6</td>
<td>14 8</td>
<td>10 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>9 9</td>
<td>13 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>56 61</td>
<td>64 67</td>
<td>61 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>44 39</td>
<td>36 33</td>
<td>39 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35 34</td>
<td>70 62</td>
<td>85 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65 66</td>
<td>30 38</td>
<td>15 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>10 8</td>
<td>11 16</td>
<td>13 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>66 70</td>
<td>68 63</td>
<td>62 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>9 8</td>
<td>6 9</td>
<td>8 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10 9</td>
<td>11 8</td>
<td>14 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than full-time</td>
<td>5 16</td>
<td>17 33</td>
<td>23 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>95 84</td>
<td>83 67</td>
<td>77 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generationb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Student</td>
<td>42 44</td>
<td>52 61</td>
<td>65 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 24 years</td>
<td>94 67</td>
<td>64 22</td>
<td>21 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 years &amp; older</td>
<td>6 33</td>
<td>36 78</td>
<td>79 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 6</td>
<td>11 20</td>
<td>16 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>10 9</td>
<td>12 16</td>
<td>23 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Percentage distribution in columns. FY=first year, Sr=Senior.

b See Figure 1, p. 7.

c Neither parent holds a bachelor's degree.
How Student Veterans Spend Their Time

Older students, veteran or not, are likely to have obligations outside of school that reduce the amount of time and energy they can devote to their studies. We estimated the total number of hours full-time students spent per week on a range of activities (Figure 13). Among full-time first-year students, nonveterans spent on average about 45 hours per week in these activities, devoting the largest portions of that time to studying and relaxing and socializing. By contrast, noncombat veterans spent about 52 hours and combat veterans spent about 59 hours on these same activities. While veterans spent about the same amount of time studying as nonveterans, they spent more time working and caring for dependents—particularly among those with combat experience. In fact, full-time first-year combat veterans spent twice as much time working and about six times as many hours on dependent care as their nonveteran peers. While there were some differences in time allocation between first-year student combat and noncombat veterans—with combat veterans spending more time working and on dependent care—senior combat and noncombat veterans allocated their time in very similar ways.

Educational Experiences of Student Veterans

Although first-year student veterans spent as much time studying as their nonveteran peers, they did not participate equally in other forms of engagement and they had different views of their educational experiences, even after controlling for key student and institutional characteristics (Table 5). For example, first-year veterans were less engaged in reflective learning compared to nonveterans. First-year noncombat veterans were less engaged with faculty, and first-year combat veterans perceived less campus support than nonveterans. However, there were no significant differences between first-year student veterans and nonveterans in their levels of overall satisfaction.

Senior veterans were generally less engaged than their nonveteran peers. Senior combat and noncombat veterans were significantly lower than nonveterans on integrative learning, reflective learning, and student-faculty interaction, and they perceived less support from their campus environment than nonveterans. Senior noncombat veterans also reported less emphasis on higher order learning and lower satisfaction than nonveterans.

As in generations past, waves of service men and women are leaving the battlefield to enroll in higher education. As a result, baccalaureate-granting institutions should seek ways to more effectively engage student veterans in effective educational practices and provide them with the supportive environments that promote success.
Curricular Peer Interaction

When students work together on coursework, both inside and outside of the classroom, they learn more, think more critically, and gain an appreciation for diverse perspectives (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Gerlach, 1994). In 2010, to revise and expand upon the existing construct of collaborative learning, NSSE appended nine experimental questions about *curricular peer interaction* (CPI) to the online survey, collecting responses from about 17,000 students attending 40 institutions.

CPIs are substantive academic exchanges with other students. Results showed that students most often exchanged feedback with each other to prepare course assignments and after taking an exam, and often worked on projects or assignments together. Students were least often engaged in writing together, studying in groups, and giving group presentations (Table 6).

### Table 6: Percentage of Students Who Frequentlya Participated in Curricular Peer Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curricular Peer Interaction Items</th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchanged feedback with other students to prepare course assignments</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchanged feedback with classmates after taking an exam</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned course material by asking and answering questions of other students</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with other students on course projects or assignments</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained course material to other students</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in small-group activities organized by faculty to help learn course material</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gave a course presentation with a group of other students</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a study group for a course</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote a paper with other students for course credit</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a “Very often” or “Often”

### Curricular Peer Interactions by Major Groups

The results in Table 6 were mostly consistent among eight categories of related majors. For example, across all major groups, seniors were less likely to write with other students for course credit and were more likely to exchange feedback with other students. However, the frequency of group presentations varied across the major categories with seniors in business and education topping the list, and those in the physical sciences and arts and humanities doing them least often (Table 7). Similarly, while only about one in six students in a business-related major never wrote a paper with other students for course credit, almost half of students in the physical sciences never did so.

### Table 7: Percentage of Seniors Who Frequentlya Gave a Group Presentation by Major Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Categories</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological sciences</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and humanities</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical sciences</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a “Very often” or “Often”

### Relating Curricular Peer Interaction to Other Forms of Engagement

Students who learned in interactions with their peers were more likely to participate in other effective educational practices and had more positive views of the campus learning environment. For example, a composite scale of the nine CPI items correlated positively with student-faculty interaction (.48) and supportive campus environment (.38), and with the three deep approaches to learning—integrative learning (.50), higher-order learning (.42), and reflective learning (.32). For example, Figure 14 illustrates that students who had the most frequent curricular peer interactions were markedly more engaged in reflective learning than those with the least frequent CPIs.

![Figure 14: Percentage of First-Year Students Who Frequently Participated in Reflective Learning by Top and Bottom Curricular Peer Interaction Quartiles](image)

These findings suggest that students collaborate in a variety of learning activities and generally do not study in isolation. There is room for improvement, however, as institutions may see benefits in promoting all forms of CPI and encouraging more collaborative writing, study groups, and group presentations.
Quantitative Reasoning

In an increasingly data-driven world we must routinely use and make sense of quantitative information. However, the 2003 National Assessment of Adult Literacy found that only about one-third of college graduates demonstrated proficiency in quantitative literacy (Kutner, et al., 2007). This suggests an urgent need to assess the opportunities college students have to develop their quantitative reasoning skills. In 2010, NSSE administered a set of experimental questions about the frequency with which college students engaged with numerical, graphical, and statistical information. We asked these questions of approximately 5,600 first-year students and 7,600 seniors attending a diverse group of 35 institutions.

Although the majority of first-year students participated at least “sometimes” in these activities (Figure 15), about 12% had never done any of the seven quantitative reasoning activities. Not surprisingly, the percentage who never performed these activities varied considerably by major (or expected major). For example, 44% of first-year arts and humanities majors had never explained in writing the meaning of numerical, graphical, or statistical information, compared to only 13% of their engineering counterparts.

To further investigate quantitative reasoning we computed the average number of these activities that students performed at least sometimes and compared the results by major type (Figure 16). Although there were differences, this analysis suggests that even non-science majors use numbers, graphs, and statistics in several ways, both in the first year and as seniors. First-year and senior engineering majors averaged at least six of the seven activities, as did seniors in physical and biological science. Education and arts and humanities majors performed the fewest quantitative reasoning behaviors, yet they still averaged at least four of the seven. These patterns varied somewhat among institutions, and we found instances in which arts and humanities and education majors reported about as many quantitative reasoning activities as business and social science majors. It is also worth noting that major differences were more pronounced when frequency was taken into account—not only did science majors do more of these activities, they did them more often than other majors.
Institutional Learning Goals

As colleges and universities face pressure to attend more to student learning outcomes, they have established explicit institution-wide learning goals to define and set expectations for the skills and abilities their undergraduates are expected to master, and to provide an intellectual framework for building a common curricular and co-curricular learning experience. Unfortunately, academic leaders report that many students are unaware of or do not understand these goals (Hart Research Associates, 2009). To explore this issue, NSSE appended a set of items to the 2010 Web survey for more than 6,000 students at 18 institutions about students’ awareness of institutional learning goals and how they are reinforced through the academic program and course assignments.

The majority of first-year students (75%) and seniors (70%) responding to these questions believed their institution had a common set of learning goals, and of these, the vast majority (95%) had at least “some” understanding of these goals. This raises questions about recent findings that just 5% of chief academic officers thought students understood institutional learning outcomes (Hart Research Associates, 2009). Institutional learning goals were received by students in a variety of ways (see Table 8 for the top three). Although administrators asserted that learning outcomes are best explained to students using institutional catalogs, course syllabi, and Web sites (Hart Research Associates, 2009), results for these suggest that only the catalogs were effective for both first-year students and seniors, and syllabi were perhaps minimally effective for seniors. Very few read about these goals on the institution’s Web site.

Seniors and Learning Goals within the Major

When asked to reflect on intended learning outcomes, four out of five seniors were aware of a common set of learning goals for their primary academic major, and of these, 85% substantially understood them. According to these seniors, their learning in the major was most often assessed by final course grades, exams, essays, and papers, while the least common method was portfolios. However, results varied among groups of related majors, with seniors in education observing the widest range of assessments and those in physical sciences the narrowest. For example, although portfolios were the least reported method, 72% of seniors in education substantially used them, while only 13% of seniors in engineering did so. Table 9 shows the top three measures used across eight related-major fields.

The creation of clear goals for learning is an important step toward providing appropriate and sufficient learning experiences for students. But it is equally important to consider students’ awareness of these learning goals and how well the assessments of their work reflect those outcomes. Most students claim to be aware of and understand their institutions’ expectations to some extent, though not always from the sources administrators believe are most effective. As institutional leaders and faculty examine how well their learning goals are understood by students, they should consider the most effective means to communicate those goals, both for general education and within the major.

“We include NSSE measures of student engagement in our university executive dashboard and treat these measures as core indicators of institutional progress and performance.”

