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The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) documents dimensions of quality in undergraduate education and provides information and assistance to colleges, universities, and other organizations to improve student learning. Its primary activity is annually surveying college students to assess the extent to which they engage in educational practices associated with high levels of learning and development.
Much good news will be found in the pages that follow—good news particularly for prospective undergraduates and their parents, and good news generally for those who are concerned about higher education. This 2004 NSSE Report is peppered with examples of campuses that use NSSE data to enhance teaching and learning on their campuses. I applaud the hundreds of participating colleges and universities listed in the back of the report. They and their leaders have shown that they care about the engagement of their students relative to their institutional peers and in absolute terms. They want to improve the quality of student learning, and they find NSSE an important tool in that effort.

Once again this year, college rankings were in the headlines, though they were overshadowed by the scoring scandals that roiled the Olympics. In the end, the problems involved with scoring gymnastics and scoring colleges are not dissimilar. Whether a particular athlete was properly awarded a few hundredths of a point, and thus a medal, depends on both objective measures and subjective judgments made in the applications of formulae that are largely hidden from public view. Where a particular college is ranked depends largely on some objective measures, particularly the selectivity of colleges in choosing their students, based on average ACT or SAT scores, and some subjective measures, particularly the judgments of college and university presidents who are asked to rank other colleges based on their reputation. As one who used to fill out those surveys regularly, I can attest that few institutional leaders are familiar with more than a small share of the campuses that they rank, and that most of their opinions are based on little more than gossip.

More troubling, in terms of college rankings, is the study in Change magazine by George D. Kuh, Chancellor’s Professor at Indiana University, the guiding spirit of NSSE, and Ernest T. Pascarella, the Mary Louise Peterson Professor at the University of Iowa. They showed first that for all practical purposes the national rankings in US News & World Report of the top 50 universities can be reproduced largely by looking at student selectivity—the SAT or ACT scores of their incoming students. Then they examined the extent to which student selectivity and the effective educational practices such as those represented on NSSE are related. Kuh and Pascarella clearly demonstrate that the relation is minimal—student selectivity is a poor indicator of whether students on a campus are engaged learners. Obviously, student selectivity—and thus rankings—and good educational practices are not mutually exclusive. But prospective students and their parents could make troubling mistakes if they rely solely on the rankings of campuses.

NSSE has become known, and widely used, for its attention to more meaningful and relevant indicators of quality such as the extent to which students find the academic work challenging, the degree to which they are active learners, the extent of student-faculty interactions, the richness of the out-of-class experiences, the overall campus environment, the exposure to diverse cultural experiences, and the scope of technology uses.
compare her campus findings with those at peer campuses, generally or even within a field or discipline. Knowing an issue, of course, does not mean that it will be addressed, let alone resolved. But it is much more likely that faculty members in a discipline or cluster of disciplines will be willing to take steps to remedy a concern if they see hard evidence that compares responses from students in their discipline with those from students in other disciplines within their institution. It can also be instructive to compare student responses to ones from undergraduates at peer colleges or universities with which they compete.

Now that NSSE has made an indelible mark in undergraduate education, college leaders are also finding that NSSE can serve as a useful assessment instrument for consortia of institutions that are especially interested in learning in depth about one particular dimension of the undergraduate experience on their campuses. A prime example is the American Democracy Project, which is co-sponsored by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities in collaboration with The New York Times and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The aim of this ambitious project is to enhance the civic engagement of students in the 191 participating campuses. The project is focused on civic learning in the curriculum, the co-curriculum, and in the activities and arrangements that make up the campus environment.

With the help of the NSSE staff, a set of civic engagement questions was added last year to the core survey for 32 campuses that are participating in both the American Democracy Project and NSSE. (These questions go beyond the set of experimental items about civic engagement that were included on NSSE this year. Conclusions from those items are summarized later in this report.) The answers to these additional questions showed that most students, both freshmen and seniors, are concerned about major issues of public policy such as education and the environment, though the differences between female and male students on some issues was significant. For example, concern about human rights issues and about civil rights issues was registered by 91% and 89% of female students, respectively, as opposed to 81% and 78% of male students. On the other hand, there were few differences between full-time and part-time students. A troubling finding is that only small percentages of students were actively involved in civic activities such as “contacted public official about an issue” (7% of freshmen and 13% of seniors) and only 37% of seniors said they had even voted. In short, there is much work that needs to be done by the campuses of the American Democracy Project. Their willingness to engage in this supplemental effort is a good sign they will take steps to help grapple with the problem. This tailored use of the NSSE survey promises to help shape how best to target efforts to this end.