—James C. Votruba, President, Northern Kentucky University

---

Table 8: Top Three Ways Students Became Aware of Institutional Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course catalog or academic handbook (64%)</td>
<td>Course catalog or academic handbook (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation for new students (49%)</td>
<td>Academic advisor (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advisor (46%)</td>
<td>Course syllabi (37%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Three Most Common Measures of Learning Outcomes for Seniors Across Major Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts and humanities</th>
<th>Biological sciences</th>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Physical sciences</th>
<th>Other professional</th>
<th>Social sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Course Grades (82%)</td>
<td>Final Course Grades (89%)</td>
<td>Exams (80%)</td>
<td>Final Course Grades (86%)</td>
<td>Exams (86%)</td>
<td>Exams (96%)</td>
<td>Exams (82%)</td>
<td>Final Course Grades (83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essays/Papers (76%)</td>
<td>Exams (88%)</td>
<td>Final Course Grades (80%)</td>
<td>Presentations (74%)</td>
<td>Final Course Grades (79%)</td>
<td>Final Course Grades (86%)</td>
<td>Final Course Grades (82%)</td>
<td>Essays/Papers (82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams (68%)</td>
<td>Essays/Papers (65%)</td>
<td>Presentations (75%)</td>
<td>Evaluations by Experts (74%)</td>
<td>Group Assignments (61%)</td>
<td>Other (62%)</td>
<td>Presentations (62%)</td>
<td>Exams (82%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* Percent responding “Very much” or “Quite a bit”
Because of their positive effects on student learning and retention, special undergraduate opportunities such as learning communities, service-learning, research with a faculty member, study abroad, internships, and culminating senior experiences are called high-impact practices (Kuh, 2008). High-impact practices share several traits: They demand considerable time and effort, provide learning opportunities outside of the classroom, require meaningful interactions with faculty and students, encourage interaction with diverse others, and provide frequent and meaningful feedback. Participation in these practices can be life-changing.

### Table 10: Percent of Seniors Who Participated in High-Impact Practices by Institution and Student Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
<td>Culminating Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Characteristics</td>
<td>2005 Basic Carnegie Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s L</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s S</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/A&amp;S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/Diverse</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>2005 Basic Carnegie Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than full-time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generationc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started here</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started elsewhere</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 24 years</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 years &amp; older</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and humanities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Students reported having “done” the activity before graduating for all high-impact practices except service-learning, where they reported participating at least “sometimes” during the current school year.
b For details on the Carnegie Classification, visit classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/basic.php.
c Neither parent holds a bachelor’s degree.
NSSE provides information that faculty, staff, and others can use almost immediately to improve the quality of the undergraduate experience. This section offers a sampling of different applications and interventions based on engagement results. One example presents how a wiki format is being used to share information about best practices in student engagement, while other examples look at the use of technology, improvements to student advising, and use of NSSE results for regional and specialized accreditation.

Using a Wiki to Share Information about Best Practices

University of New Brunswick

After extensive discussion of University of New Brunswick’s (UNB) NSSE results, the Centre for Enhanced Teaching and Learning and Student Affairs and Services for both the Fredericton and Saint John campuses teamed up to create the Student Engagement Wiki (SEW). SEW is a collaborative tool and repository of ideas and resources for UNB faculty and staff to share successful strategies for such practices as using group work, encouraging course discussions, and implementing hands-on projects.

SEW is structured around NSSE’s five Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice, which provide organizing principles for the categories and topics. SEW launched in late spring 2010 with about 100 entries that were largely based on academic journal articles about student engagement and resources like the practice briefs (nsse.iub.edu/links/practice_briefs) developed as part of NSSE’s Documenting Effective Educational Practice (DEEP) project. The goal is for faculty and staff to add entries about what has worked for them at UNB. By creating a university-wide forum, organizers hope ideas can be shared both within and across disciplines.

The objectives of SEW are:

a. to provide an easy-to-use knowledge base for ideas, practices, and resources to help faculty and staff engage students,
b. to provide a tool to facilitate sharing ideas for student engagement,
c. to structure and maintain the wiki in ways that keep content current and encourage active participation,
d. to establish an effective long-term site maintenance plan, and
e. to establish an effective long-term communications plan.

To build initial faculty support, SEW access is password-protected for anyone involved in instructional activities at either campus. Later versions may open access for student contributors. SEW organizers have initiated training sessions to introduce faculty to ways the wiki could be used.

Using Technology to Increase Active and Collaborative Learning

South Dakota Board of Regents

Since 2002, the South Dakota Board of Regents and the National Center for Higher Education Management System (NCHEMS) have embarked on a joint endeavor requiring all six regional universities to administer NSSE on a regular basis. NSSE results from four subsequent administrations showed that first-year and senior scores on the Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL) benchmark fell below the NSSE cohort norms, prompting the Board to focus their attention on the potential of technology to foster active learning in undergraduate education.

Specifically, the Board established the Mobile Computing Initiative Implementation Plan to improve student technological fluency and create an environment with unlimited connectivity. This plan calls for all students at the six regional institutions to have tablet PCs by 2012. Currently, tablet PCs are used at the institution-level at Dakota State University and South Dakota
School of Mines and Technology and by some departments at South Dakota State University and University of South Dakota. The plan also calls for increased faculty development to better integrate tablet PCs into the undergraduate curriculum. Institutions have implemented “FIRST in the Classroom Summer Faculty Cohort,” a series of training programs in which a group of faculty members spend the summer learning about and gaining experience using tablet PCs in the classroom. ACL benchmark scores at the four institutions using tablet PCs have increased since 2004, suggesting that this technology could facilitate active learning in the classroom and collaboration on assignments outside of the classroom.

**Strengthening Student Advising**

**University of Nevada, Las Vegas**

University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) responded to a collection of evidence, including NSSE results, data from Noel-Levitz’s Student Satisfaction Inventory, and an exit survey for graduating seniors developed by the UNLV Office of Academic Assessment, that all pointed to a need for improvement in the quality of academic advising. These results helped make the case for a new emphasis on advising, which included hiring more academic advisors, requiring advising for newly admitted first-year and transfer students, and creating the Academic Success Center to consolidate and enhance academic support services. Since implementing these initiatives, UNLV has seen increases in their Supportive Campus Environment benchmark scores.

**The University of Tennessee, Knoxville**

One of the goals for the University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UT Knoxville) in the past two years has been to improve the effectiveness of their advising programs. To accomplish that goal, the university administration and advising community examined a number of indicators, such as the ratio of students per advisor, information from student focus groups regarding their advising experiences, and a comprehensive program review by external consultants. They also used NSSE responses to explore several issues, including use of academic support programs, talking about career plans with advisors or faculty, perceptions of the academic experience, participation in service-learning and undergraduate research, and diverse interactions. All of these indicators align with the university’s advising program goals and learning outcomes and are related to the overall undergraduate academic experience. Advisors are expected to guide students toward academic support services, programs in service-learning and undergraduate research, co-curricular opportunities, and a comprehensive campus initiative on understanding the diversity of our world and global affairs. As a result of this two-year assessment process, the university has increased the number of full-time academic advisors, restructured orientation advising for first-year students, which includes extended contact with college academic advisors and individual advising sessions, and implemented a new advising policy that targets students who are most at-risk for progressing to graduation, such as new transfers, students on probation, and those without declared majors.
Developing Action Plans and Focusing on Engagement in Large Courses

University of Calgary

Having collected NSSE data in 2004, 2007, and 2008, the University of Calgary (U of C) has a clearer picture of the engagement of their students and is shaping student experiences inside and outside of the classroom in ways that will increase engagement and academic success.

The first part of their multi-layered process was the release of the report Student Engagement Project–Statistical Summary (2010), a composite review of 2007 and 2008 NSSE results along with other information sources. The report outlines the beginning of a three-year Student Engagement Action Plan written by U of C’s NSSE Action Team. The plan provides a blueprint to move student engagement issues forward throughout the institution and represents a concerted effort to translate NSSE results into actionable steps.

Another initiative is Project Engage, which promotes and enhances student engagement in large-enrollment introductory courses in the arts and sciences. Designed as a two-year pilot, the program provides selected faculty with support and resources to improve the learning experiences of students enrolled in these courses. According to the NSSE Action Team faculty leader, the overall objective is “to significantly improve the quality of the learning environment in these large-enrollment first-year classes and to do so in such a way that the benefits are felt by as many students as possible.”

Regional Accreditation

University of Colorado at Boulder

NSSE is one of several surveys administered by the office of Institutional Analysis at the University of Colorado at Boulder (CU-Boulder) to encourage student reflection on learning and support the assessment of campus strategic goals. Results are reported publicly at the college, school, division, and department levels. As a member of the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) program, CU-Boulder also relies on the NSSE data-sharing agreement with its AAUDE peers to benchmark itself on NSSE core survey responses as well as extra questions added to NSSE that focus on the priorities of research universities.

CU-Boulder used this information to write its self-study report, Shaping the New Flagship, for reaccreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Since CU-Boulder’s last reaccreditation review in 2001, major changes have been made in the university’s writing program. CU-Boulder’s self-study includes a focus on the Program for Writing and Rhetoric (PWR) and the creation of the campus Writing Center to address a decentralized and diffuse writing curriculum and lack of focus on first-year writing programs. PWR expanded upper-division courses, redesigned lower-division courses, and established a full-service Writing Center to reinforce pedagogical reforms driven by assessment. Results on several NSSE survey items related to student writing from the 2000, 2002, 2006, and 2009 NSSE administrations showed that CU-Boulder students improved over time and compared well to students at peer institutions. Looking ahead, the Council of Writing Program Administrators and NSSE have developed a national pilot survey that will assess connections between good writing practices and student learning. More than 24 survey items related to writing skills will allow CU-Boulder to compare its performance to that of other schools in the Consortium for the Study of Writing in College.

Washington State University

To support its 2009 self-study prepared for the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, Washington State University (WSU) used NSSE scores over multiple years to show...
evidence of the impact of several programs initiated to improve student engagement and learning. These programs included:

- A first-year living-learning community titled “Freshmen Focus”
- Integrated residence hall programming and co-curricular activities
- Implementation of a new foreign language requirement for the honors program as well as an elective for general education studies
- Residence hall tutoring services
- Increased emphasis on experiential learning

To further support first-year initiatives and improve engagement in student-faculty interactions and active and collaborative learning, WSU offered faculty curriculum improvement grants. WSU’s NSSE 2008 results suggest that the pilot projects introduced in 2005-07 have begun to impact the student experience. Goals to enhance the student experience and build deep learning experiences into the curriculum at all levels are incorporated into WSU’s new strategic plan for 2008-13.

Specialized Accreditation: Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB)

Tennessee Tech University

Tennessee Tech University (TTU) used NSSE results in its AACSB Fifth-Year Maintenance Report as evidence of assessment of World, Cultures, and Business (WCB) Goal #2 on International Awareness. Because only a small number of TTU students participated in study abroad programs, the WCB executive committee created a new course to encourage students to participate in an international experience. The course helps students understand international business practices while experiencing diverse business cultures. In addition, the university charged all students a small fee each semester to support study abroad travel for students with limited financial resources.

Displaying NSSE Results on Institution Web Sites

College and university Web sites are an increasingly popular medium to present information about the institution as well as student performance. At this critical time when transparency and public accountability figure prominently in discussions about educational quality, translating results into accurate, accessible formats for different audiences can be challenging.

Posting standard-issue NSSE reports, such as the Benchmark Comparisons Report and Executive Snapshot, can be helpful, but institutions are encouraged to go a step further by displaying NSSE results in modified formats for internal and external audiences. For example, colleges and universities may highlight selected results to demonstrate distinct undergraduate experiences to visitors and prospective students, variation in engagement by student program or major for faculty and administrators, or public self-study analyses beyond those provided in NSSE Institutional Reports.

To help institutions display their results, NSSE created Guidelines for Display of NSSE Results on Institution Web Sites and established a gallery of institutional Web site examples. These resources will aid personnel from institutional research, admissions, public relations, communications, Web development, and other areas to interpret and publicly display information that is accurate, accessible to a general audience, and consistent with NSSE’s advice and policy against rankings. The guide details elements to consider when posting NSSE results on your institutional Web site and includes suggestions to address common problems found on Web displays.

nsse.iub.edu/links/website_displays
The NSSE Institute develops user resources and responds to requests for assistance in using student engagement results to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness. Staff and associates conduct research on educationally effective practice, make presentations at national and regional meetings, and work with campuses to enhance student success. Here are a few examples of how NSSE Institute associates have been involved with other institutions, state systems, and organizations:

- Facilitated a fall faculty workshop at a private liberal arts college to examine student engagement in high-impact educational practices.
- Designed a day-long retreat with administrators and faculty at an urban research university to review their NSSE and FSSE data and identify institutional policies and practices that promote and inhibit student persistence and academic success.
- Presented a workshop at a system-level conference for faculty members interested in using NSSE data in their scholarship of teaching and learning projects.
- Consulted with a consortium of independent colleges on the best ways to interpret NSSE and CLA (Collegiate Learning Assessment) results together.
- Worked with representatives from dozens of colleges and universities that participated in regional workshops (Texas, Illinois, Florida, Oklahoma, Connecticut, Kansas, Nevada, and Kentucky) on using NSSE, BCSSE, and FSSE results for accreditation and institutional improvement initiatives.

Outreach Services

NSSE Users Workshops

Users workshops provide institutional researchers, faculty, administrators, and staff an opportunity to learn about using NSSE data from NSSE staff members and from their colleagues at peer institutions. Workshop topics address how to use NSSE results in assessment, accreditation self-studies, general education reviews, reviews of academic and student life programs, and faculty development initiatives. These ideas are presented in a collaborative environment over a one- or two-day period. Through a combination of plenary talks, concurrent interest sessions, group activities, and hands-on sessions, participants learn more about linking NSSE data to other institutional data as well as to BCSSE and FSSE results to better understand educationally effective practice.

Information on upcoming workshops and presentations from past NSSE Users Workshops is available on our Web site. nsse.iub.edu/workshop_presentations

NSSE Webinars

The 2010 NSSE Webinar series includes new topics that focus on how to integrate NSSE data with institutional data, use NSSE data for department- and program-level assessment, move beyond benchmark results, and introduce two new resources, NSSE’s Psychometric Portfolio and Custom Report Generator. Staff members from more than 830 institutions in the US and Canada have participated in one or more Webinars since 2008.

A schedule of upcoming Webinars and links to recorded Webinars are available on the NSSE Web site. Recordings are posted in the archives within a day or two after the live session. Since 2008, archived sessions have been viewed more than 2,250 times. nsse.iub.edu/webinars

Enhanced User Resources

The Guide to Online Resources provides a snapshot of user resources that are available for download from the NSSE Web site. It is posted as part of the Web version of the Institutional Report 2010 and includes descriptions and active links to:

- Regional and specialized accreditation toolkits—guidelines for incorporating NSSE into accreditation self-studies that suggest ways to map specific survey items to regional standards
- NSSE publications to enhance educational practice—DEEP practice briefs, research papers, and presentations
- User guides on (1) new ways to interpret effect sizes using NSSE Benchmark Comparisons reports, (2) how to carry out cognitive interviews and focus groups, (3) approaches to analyzing multiple years of NSSE data, and (4) step-by-step instructions on how to facilitate the presentation of NSSE and FSSE data to campus stakeholders
- Examples of NSSE data use by institutions
- A Pocket Guide to Choosing a College
- Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) resources, including syntax that allows institutions to simplify assembling NSSE data for importing into the College Portrait template nsse.iub.edu/2010_Institutional_Report/pdf/Guide_Online_Resources.pdf

Using NSSE to Assess and Improve Undergraduate Education: Lessons from the Field 2009

This report serves as a repository of practical ideas for NSSE institutions to improve evidence-based assessment and improvement initiatives. NSSE staff conducted interviews with more than 40 college and university educators on how they were utilizing their institutions’ NSSE, FSSE, and BCSSE results to enhance undergraduate teaching and learning. Interviews for the 2011
volume of Lessons from the Field will occur this academic year. nsse.iub.edu/links/lessons

Searchable Database for Using NSSE Data

Each year, more campuses use their NSSE results in innovative ways. We have highlighted these examples in publications, but all of these examples are now searchable in a new database of more than 500 examples of NSSE use. Search for examples by keywords, institution name, or Carnegie classification, and by type of use such as for accreditation, general education assessment, retention, or advising.
nsse.iub.edu/html/using_nsse_db.cfm

Undergraduate Pocket Guide

Following on the success of A Pocket Guide to Choosing a College, a companion brochure is currently in development: A Pocket Guide to Succeeding in College. This document will assist students once orientation has ended, with an emphasis on highlighting activities associated with the day-to-day life of an undergraduate that will help students work to their full potential.

NSSE and the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA)

The NSSE Web site contains resource pages that describe how NSSE results can be featured in the Student Experiences and Perceptions section in the VSA College Portrait. A variety of resources to support NSSE users, including syntax to populate the College Portrait template, and a Web page dedicated to explaining NSSE on the College Portrait, are available.
nsse.iub.edu/html/vsa.cfm

Tenth Anniversary Symposium

NSSE commemorated its milestone 10th anniversary by hosting an invitational symposium in October 2009. “Student Engagement and Educational Quality: An Agenda for the Next Decade” provided an occasion to reflect on the history and growth of NSSE as a widely used institutional assessment tool, examine current practices and research in student engagement, and look ahead to NSSE’s role in an increasingly complex environment of assessment, improvement, and accountability in higher education.

The event brought approximately 75 leading scholars, practitioners, and policymakers together for a series of talks, interactive panels, and presentations. The symposium Web site provides summaries of the event, including podcasts of selected sessions.
nsse.iub.edu/symp10

Research Initiatives

NSSE Learning to Improve Project—Spencer Foundation Grant Update

In Annual Results 2009, we reported very encouraging findings about a wide range of institutions that are showing gains in student engagement over time. In January 2010, we began work on a Spencer Foundation-funded project, Learning to Improve: A Study of Evidence-Based Improvement in Higher Education, by identifying a set of approximately 140 institutions that had achieved significant positive improvement in a variety of measures over at least four NSSE administrations. We are now collecting questionnaire responses on how institutions use assessment data, formulate improvement strategies, engage important stakeholders in the enterprise, and implement change. A subset of 10–15 institutions will be selected for case study research to develop a detailed understanding of how colleges and universities are achieving positive change.

By describing improvement processes and identifying supporting and inhibiting factors, the study will document promising practices to foster educational reform in higher education and will contribute to research, policymaking, and national discussions regarding the role of assessment in educational reform.
nsse.iub.edu/learningtoimprove

CIC-CLA Consortium Project

The Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) works with a consortium of institutions that are using the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), an evaluation tool for measuring the cognitive growth of students. The goal of the CIC-CLA project is to learn more about programmatic features that correlate with “institutional effects” associated with larger-than-expected gains in students’ analytical reasoning, critical thinking, and writing skills. NSSE is one diagnostic tool that schools can use in their efforts. NSSE continues to participate in workshops and provide Webinars to support institutions’ use of NSSE and CLA in combination.

Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts (CILA) Projects

NSSE continues its collaborations with CILA and arranged a licensing agreement for NSSE to be used with the 2010 senior cohort of the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education (WNSLAE), a longitudinal project studying factors that affect the outcomes of a liberal arts education. The project aims to explore not only whether and how much students develop because of their collegiate experiences, but also why and how this development takes place. NSSE and the WNSLAE research team will conduct further analysis of NSSE data and key outcomes to support cross-validation activities. The Center of Inquiry Web site provides full details on the project.
www.liberalarts.wabash.edu/study-overview
In this section we look at what’s new and also on the horizon for NSSE and its related projects.