Some insights can already be gained from the NSSE survey that will be helpful to particular types of colleges. The NSSE survey will be useful, for example, to those who want to publicize the special benefits of attending a women’s college. It shows that in general, women at those colleges are more engaged in the good educational practices covered by NSSE than women at co-educational institutions. They report higher levels of academic challenge, greater opportunities for active and collaborative learning, more interactions with faculty members, and more interaction with diverse peers.

Using NSSE as part of a consortia of institutions with similar characteristics, such as public liberal
arts colleges or faith-based colleges, offers many more opportunities to examine in depth particular dimensions of the undergraduate experience that are otherwise difficult to assess, especially without measures that are common for a number of like campuses.

If NSSE is such a good idea, why are some college and university leaders deciding not to participate? My informal soundings suggest that a primary reason is that some campuses do not see the benefit compared to what they view as the risks. They think their institutions are doing a great job of educating talented undergraduates and they are particularly concerned lest data show that there are gaps in student engagement in comparison to their peers. Some of those institutions give NSSE the highest compliment by copying the NSSE approach in their own surveys, and we applaud those efforts when they are successful.

Others, however, are simply choosing not to know the facts about their institution—even though the information is confidential—in comparison with others. One of our challenges is helping their leaders to understand that it makes sense to learn the facts about student engagement and then to take steps to improve. Without the facts, progress will happen only by happenstance, not by design.

NSSE is certainly not a perfect instrument to measure student engagement, and student engagement is not all there is to undergraduate education. But NSSE is a remarkably useful tool for everyone on a campus who wants to improve undergraduate education. Thanks to helpful advice from many who use NSSE, we are confident that results from the survey will be even more useful in the future.

All of those involved with NSSE will welcome your comments and suggestions in the years ahead.

Thomas Ehrlich
Senior Scholar, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching

“NSSE is a remarkably useful tool for everyone on a campus who wants to improve undergraduate education.”
There’s a lot of buzz these days about student success. It’s an umbrella term for a host of desirable outcomes of college including achievement, satisfaction, a variety of learning and personal development measures, and educational attainment. As college costs rise and participation in postsecondary education becomes ever more important, the federal government, parents, and students among others are asking tough questions about what they can reasonably expect an institution of higher education should contribute to student success. College enrollments are at an all-time high, yet the proportion of students earning degrees has stayed nearly constant for decades. This leads some to conclude that colleges aren’t holding up their end of the educational bargain. Higher education leaders predictably push back, pointing to the fact that record numbers of students today start college with one or more academic deficiencies. Access, they say, comes at a price—the risk that some students may not be ready to perform at the level required to succeed. Both positions have merit, suggesting that graduating more students while increasing educational quality is both a national priority and a complex challenge.

Among the students who start college ill-prepared are some who are the first in their family to attend college. Many of these students lack tacit knowledge about what college will be like. Other traditional-age students are not developmentally “ready” to do serious academic work. For these and a host of other reasons—most of which they cannot control—they struggle academically and socially. Indeed, a sizable fraction is figuratively lost at sea. They see few markers on their daily horizons that direct them toward familiar activities, allow them to build on their strengths, give them confidence to try new things, and motivate them to invest the necessary time and energy to meet academic challenges. These are among the behaviors associated with success in college. But for many reasons, large numbers of students do not engage in them frequently or well enough, though they are capable of doing so. The result? They leave college. Many never return to try again.

To come to grips with this unacceptable waste of human potential, some colleges and universities are taking action. One important step is to create pathways to engagement that are clearly marked, so that students can more easily find their way to educational resources and become involved in purposeful activities. Through a combination of intentionally crafted policies and practices, these institutions begin to teach students long before they arrive on campus what they can expect from faculty, staff, and other students, and what they themselves need to do to thrive. They arrange for students to participate in events and activities upon matriculation to help them effectively navigate their new environment and make meaning of their experiences. And they monitor student performance in the crucial first weeks and months of college, giving students plenty of early feedback about the nature and quality of their work.