**Online Report Generation**

As part of the recent redesign of the NSSE Web site, we introduced a new interactive online tool for generating custom reports of aggregate NSSE results. The Custom Report Generator gives interested parties—institutional users, journalists, policy analysts, researchers, high school students, parents, and counselors—a convenient way to view NSSE results according to a range of individual and institutional characteristics. For example, users could generate results for first-generation students at different types of institutions, or they could compare results for men and women by major and institutional type. As we collect user feedback and examine usage patterns, we plan to expand the tool’s capabilities. We are also developing a specialized version—accessible through the password-protected Institution Interface—that will allow authorized users to examine an institution’s results relative to self-selected comparison groups. Visit the “Tools & Services” section of the NSSE Web site and click on “Select & View Results.”

**NSSE 2.0**

A decade of NSSE results as well as new research about student learning and educational effectiveness present fresh ideas about student engagement. We are excited to announce that an updated version of the NSSE survey is currently under development. This reflects our continuing commitment to the improvement of our survey, reports, and technical procedures. NSSE’s Technical Advisory Panel and research staff are combining their expertise and experience in developing new items and revising the existing ones. Pilot testing will take place in 2011 and 2012, independent of ongoing standard NSSE administrations. This testing phase will include cognitive interviews to ensure that respondents understand new item wording and response options as intended, and to identify and address any possible problems. The new survey will go live with the 2013 administration.

We have four goals for the new survey: (1) preserve NSSE’s signature focus on effective educational practices and diagnostic, actionable information that can inform improvement efforts; (2) refine the measurement of constructs included in the current survey; (3) incorporate new content to address emergent constructs relevant to teaching and learning; and (4) refine item wording for clarity, consistency, applicability to online as well as face-to-face instruction, and to eliminate obsolete terminology (primarily related to technology).

**Anticipated Changes**

Keeping the survey to a reasonable length is of paramount importance because we rely on students to volunteer their time to complete it. Consequently, some existing content will be eliminated to make room for new content. Changes to item wording, and sometimes even changes in the sequence of questions, can also have subtle effects on responses.

We anticipate that these changes will necessitate changes to NSSE’s Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice. We also expect to introduce new composite measures that will enrich the information that NSSE provides (for example, we will be testing new questions related to students’ writing experiences, peer-to-peer learning, and quantitative reasoning).

These changes will likely disrupt trend analyses based on NSSE benchmarks and individual items. But we are confident that the end result will be an even more useful tool for assessing and improving undergraduate education. We welcome feedback as we test and develop NSSE 2.0 and will offer several opportunities for input. Consult the NSSE Web site for updates on this important work.

**Learning to Improve**

Work progresses on our Spencer Foundation-funded project, *Learning to Improve: A Study of Evidence-Based Improvement in Higher Education*. As of this writing, we have collected narrative descriptions of successful improvement efforts from a diverse group of roughly 50 colleges and universities. After analyzing these responses, we will select a subset for intensive case study analysis. We expect that our findings will make a significant contribution to our understanding of how colleges and universities effect positive change in undergraduate teaching and learning.

[nsse.iub.edu/learningtoimprove](nsse.iub.edu/learningtoimprove)

We remain true to our mission of providing actionable data that can be used to promote student success in college and advancing the national conversation about quality in undergraduate education.

“At a time when the position of U.S. standards for higher education are being evaluated in a competitive global context, NSSE data provide real insights into the qualities of the campus learning environment.”

—Molly Corbett Broad, President, American Council on Education


National Research Council, Committee on Undergraduate Biology Education to Prepare Research Scientists for the 21st Century (2003).


For a list of research articles, conference presentations, and other works, see nsse.iub.edu/html/pubs.cfm

### Online Resources

**Summary Tables**

View tables of annual survey results and benchmarks by selected student and institution characteristics. nsse.iub.edu/links/summary_tables

**Custom Report Generator**

Generate individualized reports from the two most recent years of NSSE data, according to user-selected student and institutional characteristics. nsse.iub.edu/links/report_generator

**Psychometric Portfolio**

Studies of validity, reliability, and other indicators of quality of NSSE data. nsse.iub.edu/links/psychometric_portfolio

**Participating Institutions Search**

Generate lists of participating institutions for selected years and surveys, as well as other criteria such as location or institutional control, or view a specific institution’s participation history. nsse.iub.edu/html/participants.cfm

**Webinars**

Live and recorded Webinars for faculty, administrators, institutional researchers, and student affairs professionals who want to better use and understand their NSSE, BCSSE, and FSSE data. nsse.iub.edu/webinars
To represent the multi-dimensional nature of student engagement at the national, sector, and institutional levels, NSSE developed five indicators, or Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice:

- Level of Academic Challenge
- Active and Collaborative Learning
- Student-Faculty Interaction
- Enriching Educational Experiences
- Supportive Campus Environment

To facilitate comparisons across time, as well as between individual institutions and types of institutions, each benchmark is expressed as a 100-point scale.

Pages 33 through 42 show percentile distributions of student benchmark scores and frequency distributions of the individual items that make up each of the benchmarks. These statistics are presented separately by class standing for each of the 2005 Basic Carnegie Classification groups and for the entire U.S. NSSE 2010 cohort of colleges and universities. Also included are aggregated results for institutions that scored in the top 10% of all U.S. NSSE 2010 institutions (56 schools) on the benchmark. The pattern of responses among these “Top 10%” institutions sets a high bar for schools aspiring to be among the top performers on a particular benchmark.

Sample

These results are based on responses from 165,998 first-year and 196,231 senior students who were randomly sampled from 561 and 563 baccalaureate-granting colleges and universities in the US, respectively.

Weighting

Student cases in the percentile distributions and frequency tables are weighted within their institution by gender and enrollment status (full-time, less than full-time). In addition, to compensate for different sampling and response rates across institutions of varying size, cases are weighted so that the number of respondents at an institution represents that institution’s share of total enrollment across all participating U.S. institutions.

Interpreting Scores

When interpreting benchmark scores, keep in mind that individual student performance typically varies much more within institutions than average performance does between institutions. Many students at lower-scoring institutions are more engaged than the typical student at top-scoring institutions. An average benchmark score for an institution might say little about the engagement of an individual student with certain characteristics.

For these reasons, we recommend that institutions disaggregate results and calculate scores for different groups of students.

As in previous years, students attending smaller schools with a focus on arts and sciences have higher scores across the board on average. However, some large institutions are more engaging than certain small colleges in a given area of effective educational practice. Thus, many institutions are an exception to the general principle that “smaller is better” in terms of student engagement. For this reason, it is prudent that anyone wishing to estimate collegiate quality reviews institution-specific results.
Percentile Distributions

Percentile distributions are shown in a modified “box and whiskers” type of chart with an accompanying table. For each institutional type, the charts and tables show students’ scores within the distribution at the 95th, 75th, 50th, 25th, and 5th percentiles. The dot signifies the median—the middle score that divides all students’ scores into two equal halves. The rectangular box shows the 25th to 75th percentile range, the middle 50% of all scores. The “whiskers” on top and bottom are the 95th and 5th percentiles, showing the general range of scores but excluding outliers.

This type of information is richer than simple summary measures such as means or medians. One can see the range and variation of student scores in each category as well as where the midrange of typical scores falls. At the same time, one can see what scores are needed (i.e., 75th or 95th percentile) to be a top performer in the group.

Frequency Tables

Following each set of percentile distributions is a table of frequencies based on data from 2010 that shows the percentages of responses to the items that contribute to the benchmark. The values listed are column percentages.

For more details on the construction of the benchmarks, visit our Web site.
nsse.iub.edu/links/institutional_reporting
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Carnegie 2005 Basic Classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Research Universities (high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRU</td>
<td>Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s L</td>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s M</td>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities (medium programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s S</td>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities (smaller programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/A&amp;S</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges–Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/Div</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges–Diverse Fields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

classifications.carnegiefoundation.org

Notes

1 To derive the top 10% categories, institutions were sorted according to their precision-weighted scores. Precision weighting adjusts less reliable scores toward the grand mean.

2 The sample includes one lower-division institution with no seniors and three upper-division institutions with no first-year students. Eight participating U.S. institutions were excluded from these data due to sampling or response issues.

3 A percentile is a score within a distribution below which a given percentage of scores is found. For example, the 75th percentile is the score below which 75% of all scores fall.
Level of Academic Challenge

Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. Colleges and universities promote high levels of student achievement by setting high expectations for student performance.

Key
- First-Year Students
- Seniors
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Benchmark Scores First-Year Students

Percentiles First-Year Students

Benchmark Scores Seniors

Percentiles Seniors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>(in percentages)</th>
<th>RU/VH</th>
<th>RU/H</th>
<th>DRU</th>
<th>Master's L</th>
<th>Master's M</th>
<th>Master's S</th>
<th>Bac/A&amp;S</th>
<th>Bac/Div</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
<th>NSSE 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1 and 4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 5 and 10</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 11 and 20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 5 and 10</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1 and 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 5 and 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 11 and 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 5 and 10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1 and 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 5 and 10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 11 and 20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 1 and 4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 5 and 10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Between 11 and 20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coursework emphasized: ANALYZING the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coursework emphasized: SYNTHESIZING and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coursework emphasized: MAKING JUDGMENTS about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coursework emphasized: APPLYING theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coursework emphasized: WORKED HARDER than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hours per 7-day week spent working on class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional emphasis: SPENDING SIGNIFICANT amounts of time studying and on academic work</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active and Collaborative Learning

Students learn more when they are intensely involved in their education and are asked to think about and apply what they are learning in different settings. Collaborating with others in solving problems or mastering difficult material prepares students to deal with the messy, unscripted problems they will encounter daily, both during and after college.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>(in percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>DRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a class presentation</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with other students on projects DURING CLASS</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with classmates OUTSIDE OF CLASS to prepare class assignments</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a community-based project (e.g., service-learning) as part of a regular course</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“NSSE is becoming increasingly helpful in improving student success and building public confidence in the commitment of colleges and universities to improve teaching and learning.”

—Paul E. Lingenfelter, President, State Higher Education Executive Officers
Student-Faculty Interaction

Students learn firsthand how experts think about and solve problems by interacting with faculty members inside and outside of the classroom. As a result, their teachers become role models, mentors, and guides for continuous, lifelong learning.

**Benchmark Scores** First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RU/VH</th>
<th>RU/H</th>
<th>Dru</th>
<th>Master’s L</th>
<th>Master’s M</th>
<th>Master’s S</th>
<th>Bac/A&amp;S</th>
<th>Bac/Div</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
<th>NSSE 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentiles** First-Year Students

**Benchmark Scores** Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RU/VH</th>
<th>RU/H</th>
<th>Dru</th>
<th>Master’s L</th>
<th>Master’s M</th>
<th>Master’s S</th>
<th>Bac/A&amp;S</th>
<th>Bac/Div</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
<th>NSSE 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Percentiles** Seniors

Guide to Benchmark Figures

Key

- **First-Year Students**
- **Seniors**

Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice (continued)
The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) provides the basis for extended conversation among faculty, in terms of how we engage our students.”

—Michael F. Middaugh, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Planning, University of Delaware
Enriching Educational Experiences

Complementary learning opportunities inside and outside of the classroom augment the academic program. Experiencing diversity teaches students valuable things about themselves and other cultures. Used appropriately, technology facilitates learning and promotes collaboration between peers and instructors. Internships, community service, and senior capstone courses provide students with opportunities to synthesize, integrate, and apply their knowledge. Such experiences make learning more meaningful and, ultimately, more useful because what students know becomes a part of who they are.
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### Benchmark Scores First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentiles First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Benchmark Scores Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percentiles Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Benchmark Scores Seniors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Percentiles Seniors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Guide to Benchmark Figures**

---

**Benchmark Scores Seniors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Percentiles Seniors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>95th</th>
<th>75th</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>25th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Students</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>(in percentages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used an electronic medium (Listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service or volunteer work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language coursework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study or self-designed major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supportive Campus Environment

Students perform better and are more satisfied at colleges that are committed to their success and cultivate positive working and social relations among different groups on campus.
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Benchmark Scores First-Year Students

Percentiles First-Year Students

Benchmark Scores Seniors

Percentiles Seniors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>(in percentages)</th>
<th>RU/VH</th>
<th>RU/H</th>
<th>DRU</th>
<th>Master's L</th>
<th>Master's M</th>
<th>Master's S</th>
<th>Bac/A&amp;S</th>
<th>Bac/Div</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
<th>NSSE 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td>emphasis:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing the</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td>support you</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td></td>
<td>need to</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td>thrive socially</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td>emphasis:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td></td>
<td>Providing the</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td>support you</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td></td>
<td>need to</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td>help you</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td></td>
<td>emphasis:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helping you</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td>cope with</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td></td>
<td>your non-academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfriendly, unsupportive, sense of alienation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality: Your relationships with other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available, helpful, sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailable, unhelpful, unsympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available, helpful, sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhelpful, inconsiderate, rigid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available, helpful, sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available, helpful, sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participating Colleges and Universities: 2000–2010

Alabama
Alabama A&M University
Auburn University
Auburn University-Montgomery
Birmingham Southern College
 Faulkner University
Huntingdon College
Jacksonville State University
Judson College
Miles College
Oakwood University
Samford University
Southeastern Bible College
Spring Hill College
Stillman College
Troy State University-Montgomery Campus
Troy University
University of Alabama at Birmingham
University of Alabama in Huntsville
University of Alabama, The
University of Mobile
University of Montevallo
University of North Alabama
University of South Alabama

Alaska
Alaska Pacific University
University of Alaska Anchorage
University of Alaska Fairbanks
University of Alaska Southeast

Arizona
Arizona State University
Arizona State University at the Polytechnic Campus
Arizona State University at the West Campus
Embry Riddle Aeronautical University-Prescott
Northern Arizona University
Prescott College
University of Advancing Technology
University of Arizona
University of Phoenix-Online Campus
University of Phoenix-Phoenix-Hohokam Campus
Western International University

Arkansas
Arkansas State University-Jonesboro
Arkansas Tech University
Central Baptist College
Ecclesia College
Henderson State University
Hendrix College
John Brown University
Lyon College
Ouachita Baptist University
Philander Smith College
Southern Arkansas University
University of Arkansas
University of Arkansas at Fort Smith
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
University of Arkansas at Monticello
University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
University of Central Arkansas
University of the Ozarks

California
Alliant International University
American Jewish University
Art Center College of Design
California Baptist University
California College of the Arts
California Lutheran University
California Maritime Academy
California Polytechnic State University-San Luis Obispo
California State Polytechnic University-Pomona
California State University-Bakersfield
California State University-Channel Islands
California State University-Chico
California State University-Dominguez Hills
California State University-East Bay
California State University-Fresno
California State University-Fullerton
California State University-Long Beach
California State University-Los Angeles
California State University-Monterey Bay
California State University-Northridge
California State University-Sacramento
California State University-San Bernardino
California State University-San Marcos
California State University-Stansbury
Chapman University
Claremont McKenna College
Concordia University
Fresno Pacific University
Harvey Mudd College
Holy Names University
Hope International University
Humboldt State University
Humphreys College-Stockton and modesto Campuses
La Sierra University
Laguna College of Art and Design
Loyola Marymount University
Master's College and Seminary, The
Menlo College
Mills College
Mount St. Mary's College
National University
Notre Dame de Namur University
Occidental College
Pacific Union College
Pepperdine University
Pitzer College
Point Loma Nazarene University
Saint Mary's College of California
San Diego Christian College
San Diego State University
San Francisco State University
San Jose State University
Santa Clara University
Scripps College
Sierra College
Simon University
Sonoma State University
University of California-Berkeley
University of California-Davis
University of California-Merced
University of California-Santa Cruz
University of La Verne
University of Phoenix-Southern California Campus
University of Redlands
University of San Diego
University of San Francisco
University of the Pacific
Vanguard University of Southern California
Westmont College
Whittier College
Woodbury University

Colorado
Adams State College
Colorado College
Colorado School of Mines
Colorado State University
Colorado State University-Pueblo
Colorado Technical University Online
Fort Lewis College
Johnson & Wales University-Denver
Mesa State College
Metropolitan State College of Denver
Naropa University
Regis University
United States Air Force Academy
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
University of Colorado Denver
University of Denver

Connecticut
Central Connecticut State University
Charter Oak State College

Delaware
Delaware State University
Goldy-Beacom College
University of Delaware
Wesley College
Wilmington University

District of Columbia
American University
Catholic University of America
Corcoran College of Art and Design
Gallaudet University
George Washington University
Georgetown University
Howard University
Southeastern University
Strayer University
Trinity Washington University
University of the District of Columbia

Florida
American InterContinental University
Ave Maria University
Barry University
Beacon College
Bethune Cookman University
Eckerd College
Edward Waters College
Embry Riddle Aeronautical University-Daytona Beach
Embry Riddle Aeronautical University-Worldwide
Flagler College
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University
Florida Atlantic University
Florida Gulf Coast University
Florida Hospital College of Health Sciences
Florida Institute of Technology
Florida International University
Florida Memorial University
Florida Southern College
Florida State University
Jacksonville University
Johnson & Wales University-Florida Campus
Lynn University
New College of Florida
Northwood University-Florida Education Center
Nova Southeastern University
Palm Beach Atlantic University-West Palm Beach
Ringling College of Art and Design
Rollins College
Saint John Vianney College Seminary
Saint Leo University
Saint Thomas University
Southeastern University
Stetson University
University of Central Florida
University of Florida
University of Miami
University of North Florida
University of South Florida
University of South Florida- St. Petersburg
University of Tampa
University of West Florida, The 1 2
Warner University 2
Georgia
Agnes Scott College 1
Albany State University 1 2
American InterContinental University
American InterContinental University-Buckhead
Armstrong Atlantic State University 1
Augusta State University
Berry College 1
Berea College
Clark Atlanta University 1 2
Clayton State University 1 2
Columbus State University 2
Covenant College 2
Dalton State College 2
Emory University
Fort Valley State University 1 3
Georgia College & State University 2
Georgia Gwinnett College 1 2
Georgia Institute of Technology
Georgia Southern University 1
Georgia Southern University-Statesboro
Georgia State University 1 2
Kennesaw State University 2
LaGrange College 1 2
Macon State College 1
Medical College of Georgia
Mercer University 1 2
Morehouse College 1
North Georgia College & State University 1 2
Oglethorpe University 1 2
Oxford College of Emory University 2
Savannah College of Art and Design 2
Savannah State University 1 2
Shorter College 1 2
Southern Catholic College
Southern Polytechnic State University
Spelman College 1
Thomas University
Truett-McConnell College
University of Georgia 1 2
University of Phoenix-Atlanta Campus
University of West Georgia
Valdosta State University 2
Wesleyan College 2
Guam
University of Guam
Hawaii
Brigham Young University-Hawaii 2
Chaminade University of Honolulu 1 2
Hawaii Pacific University
University of Hawai'i at Hilo 1 2
University of Hawai'i at Manoa 3
University of Hawai'i-West O'ahu
Idaho
Boise State University 1 2
Brigham Young University-Idaho 2
College of Idaho, The 1
Idaho State University 2 2
University of Idaho 3
Illinois
American InterContinental University-Online
Augustana College 2
Aurora University 2
Benedictine University 2
Blackburn College 2
Bradley University 2
Chicago State University 1 2
Columbia College Chicago 1
Concordia University 1 2
DePaul University 2 2
Dominican University 1 2
East-West University 1 2
Eastern Illinois University 2
Elmhurst College 2
Eureka College 2
Greenville College
Harrington College of Design
Illinois College 2
Illinois Institute of Technology
Illinois State University 1 2
Illinois Wesleyan University 1 2
Judson University
Knox College 1 2
Lake Forest College
Lewis University 1 2
Lincoln Christian University
 Loyola University Chicago
MacMurray College
McKendree University
Millikin University 1 2
Monmouth College 1
North Central College 1
North Park University
Northeastern Illinois University
Northern Illinois University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University 1
Olivet Nazarene University
Quincy University 1
Robert Morris University Illinois 2
Rockford College
Roosevelt University 1
Saint Xavier University 1
School of the Art Institute of Chicago
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville 2
Trinity Christian College 1
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Illinois at Springfield 2
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of St. Francis 1
Western Illinois University 1 2
Wheaton College 2
Indiana
Anderson University
Ball State University
Butler University 1 2
Calumet College of Saint Joseph 1 2
DePauw University 2
Earlham College 2
Franklin College
Goshen College
Grace College and Theological Seminary
Hanover College
Holy Cross College 1
Huntington University 2
Indiana Institute of Technology
Indiana State University 1 2
Indiana University Bloomington 1 2
Indiana University East 1
Indiana University Kokomo
Indiana University Northwest
Indiana University South Bend 1 2
Indiana University Southeast
Indiana University-Purdue University-Fort Wayne
Indiana University-Purdue University-Indianapolis 1
Indiana Wesleyan University 1 2
Manchester College 2
Martin University
Purdue University 1 2
Purdue University-Calumet Campus
Purdue University-North Central Campus
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology 2
Saint Joseph's College
Saint Mary's College 1 2
Taylor University
Taylor University Fort Wayne
Trine University
University of Evansville 1 2
University of Indianapolis 3
University of Southern Indiana 1
Valparaiso University
Wabash College
Iowa
Ashford University
Briar Cliff University 2
Buena Vista University 1 2
Central College 1
Clarke University 1 2
Cornell College
Dordt College
Drake University 1 2
Grace and College of Reverence
Grand View University 2
Grinnell College 1 2
Iowa State University 2
Iowa Wesleyan College
Kaplan University 1
Loras College
Luther College 1 2
Maharishi University of Management
Morningside College 2
Mount Mercy University
Northwestern College
Saint Ambrose University 1 2
Simpson College 1 2
University of Dubuque
University of Iowa 1
University of Northern Iowa 2
Waldorf College
Warburg College 1 2
Kansas
Baker University 2
Benedictine College 1
Bethany College 2
Emporia State University 2
Fort Hays State University 2
Friends University 2
Haskell Indian Nations University 1
Kansas State University
McPherson College
MidAmerica Nazarene University
Newman University 2
Ottawa University
Pittsburg State University
Southwestern College 2
Tabor College
University of Kansas
University of Saint Mary
Washburn University 2
Wichita State University 2
Kentucky
Alice Lloyd College
Asbury College
Bellarmine University 1 2
Berea College
Brescia University
Campbellsville University 1 2
Centre College 1 2
Eastern Kentucky University 2
Georgetown College
Kentucky Christian College
Kentucky State University 1 2
Kentucky Wesleyan College
Lindsey Wilson College
Madison College 1
Morehead State University 1 2
Murray State University 1 2
Northern Kentucky University 1 2
Pikeville College
Sullivan University 1
Thomas More College
Transylvania University 2
Union College
University of Kentucky
University of Louisville
Western Kentucky University 2
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### Participating Colleges and Universities: 2000–2010 (continued)