A research team organized by the NSSE Institute for Effective Educational Practice learned a good deal about what such pathways look like from a two-year study of 20 four-year colleges and universities that had higher-than-predicted graduation rates and higher-than-predicted scores on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). More information about the Documenting Effective Educational
A Message from the Director (continued)

Practice (DEEP) project is described later in this report. In the following pages, I would like to briefly review what selected pathways to success look like.

**Pathways to Engagement**

To channel student time and energy toward effective educational activities, the schools in the DEEP study do two things very well. First, they teach students early on how to take advantage of institutional resources for their learning. To be sure students take advantage of these resources, these colleges sometimes require certain students to participate in activities, such as summer advising and orientation as well as substantive welcome-week events in the fall. Second, they make available to students what they need when they need it. Faculty and staff members identify students at risk and assiduously follow up with intensive advising and other mechanisms that enable students to mark their progress over the course of the first year.

**Teaching Newcomers**

Project DEEP colleges and universities send prospective students clear messages about the institution’s mission, values, and expectations. Most offer pre-college opportunities for students who need a head start in adapting to college. For example, Creating Higher Expectations for Educational Readiness (CHEER) is Fayetteville State’s summer transition program that helps students acquire the academic skills and social confidence they need to succeed in college. CHEER students receive scholarships to cover the cost of the three credit MATH 121, Introduction to Algebra course.

The Ursinus College Bridge Program was created in the late 1980s. Participants take an intensive sociology or literature course during the three-week late-summer program that acclimates them to the College’s academic demands. Faculty advisors monitor students’ academic progress and meet with students on a weekly basis during the fall term. Successful by any measure, Bridge Program students now graduate from Ursinus at the same rate as majority students.

Applicants to the University of Michigan receive a compact disc describing what the experience will be like—“an academic boot camp,” as one administrator characterized it. Its Pathways to Student Success and Excellence (POSSE) program provides academically and economically disadvantaged undergraduates with tutoring and academic advising primarily in the first and second year. As one student told us, “POSSE taught me how to survive the University of Michigan.”

Winston-Salem State University’s pathway to success starts with its First Year College (FYC). Most FYC offices and programs are housed in one building near the center of campus, conveniently locating most sources of academic support for new students under one roof. All new and transfer students with fewer than 30 credit hours must enroll in one of three new-student adjustment courses. One distinctive twist is designating certain sections for students interested in specific majors. Faculty members teaching these sections also serve as academic advisors and “mentors” for the first academic year. Student services professionals teach sections for undecided students. The FYC instructors receive pre-service training and meet every other week to discuss how the course is going and to share ideas.

California State University-Monterey Bay (CSUMB) introduces its new students, including transfers, to the flow and substance of academic and social life through the Freshman-Year Experience Seminar. Students design an Individualized Learning Plan (ILP) that will guide their studies throughout the

“NSSE has elevated campus-level discussion on student engagement, providing university leaders with the comparative data needed to evaluate the campus learning environment and implement needed change.”—Molly Broad, President, University of North Carolina
baccalaureate experience, and are expected to periodically update the ILP to respond to their changing educational and vocational goals. One key reflection point is the required major-specific ProSeminar 300 in the junior year.

One of the University of Texas at El Paso’s signature interventions is UNIV 1301, a transition to college course taught by an instructional team of a faculty member, peer leader, and librarian. Classes are small, making it possible for students to work frequently with others and to get to know their classmates in a setting that values active and collaborative learning, the cornerstone of the UTEP experience. Instructors emphasize active-learning techniques including “open forums” and group projects. UNIV 1301 instructors, along with the peer leaders, meet with each student in their class twice during the fall semester to review the student’s academic progress; they typically follow up with their students the next semester to monitor their performance.

Evergreen’s roadmap to success is organized around its “Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate,” which outlines what students should strive for in their individualized academic plan. The Expectations flow from the College’s Five Foci for teaching and learning: interdisciplinary learning; learning across significant differences; personal engagement with learning; linking theory to practice; and collaborative learning. Both the Expectations and Five Foci are posted in main buildings and outdoor kiosks as a constant reminder to students.

Another way DEEP schools instill in students a commitment to engage fully in campus life is through meaningful rituals and traditions. On “Traditions Night” at the University of Kansas, more than 3,000 students gather in the football stadium to rehearse the Rock Chalk Chant and hear stories about the Jayhawk, a mythical bird that along with being the campus mascot is a powerful, enduring symbol of Kansas as a Free State. To deepen new students’ commitment to graduating from KU, students who are second and third generation Jayhawks are asked to stand at a point during the event while a torch is passed from a student representing the senior class to a first-year student class representative, both of whom are usually fourth or fifth generation Jayhawks. The ritual is powerful and moving for everyone involved.

Aligning Resources with Student Needs

Showing newcomers what they must do to succeed in college is necessary but not sufficient. Also important is an infrastructure of support including early warning systems, redundant safety nets, reward systems, and ongoing assessment. DEEP colleges purposefully align their resources and structures with their educational missions, curricular offerings,

Expectations of an Evergreen Graduate

- Articulate and assume responsibility for your own work
- Participate collaboratively and responsibly in our diverse society
- Communicate creatively and effectively
- Demonstrate integrative, independent, and critical thinking
- Apply qualitative, quantitative, and creative modes of inquiry appropriately to practical and theoretical problems across disciplines
- Demonstrate depth, breadth, and synthesis of learning and the ability to reflect on the personal and social significance of that learning

and student abilities and aspirations, continually tweaking or introducing new programs to meet changing student needs.

DEEP schools set high, but reasonable, standards for achievement consistent with students’ academic preparation but at levels that also stretch them to go beyond what they think they can accomplish. After reviewing its NSSE results and other information, Miami University was convinced its students would learn even more if more of their time and energy were directed toward educationally purposeful activities. The University introduced the “Choice Matters” initiative with the goal that students become more intentional about how they spend their time and reflect more systematically on what they are learning from their experiences, inside and outside the classroom. A menu of linked programs compose the initiative, including: (1) Miami Plan Foundation courses taught by full-time faculty; (2) optional first-year seminars; (3) community living options that emphasize leadership and service; and (4) cultural, intellectual, and arts events.

Many first-generation college students at the University of Maine at Farmington must work to attend college. Up until several years ago, most students who worked did so off campus, which research shows is related to a greater likelihood of leaving college prematurely. After documenting this behavior, the University increased the number of meaningful work-study jobs on campus. The program began in 1998 with an $86,000 allocation from the UMF president. Five years later the Student Work Initiative fund had doubled. Campus jobs were created with two goals in mind: (1) to provide students with meaningful learning experiences through employment, and (2) to increase persistence and graduation rates. Now, about 50% of UMF students work on campus, and the rate of student persistence to graduation has improved from 51% to 56% and continues to climb.

Most DEEP schools have early warning systems in place to identify and support students at academic risk. George Mason University monitors students’ performance to ensure they do not slip through the cracks. In the midterm progress report, faculty members, who receive reports for their advisees, and the Academic Advising office, which receives grades for undeclared students, contact students with low grades. In addition, the UNIV 100 orientation course uses a series of assessments as student performance indicators. Students can access their assessment records online, as well as faculty evaluations when they register for class.

Fayetteville State’s Early Alert System depends on an intricate network of faculty, mentors, academic support units, and University College and Career Center staff to identify and assist students in academic difficulty. Faculty members teaching 100-level courses are paired with University College staff, while those teaching courses at the 200 level and above work with colleagues at the Advisement and Career Services Center to intervene when needed. Within the first two weeks of the semester, all faculty teaching freshmen-level courses receive a roster indicating the mentor (usually the instructor of the First-Year Seminar course) for each first-year student. The faculty use this information to contact the mentor and the University College to alert them about students experiencing difficulty. Mentors, in turn, contact students and determine whether additional referrals are needed.