**Louisiana**
- Centenary College of Louisiana
- Dillard University
- Grambling State University
- Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College
- Louisiana State University-Shreveport
- Louisiana Tech University
- Loyola University New Orleans
- McNeese State University
- Nicholls State University
- Northwestern State University of Louisiana
- Our Lady of the Lake College
- Saint Joseph Seminary College
- Southeastern Louisiana University
- Southern University and A&K College
- Southern University at New Orleans
- Tulane University of Louisiana
- University of Louisiana at Lafayette
- University of Louisiana Monroe
- University of New Orleans
- Xavier University of Louisiana

**Maine**
- Colby College
- College of the Atlantic
- Husson University
- Maine College of Art
- Saint Joseph's College of Maine
- Thomas College
- Unity College
- University of Maine
- University of Maine at Augusta
- University of Maine at Farmington
- University of Maine at Fort Kent
- University of Maine at Machias
- University of Maine at Presque Isle
- University of New England
- University of Southern Maine

**Maryland**
- Bowie State University
- College of Notre Dame of Maryland
- Coppin State University
- Frostburg State University
- Goucher College
- Hood College
- Loyola University Maryland
- Maryland Institute College of Art
- McDaniel College
- Morgan State University
- Mount St. Mary's University
- Saint Mary's College of Maryland
- Salisbury University
- Sojourner-Douglass College
- Stevenson University
- Towson University
- United States Naval Academy
- University of Baltimore
- University of Maryland Eastern Shore
- University of Maryland-Baltimore County
- University of Maryland-College Park
- Washington College

**Massachusetts**
- American International College
- Amherst College
- Anna Maria College
- Assumption College
- Babson College
- Bard College at Simon's Rock
- Bay Path College
- Bentley University
- Boston Architectural College
- Boston College
- Boston University
- Bridgewater State College
- Clark University
- College of Our Lady of the Elms
- College of the Holy Cross
- Curry College
- Dean College
- Eastern Nazarene College
- Emerson College
- Emmanuel College
- Endicott College
- Fitchburg State College
- Framingham State College
- Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering
- Gordon College
- Hampshire College
- Lasell College
- Lesley University
- Massachusetts College of Art and Design
- Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts
- Merrimack College
- Mount Holyoke College
- Mount Ida College
- Newbury College-Brookline
- Nichols College
- Northeastern University
- Pine Manor College
- Regis College
- Salem State College
- School of the Museum of Fine Arts-Boston
- Simmons College
- Smith College
- Springfield College
- Stonehill College
- Suffolk University
- Tufts University
- University of Massachusetts Amherst
- University of Massachusetts Boston
- University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
- University of Massachusetts Lowell
- Wellesley College
- Wentworth Institute of Technology
- Western New England College
- Wheaton College
- Wheelock College
- Williams College
- Worcester Polytechnic Institute
- Worcester State College

**Michigan**
- Adrian College
- Albion College
- Alma College
- Andrews University
- Calvin College
- Central Michigan University
- Cleary University
- Concordia University-Ann Arbor
- Davenport University
- Eastern Michigan University
- Ferris State University
- Grand Valley State University
- Great Lakes Christian College
- Hope College
- Kalamazoo College
- Kettering University
- Kuyper College
- Lake Superior State University
- Lawrence Technological University
- Madonna University
- Marygrove College
- Michigan State University
- Michigan Technological University
- Northern Michigan University
- Northwood University
- Oakland University
- Siena Heights University
- Spring Arbor University
- University of Detroit Mercy
- University of Michigan-Ann Arbor
- University of Michigan-Dearborn
- University of Michigan-Flint
- University of Phoenix-Metro Detroit Campus
- Wayne State University
- Western Michigan University

**Minnesota**
- Augsburg College
- Bemidji State University
- Bethany Lutheran College
- Bethel University
- Capella University
- Carleton College
- College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University
- College of Saint Scholastica, The
- Concordia College at Moorhead
- Concordia University-Saint Paul
- Gustavus Adolphus College
- Hamline University
- Macalester College
- Martin Luther College
- Metropolitan State University
- Minneapolis College of Art and Design
- Minnesota State University-Mankato
- Minnesota State University-Moorhead
- Saint Catherine University
- Saint Cloud State University
- Saint Mary's University of Minnesota
- Saint Olaf College
- Southwest Minnesota State University
- University of Minnesota-Crookston
- University of Minnesota-Duluth
- University of Minnesota-Morris
- University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
- University of St. Thomas
- Winona State University

**Mississippi**
- Alcorn State University
- Delta State University
- Jackson State University
- Millsaps College
- Mississippi State University
- Mississippi State University-Meridian Campus
- Mississippi University for Women
- Mississippi Valley State University
- Tougaloo College
- University of Mississippi
- University of Southern Mississippi
- William Carey University

**Missouri**
- Avila University
- Barnes-Jewish College
- Goldfarb School of Nursing
- Central Methodist University-College of Liberal Arts & Sciences
- College of the Ozarks
- Columbia College
- Culver-Stockton College
- Drury University
- Fontbonne University
- Harris-Stowe State University
- Kansas City Art Institute
- Lincoln University
- Lindenwood University
- Maryville University of Saint Louis
- Missouri Baptist University
- Missouri Southern State University
- Missouri State University
- Missouri University of Science and Technology
- Missouri Valley College
- Missouri Western State University
- Northwest Missouri State University
- Rockhurst University
- Saint Louis University
- Saint Luke's College
- Southeast Missouri State University
- Stephens College
- Truman State University
- University of Central Missouri
- University of Missouri-Columbia
| University of Missouri-Kansas City | 2 |
| University of Missouri-St. Louis | 2 |
| Webster University | 2 |
| Westminster College | 1 |
| William Jewell College | 1 |
| William Woods University | 2 |
| Montana | 2 |
| Carroll College | 2 |
| Montana State University | 2 |
| Montana State University-Billings | 2 |
| Salish Kootenai College | 1 |
| University of Great Falls | 1 |
| University of Montana-Western, The | 3 |
| University of Montana, The | 3 |
| Nebraska | 2 |
| Bellevue University | 2 |
| Chadron State College | 2 |
| College of Saint Mary | 2 |
| Concordia University | 2 |
| Creighton University | 2 |
| Dana College | 2 |
| Doane College | 1 |
| Hastings College | 2 |
| Nebraska Methodist College of Nursing & Allied Health | 2 |
| Nebraska Wesleyan University | 2 |
| Peru State College, Union College | 1 |
| University of Nebraska at Kearney | 2 |
| University of Nebraska at Omaha | 2 |
| University of Nebraska-Lincoln | 2 |
| Wayne State College | 2 |
| Nevada | 2 |
| Nevada State College | 1 |
| University of Nevada, Las Vegas | 1 |
| University of Nevada, Reno | 3 |
| New Hampshire | 46 |
| Colby-Sawyer College | 2 |
| Daniel Webster College | 2 |
| Franklin Pierce University | 2 |
| Granite State College | 2 |
| Keene State College | 2 |
| New England College | 2 |
| Plymouth State University | 2 |
| Rivier College | 2 |
| Saint Anselm College | 1 |
| New Jersey | 2 |
| Berkeley College | 2 |
| Bloomfield College | 2 |
| Centenary College | 2 |
| College of New Jersey, The | 2 |
| College of Saint Elizabeth | 2 |
| Drew University | 1 |
| Fairleigh Dickinson University-College at Florham | 2 |
| Fairleigh Dickinson University-Metropolitan Campus | 2 |
| Felician College | 1 |
| Georgian Court University | 2 |
| Kean University | 2 |
| Monmouth University | 2 |
| Montclair State University | 2 |
| New Jersey City University | 2 |
| New Jersey Institute of Technology | 2 |
| Ramapo College of New Jersey | 2 |
| Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, The | 2 |
| Rider University | 2 |
| Rowan University | 2 |
| Rutgers University-Camden | 2 |
| Rutgers University-New Brunswick | 2 |
| Rutgers University-Newark | 2 |
| Saint Peter's College | 2 |
| Seton Hall University | 2 |
| Stevens Institute of Technology | 2 |
| William Paterson University of New Jersey | 2 |
| New Mexico | 2 |
| Eastern New Mexico University | 2 |
| Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture | 2 |
| New York | 2 |
| Adelphi University | 2 |
| Alfred University | 2 |
| Barnard College | 2 |
| Berkeley College | 2 |
| CUNY | 2 |
| City College | 2 |
| CUNY College of Staten Island | 2 |
| CUNY Herbert H. Lehman College | 2 |
| CUNY Hunter College | 2 |
| CUNY John Jay College of Criminal Justice | 2 |
| CUNY Medgar Evers College | 2 |
| CUNY New York City College of Technology | 2 |
| CUNY Queens College | 2 |
| CUNY York College | 2 |
| Daemen College | 2 |
| Dominican College of Bla returns | 2 |
| Excelsior College | 2 |
| Farmingdale State College of the State University of New York | 2 |
| Fashion Institute of Technology | 2 |
| Fordham University | 2 |
| Hamilton College | 2 |
| Hartwick College | 2 |
| Herkimer College | 2 |
| Hofstra University | 2 |
| Iona College | 2 |
| Ithaca College | 2 |
| Keuka College | 2 |
| Le Moyne College | 2 |
| LIM College | 2 |
| Long Island University-Brooklyn Campus | 2 |
| Long Island University-C W Post Campus | 2 |
| Manhattan College | 2 |
| Manhattanville College | 2 |
| Marist College | 2 |
| Marymount College of Fordham University | 2 |
| Marymount Manhattan College | 2 |
| Medaille College | 2 |
| Mercy College | 2 |
| Metropolitan College of New York | 2 |
| Molloy College | 2 |
| Morrisville State College | 2 |
| Mount Saint Mary College | 2 |
| Nazareth College | 2 |
| New School, The | 2 |
| New York Institute of Technology-Manhattan Campus | 2 |
| New York Institute of Technology-Old Westbury | 2 |
| Niagara University | 2 |
| Pace University-New York | 2 |
| Paul Smith's College | 2 |
| Polytechnic Institute of New York | 2 |
| Pratt Institute-Main | 2 |
| Roberts Wesleyan College | 2 |
| Rochester Institute of Technology | 2 |
| Russell Sage College | 2 |
| Sage College of Albany | 2 |
| Saint Bonaventure University | 2 |
| Saint Francis College | 2 |
| Saint John's University-New York | 2 |

Saint Joseph's College | 2 |
Saint Joseph's College-Suffolk Campus | 2 |
Saint Lawrence University | 2 |
Sarah Lawrence College | 2 |
School of Visual Arts | 2 |
Siena College | 2 |
Skidmore College | 2 |
Stony Brook University | 12 |
SUNY at Albany | 12 |
SUNY at Binghamton | 12 |
SUNY at Fredonia | 12 |
SUNY at Geneseo | 12 |
SUNY at Purchase College | 2 |
SUNY College at Brockport | 2 |
SUNY College at Buffalo | 2 |
SUNY College at Cortland | 2 |
SUNY College at Old Westbury | 2 |
SUNY College at Oneonta | 2 |
SUNY College at Oswego | 2 |
SUNY College at Plattsburgh | 2 |
SUNY College at Potsdam | 2 |
SUNY College of Agriculture and Technology at Cobleskill | 2 |
SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry | 2 |
SUNY College of Technology at Alfred | 2 |
SUNY College of Technology at Canton | 2 |
SUNY College of Technology at Delhi | 2 |
SUNY Empire State College | 2 |
SUNY Institute of Technology at Utica-Rome | 2 |
SUNY Maritime College | 2 |
SUNY Upstate Medical University | 2 |
Syracuse University | 2 |
Touro College | 2 |
Union College | 2 |
United States Merchant Marine Academy | 2 |
United States Military Academy | 2 |
University at Buffalo | 2 |
Vassar College | 2 |
Vaugn College of Aeronautics and Technology | 2 |
Wagner College | 2 |
Webb Institute | 2 |
Wells College | 2 |
Yeshiva University | 2 |

North Carolina | 2 |
Appalachian State University | 2 |
Barton College | 2 |
Belmont Abbey College | 2 |
Bennett College for Women | 2 |
Brevard College | 2 |
Campbell University Inc. | 2 |
Catawba College | 2 |
Chowan University | 2 |
East Carolina University | 2 |
Elizabeth City State University | 2 |
Elon University | 2 |
Fayetteville State University | 2 |
Gardner-Webb University | 2 |
Greensboro College | 2 |
Guilford College | 2 |
High Point University | 2 |
Johnson & Wales University-Charlotte | 2 |
Johnson C. Smith University | 2 |
Lees-McRae College | 2 |
Lenoir-Rhyne University | 2 |
Livingstone College | 2 |
Mars Hill College | 2 |
Meredith College | 2 |
Methodist University | 2 |
Montreat College | 2 |
North Carolina A&T State University | 2 |
North Carolina Central University | 2 |
North Carolina State University at Raleigh | 2 |
Peace College | 2 |
Pfeiffer University | 2 |
Queens University of Charlotte | 2 |
Saint Andrews Presbyterian College | 2 |
Participating Colleges and Universities: 2000–2010 (continued)

Saint Augustine’s College
Salem College
Shaw University
University of North Carolina at Asheville
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
University of North Carolina at Pembroke
University of North Carolina-Wilmington
Warren Wilson College
Western Carolina University
Wingate University
Winston-Salem State University
North Dakota
Dickinson State University
Mayville State University
Minot State University
North Dakota State University
University of Mary
University of North Dakota
Valley City State University
Ohio
Antioch College
Ashland University
Baldwin-Wallace College
Bowling Green State University
Capital University
Case Western Reserve University
Cedarville University
Central State University
Cleveland State University
College of Mount St. Joseph
College of Wooster, The
Columbus College of Art and Design
Defiance College
Denison University
Franciscan University of Steubenville
Franklin University
Heidelberg University
Hiram College
John Carroll University
Kent State University Kent Campus
Kent State University Stark Campus
Kenyon College
Kettering College of Medical Arts
Lake Erie College
Lourdes College
Malone University
Marietta College
Miami University-Oxford
Mount Union College
Notre Dame College
Oberlin College
Ohio Christian University
Ohio Dominican University
Ohio Northern University
Ohio State University-Lima Campus
Ohio State University-Mansfield Campus
Ohio State University-Marion Campus
Ohio State University-Newark Campus
Ohio State University, The
Ohio University
Ohio University-Zanesville Campus
Ohio Wesleyan University
Otterbein College
Shawnee State University
Tiffin University
University of Akron, The
University of Cincinnati
University of Dayton
University of Findlay, The
University of Rio Grande
University of Toledo
Urbana University
Ursuline College
Walsh University
Wilmington College
Wittenberg University
Wright State University
Xavier University
Youngstown State University
Oklahoma
Cameron University
East Central University
Northeastern State University
Northern Oklahoma State University
Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma State University
Ozal Roberts University
Roger State University
Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Southern Nazarene University
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
University of Central Oklahoma
University of Oklahoma Norman Campus
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma
University of Tulsa
Oregon
Concordia University
Eastern Oregon University
George Fox University
Lewis & Clark College
Linfield College
Northwest Christian University
Oregon Institute of Technology
Oregon State University
Pacific University
Portland State University
Southern Oregon University
University of Oregon
University of Portland
Warner Pacific College
Western Oregon University
Willamette University
Pennsylvania
Albright College
Allegheny College
Alvernia University
Arcadia University
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania
Bryn Mawr College
Bucknell University
Cabrini College
California University of Pennsylvania
Carlow University
Carnegie Mellon University
Cedar Crest College
Chatham University
Chesnut Hill College
Cheyney University of Pennsylvania
Clarion University of Pennsylvania
Delaware Valley College
Dickinson College
Drexel University
Duquesne University
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Eastern University
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Elizabethtown College
Franklin and Marshall College
Gannon University
Gettysburg College
Grove City College
Gwynedd Mercy College
Harrisburg University of Science and Technology
Holy Family University
Immaculata University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Juniata College
Keystone College
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
La Roche College
La Salle University
Lafayette College
Lebanon Valley College
Lehigh University
Lincoln University of Pennsylvania
Lock Haven University
Lycoming College
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania
Marywood University
Mercyhurst College
Messiah College
Miller University of Pennsylvania
Misericordia University
Moore College of Art and Design
Moravian College and Moravian Theological Seminary
Mount Aloysius College
Muhlenberg College
Neumann University
Penn State University-Abington
Pen State University-Altoona
Penn State University-Erie, The Behrend College
Penn State University-Fayette, The Eberly Campus
Penn State University-Harrisburg
Penn State University-University Park
Penn State University-Worthington Scranton
Penn State University-York
Pennsylvania College of Technology
Pennsylvania State University-Brandywine
Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Berks
Pennsylvania State University-Penn State Hazleton
Philadelphia University
Point Park University
Robert Morris University
Rosemont College
Saint Francis University
Saint Joseph’s University
Saint Vincent College
Seton Hill University
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania
Susquehanna University
Swarthmore College
Temple University
Thiel College
University of Pittsburgh-Bradford
University of Pittsburgh-Greensburg
University of Pittsburgh-Johnstown
University of Pittsburgh-Pittsburgh Campus
University of Scranton
University of the Arts, The
University of the Sciences in Philadelphia
Ursinus College
Villanova University
Washington & Jefferson College
Waynesburg University
West Chester University of Pennsylvania
Widener University
Wilkes University
Wilson College
York College Pennsylvania
Puerto Rico
Inter American University of Puerto Rico-Ponce
Inter American University of Puerto Rico-San German
Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico-Ponce
Universidad Del Este
Universidad Politecnica de Puerto Rico
University of Puerto Rico in Ponce
University of Puerto Rico-Carolina
University of Puerto Rico-Humacao
University of Puerto Rico-Mayaguez
University of Puerto Rico-Rio Piedras Campus
University of Puerto Rico-University
University of Sacred Heart
Rhode Island
Bryant University
Johnson & Wales University
Providence College
Rhode Island College
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Rhode Island School of Design
Roger Williams University 2
Salve Regina University
University of Rhode Island 3