---

“NSSE was launched with ambitious aims—among them to be widely used by institutions to improve undergraduate education and to help reshape public perceptions of collegiate quality. In five short years, NSSE has done all this and more. No other measure has become so authoritative and so informative so quickly.”
—Peter T. Ewell, Vice President, National Center for Higher Educational Management Systems

---

It’s Much More Complicated Than This

These are just a few of the many initiatives we found at the 20 Project DEEP colleges and universities that help put students on a pathway to success.
by involving them early and often in effective educational practices. Some of the guideposts that mark these paths are tied directly to the academic program, such as first-year seminars, regular advising meetings, and capstone courses. Others are interwoven into the institutions’ social fabric, such as convocations that raise aspirations and celebrate academic achievement. In general, these schools are unmistakably intentional about periodically reminding students about the resources and services available to help them succeed. Some institutions are more intrusive than others in this regard; some require specific activities of some or all of their students. Others have few, if any, such requirements. Additionally, they tailor their efforts to meet the needs of their students. Each institution sets standards according to what is reasonable, given students’ educational backgrounds and aspirations, and provides the support—remedial, supplemental, or enrichment—students need to meet these standards. Most important, the programs and practices they offer are of unusually high quality and touch large numbers of students.

Creating pathways to success is one of a handful of integrated, complementary conditions we found operating at DEEP colleges and universities. While we do not claim that these schools are the “best” in the country, they all have in place numerous policies and practices that are worthy of emulation in other settings with appropriate adaptations. We describe these noteworthy efforts more fully in Student Success in College: Creating Conditions That Matter, which will be available from Jossey-Bass and the American Association for Higher Education in March 2005.

NSSE 2004

Now, I invite you to review the highlights from the 2004 NSSE program. This is the fifth such report featuring insights into the relationships between effective educational practice and selected aspects of student success. The data come from more than 160,000 first-year and senior students randomly sampled from more than 470 institutions. Other analyses examine a few noteworthy trends over time and the results from experimental items added to the NSSE online version, including the relationships between selected civic engagement activities and other educationally purposeful activities during college. Finally, as with previous reports, we offer examples of how a variety of institutions are using their NSSE data.

This report is the product of the combined efforts of an enormously talented cadre of personnel at the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and the Indiana University Center for Survey Research in partnership with the participating colleges and universities. The names of these people as well as the colleges and universities that have used NSSE are listed later. Please join me in thanking them for their superb contributions.

George D. Kuh
Chancellor’s Professor and Director
Center for Postsecondary Research
Indiana University Bloomington
Quick Facts

Survey
The annual NSSE survey is entirely supported by institutional participation fees. The survey itself, The College Student Report, is available in paper and Web versions and takes about 15 minutes to complete.

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

Partners
Established with a grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts. Current support for research and development projects is from Lumina Foundation for Education, the Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College, and the American Association for Higher Education. Cosponsored by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Pew Forum on Undergraduate Learning.

Participating Colleges and Universities
More than 620,000 students at 850 different four-year colleges and universities thus far. About 500 schools are registered for the spring 2005 program.

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

Administration
Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research in cooperation with the Indiana University Center for Survey Research and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS).

Validity & Reliability
The NSSE survey was designed by experts and extensively tested to ensure validity and reliability and to minimize non-response bias and mode effects. For more information visit the NSSE Web site at www.iub.edu/~nsse.

Response Rates
Average institutional response rate for paper and Web versions is about 42%, with a range of 15% to 89%.

Audiences
College and university administrators, faculty members, students, governing boards, external authorities such as accreditors and government agencies, prospective students and their families, college advisors, institutional researchers, higher education scholars.

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. Results specific to each college or university and identified as such will not be made public except by mutual agreement.

Cost
Institutions pay a minimum participation fee ranging from $1,800 to $7,800 determined by undergraduate enrollment.

Current Initiatives
NSSE is involved with the American Democracy Projects which is cosponsored by American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and The New York Times. The NSSE Institute for Effective Educational Practice is also collaborating with AAHE on two major initiatives, Documenting Effective Educational Practices (DEEP) and Building Engagement and Attainment of Minority Students (BEAMS), and with The Policy Center on the First Year of College “Foundations of Excellence” project.

Other Programs and Services
Faculty Survey, Beginning College Student Survey, Law School Survey, NSSE workshops, faculty and staff retreats, consulting, peer comparisons, norms data, and special analyses.

Consortium & State or University Systems
Numerous peer groups (e.g., urban institutions, women’s colleges, research institutions, Christian colleges, engineering, and technical schools) and state and university systems (e.g., California State University, Georgia, Indiana, Kentucky, Massachusetts, North Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Wisconsin) have formed to ask additional mission-specific questions and share aggregated data.

Data Sources
Randomly selected first-year and senior students from hundreds of four-year colleges and universities. Supplemented by other information such as institutional records, results from other surveys, and data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Table 1
NSSE 2000-2004 Participating Colleges and Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Doc/Res-Ext</th>
<th>Doc/Res-Int</th>
<th>Master’s I &amp; 2</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>NSSE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student Engagement Quiz

True or False?

1. More seniors at liberal arts colleges work on research projects with a faculty member than their counterparts at research universities.

2. First-year students at master’s colleges and universities and research universities spend more time in extracurricular activities than students at liberal arts colleges.

3. Seniors at doctoral research-intensive universities use technology such as listservs, chat groups, and the internet to discuss or complete assignments more than seniors at liberal arts colleges.

4. Fewer students attending institutions with “most competitive” admissions criteria report gaining a substantial amount in terms of their understanding of people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds compared with those at the “least competitive” institutions.¹

5. More students at master’s colleges and universities are first in their family to go to college than students at liberal arts colleges.

6. First-year students at urban universities are more likely to work off-campus more than 10 hours a week than their counterparts at other schools.

7. More students at research universities do community service as part of a class than students attending liberal arts colleges.

8. More first-year students at research universities participate in learning communities compared with students at liberal arts colleges.

9. Fewer first-year students at small public colleges and universities report grades of “A” compared with first-year students at medium-size private colleges and universities.

10. Students at liberal arts colleges are more likely to study a foreign language and study abroad compared with students at master’s colleges and universities.

Note:

¹ Selectivity guide by Barron’s Profiles of American Colleges.

Answers

1. True, 33% at liberal arts colleges
2. False, students at liberal arts colleges spend an average of 10 hours per week on extracurricular activities versus 7 hours at master’s colleges and universities.
3. True, 55% of students at liberal arts colleges study a second language for at least 9 months, compared with 35% at master’s colleges and universities.
4. True, 75% of first-year students at liberal arts colleges report communicating with students at other research-intensive institutions, compared with 65% at master’s colleges and universities.
5. True, 55% of students at liberal arts colleges report participating in learning communities.
6. True, 15% of first-year students participate in learning communities.
7. True, 35% of first-year students at small public colleges and universities report grades of “A”.
8. True, 55% of students at liberal arts colleges study abroad.
9. False, 33% at liberal arts colleges and universities are first in their family to go to college.
10. True, 20% of first-year students at research universities study abroad.

Student engagement information is often used to challenge existing assumptions related to the college student experience—whether it is for institutional improvement purposes or to assist during the college decision-making process. This short quiz is designed to challenge your knowledge of the college student experience at various types of colleges and universities.
Student Engagement in 2004—A Closer Look

Selected Results

In the past five years, more than 620,000 students at 850 four-year colleges and universities across the country have reported their college activities and experiences by completing the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). As a result, NSSE is a leading authoritative voice dedicated to improving undergraduate education, enhancing student success, and promoting collegiate quality.

Campuses use NSSE results to stimulate conversations about how to enhance student learning and improve collegiate quality. The following sections highlight key findings from this year’s annual survey.

- When faculty members expect students to study more and arrange class work toward this end, students do so.
- Students at historically Black colleges and universities are far more likely to participate in a community project linked to a course and report gaining more in personal, social, and ethical development.
- Students who engage more frequently in “deep” learning activities report greater educational and personal gains from college, participate in more enriching educational experiences, perceive their campus to be more supportive, and are more satisfied overall with college.

Promising Findings

Since 2000, some aspects of the student experience have improved. For example, today more seniors:

- Participate in service learning (+7%)
- Have serious conversations with students with different social, political, and religious views (+10%)
- Perceive their campus administration to be helpful, considerate, and flexible (+15%)

Some findings for all students:

- About 9 of 10 students rate their college experience “good” or “excellent” and 82% would “probably” or “definitely” attend the same school if they were starting college again.
- Four-fifths of fraternity and sorority members participate in a fundraising event compared with only 43% of non-Greek members.
- Three-fifths of seniors and 37% of first-year students do community service or volunteer work.

Disappointing Findings

- About half of denominational college students say that their institution substantially (“very much” or “quite a bit”) contributes to their development of a deepened sense of spirituality compared with only 19% of the students at public institutions.
- Only one-tenth of students rely on newspapers or magazines as their primary source of local, national, or international news; more than half say television is their primary source.
- Two-fifths of first-year students and a quarter of seniors “never” discuss ideas from their classes or readings with a faculty member outside of class.
- One-fifth of all students spend no time exercising.
- More than a quarter of all students have “never” attended an art exhibit, gallery, play, dance, or other theater performance during the current school year.