**South Carolina**
Anderson University
Benedict College 1
Bob Jones University 1
Charleston Southern University
Citadel Military College of South Carolina 4
Clflin University 2
Clemson University
Coastal Carolina University
Coker College 12
College of Charleston 12
Columbia College 2
Columbia International University
Converse College
Francis Marion University
Furman University 1
Lander University
Limestone College
Morris College 1
Presbyterian College 2
Southern Wesleyan University
University of South Carolina-Aiken 6
University of South Carolina-Beaufort 2
University of South Carolina-Columbia
University of South Carolina-Upstate 2
Voorhees College 12
Winthrop University 2
Wofford College 12

**South Dakota**
Augustana College 1
Black Hills State University 12
Dakota State University 12
Dakota Wesleyan University
Mount Marty College
Northern State University 2
Ogala Lakota College 1
Presentation College 12
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology 12
South Dakota State University 2
University of South Dakota 2

**Tennessee**
Austin Peay State University
Baptist Memorial College of Health Sciences 5
Belmont University 1
Bethel University
Bryan College 2
Christian Brothers University
Cumberland University 1
East Tennessee State University
Fisk University 1
Johnson Bible College
King College 1
Lane College 12
Lee University
LeMoyne-Owen College 13
Lincoln Memorial University 2
Lipscomb University 12
Martin Methodist College 1
Maryville College
Memphis College of Art
Middle Tennessee State University
Milligan College 1
Rhodes College 2
Southern Adventist University 2
Tennessee State University 1
Tennessee Technological University
Tennessee Temple University
Trevecca Nazarene University 1
Tusculum College 2
Union University
University of Memphis
University of Tennessee, The 2
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, The 12
University of Tennessee-Martin, The
University of the South, Sewanee 2

**Texas**
Abilene Christian University 12
American InterContinental University
Angelo State University
Austin College 2
Baylor University 2
Concordia University Texas
East Texas Baptist University 1
Hardin-Simmons University
Houston Baptist University
Howard Payne University
Huston-Tillotson University 3
Jarvis Christian College 1
Lamar University
LeTourneau University
Lubbock Christian University 2
McMurry University 2
Midwestern State University
Northwood University
Our Lady of the Lake University-San Antonio 3
Paul Quinn College
Prairie View A&M University 13
Rice University
Saint Edward’s University
Saint Mary’s University 1
Sam Houston State University 2
Schreiner University
Southern Methodist University
Southwestern Assemblies of God University
Southwestern Christian College
Southwestern University
Stephen F. Austin State University
Texas A&M University 2
Texas A&M International University 12
Texas A&M University 1
Texas A&M University-Commerce 3
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi 13
Texas A&M University-Kingsville 23
Texas A&M University-Texarkana 4
Texas A&M University at Galveston 2
Texas Christian University 2
Texas Lutheran University 2
Texas State University-San Marcos 2
Texas Tech University 1
Texas Woman’s University 12
University of Dallas
University of Houston
University of Houston-Clear Lake
University of Houston-Downtown 2
University of Houston-Victoria 12
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor 12
University of North Texas
University of Phoenix-Houston Westside Campus
University of St. Thomas 21
University of Texas at Arlington, The 12
University of Texas at Austin, The 6
University of Texas at Brownsville, The
University of Texas at Dallas, The 12
University of Texas at El Paso, The 3
University of Texas at San Antonio, The 21
University of Texas at Tyler, The 12
University of Texas of the Permian Basin, The
University of Texas-Pan American, The 14
University of the Incarnate Word 21
Wayland Baptist University 2
West Texas A&M University 12
Wiley College 12

**Utah**
Brigham Young University 14
Dixie State College of Utah
Southern Utah University
University of Utah 2
Utah State University 2
Utah Valley University 12
Weber State University
Western Governors University
Westminster College 13

**Vermont**
Bennington College 1
Burlington College
Castleton State College
Champlain College
Green Mountain College
Johnson State College 1
Lyndon State College 1
Marlboro College 2
Middlebury College
Norwich University 2
Saint Michael’s College
Southern Vermont College 1
Sterling College
University of Vermont 2
Woodbury Institute at Champlain College

**Virginia**
Art Institute of Washington, The 1
Bluefield College
Bridgewater College
Christopher Newport University
College of William and Mary 1
Eastern Mennonite University
Emory and Henry College
Ferrum College
George Mason University 12
Hampden-Sydney College 12
Hollins University
James Madison University
Liberty University
Longwood University 7
Lynchburg College
Mary Baldwin College
Marymount University 1
Norfolk State University 12
Old Dominion University
Radford University
Randolph College
Randolph-Macon College 1
Regent University 2
Roanoke College 11
Shenandoah University 1
Southern Virginia University 12
Sweet Briar College 12
University of Mary Washington
University of Richmond 2
University of Virginia
University of Virginia’s College at Wise, The
Virginia Commonwealth University 12
Virginia Commonwealth University 12
Virginia Intermont College 12
Virginia Military Institute
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Virginia Union University 1
Virginia Wesleyan College
Washington and Lee University 12

**Washington**
Central Washington University
Eastern Washington University 1
Evergreen State College, The 2
Gonzaga University
Heritage University 13
Northwest University
Pacific Lutheran University 12
Saint Martin’s University
Seattle Pacific University 2
Seattle University 1
University of Puget Sound
University of Washington-Bothell Campus
University of Washington-Seattle Campus
University of Washington-Tacoma Campus 12

---
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Participating Colleges and Universities: 2000–2010 (continued)

Washington State University
Western Washington University
Whitman College
Whitworth University

West Virginia
Alderson Broaddus College
American Public University System
Bethany College
Bluefield State College
Concord University
Davis & Elkins College
Fairmont State University
Marshall University
Mountain State University
Shepherd University
University of Charleston
West Liberty University
West Virginia State University
West Virginia University
West Virginia University Institute of Technology
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Wheeling Jesuit University

Wisconsin
Alverno College
Beloit College
Cardinal Stritch University
Carroll University
Carthage College
Concordia University-Wisconsin
Edgewood College
Lakeland College
Lawrence University
Maranatha Baptist Bible College Inc.
Marian University
Marquette University
Milwaukee Institute of Art & Design
Milwaukee School of Engineering
Mount Mary College
Northland College
Ripon College
Saint Norbert College
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
University of Wisconsin-Green Bay
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse
University of Wisconsin-Madison
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh
University of Wisconsin-Parkside
University of Wisconsin-Platteville
University of Wisconsin-River Falls
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point
University of Wisconsin-Stout
University of Wisconsin-Superior
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Viterbo University
Wisconsin Lutheran College

Wyoming
University of Wyoming

Canada

Alberta
Ambrose University College
Grant MacEwan University
Mount Royal University
University of Alberta
University of Calgary
University of Lethbridge

British Columbia
Capilano University
Kwantlen Polytechnic University
Quest University Canada
Royal Roads University
Simon Fraser University
Thompson Rivers University
Trinity Western University
University of British Columbia
University of British Columbia, Okanagan
University of Northern British Columbia
University of the Fraser Valley
University of Victoria
Vancouver Island University

Manitoba
Brandon University
University of Manitoba
University of Winnipeg

New Brunswick
Mount Allison University
St. Thomas University
University of New Brunswick-Fredericton
University of New Brunswick-Saint John Campus

Nova Scotia
Acadia University
Dalhousie University
Mount St. Vincent University
Nova Scotia Agricultural College
Saint Mary's University
St. Francis Xavier University
University of King's College

Ontario
Algoma University
Brescia University College
Brock University
Carleton University
Humber College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning
Huron University College
King's College
Lakehead University
Laurentian University
McMaster University
Nipissing University
Ontario College of Art and Design
Queen's University
Ryerson University
Trent University
Tyndale University College and Seminary
Université d’Ottawa/University of Ottawa
Université de Hearst
University of Guelph
University of Ontario-Institute of Technology
University of Ottawa
Université de Outaouais
Vancouver Island University
University of Victoria
University of the Fraser Valley
University of Western Ontario
University of Windsor
Wilfrid Laurier University
York University

Prince Edward Island
University of Prince Edward Island

Quebec
Bishop's University
Concordia University
École de technologie supérieure
McGill University
Université de Montréal, Montréal Campus
Université de Sherbrooke
Université du Québec à Chicoutimi
Université du Québec à Montréal
Université du Québec à Rimouski
Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières
Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue
Université du Québec en Outaouais
Université Laval

Saskatchewan
University of Regina
University of Saskatchewan

Afghanistan
American University of Afghanistan, The

Egypt
American University in Cairo, The

Lebanon
Lebanese American University

Qatar
Carnegie Mellon, Qatar Campus
Georgetown University School of Foreign Service in Qatar
Texas A&M University at Qatar
Virginia Commonwealth University in Qatar

United Arab Emirates
American University of Sharjah
Petroleum Institute, The

Notes: 1 Participated in the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE)
2 Participated in the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)
3 Participating in the Building Engagement and Attainment of Minority Students project (BEAMS)
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