“NSSE is giving us increasingly credible evidence of student engagement in effective educational practices and allows us to compare campus findings with those of local, regional, and national peers.”—Trudy Banta, Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Other Key Findings

Here are some other key NSSE 2004 findings. Additional results by Class and by Carnegie type can be found in the Summary Statistics section of the report on page 34.

Time on Task

What students put into their education determines what they get out of it. Table 2 outlines how students spend their time during the week.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Activity</th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working on-campus</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working off-campus</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in co-curricular activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing and socializing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring for dependents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting to class</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A non-trivial fraction of seniors (about 19%) spend 11 or more hours per week caring for dependents.
- A quarter of all students spend 16 or more hours a week relaxing and socializing, nearly one out of every ten (8%) spends more than 25 hours.

Living Arrangements

- Forty-five percent of all students live in campus housing (68% of first-year students, 22% of seniors). The remainder live within driving distance (41%), within walking distance (13%), or in a fraternity or sorority house (1%).

Fraternity and Sorority Membership

- Twelve percent of men and 10% of women are members of a social fraternity or sorority.

Grades

- About two-fifths of all students reported that they earned mostly A grades, another 41% reported grades of either B or B+, and only 3% of students reported earning mostly Cs or lower.

Parental Education

- Thirty-four percent of NSSE respondents are first-generation college students, 37% have parents who both graduated from college, 22% have master’s degrees, and 7% reported parents with doctoral degrees.

Multiple Institutions

- Approximately 36% of students attend one or more “other institutions” in addition to the one at which they were currently enrolled. Of this group, 25% went to another four-year college, 36% to a community college, 7% to a vocational-technical school, 6% to another form of postsecondary education, and 25% went to a combination of these.
Student Engagement in 2004—A Closer Look

College Activities

The survey includes questions about the nature of the activities in which students engage. A “substantial amount” of engagement is defined to be at least 50% of all students reporting “often” or “very often” on a given item (Table 3). The least frequent activities are those where the percentage of students who respond “never” exceed 35%, meaning that roughly one-third had no experiences in these areas during the 2003-2004 academic year.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most Frequent Activities</th>
<th>First-Year Students*</th>
<th>Seniors*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, coworkers, etc.)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received prompt feedback from faculty members on your academic performance (written or oral)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs) in class discussions or writing assignments</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent responding “Very often” or “Often”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Least Frequent Activities</th>
<th>First-Year Students*</th>
<th>Seniors*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated in community-based project as part of a regular course</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored or taught other students</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent responding “Never”

Educational and Personal Growth

A number of questions on the survey ask students to self-report the extent to which their college experience has contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development. Table 4 highlights the percentage of students reporting substantial (“very much” and “quite a bit”) gains from their educational experience.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Reported Educational and Personal Gains From College</th>
<th>First-Year Students*</th>
<th>Seniors*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring a broad general education</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with others</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning effectively on your own</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using computing and information technology</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding yourself</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing quantitative problems</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a personal code of values and ethics</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving complex real-world problems</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the welfare of your community</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a deepened sense of spirituality</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting in local, state, or national elections</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent responding “very much” or “quite a bit”
NSSE annually reports student participation in selected enriching educational experiences. This year NSSE revised the response options for these activities to obtain more accurate information about the experiences in which seniors have participated before graduation.

Table 5 shows certain types of students are more likely to engage in various activities. This analysis only includes seniors and adjusts for differences in major field of study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Practicum, internship, or field, co-op, or clinical experience</th>
<th>Community service or volunteer work</th>
<th>Learning community</th>
<th>Research with faculty member outside of program</th>
<th>Foreign language coursework</th>
<th>Studying abroad</th>
<th>Independent study or self-designed major</th>
<th>Culminating senior experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nontraditional</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American vs. White</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific vs. White</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic vs. White</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-generation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternity/Sorority Member</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varsity Athlete</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ indicates student is more likely to participate
- indicates student is less likely to participate

- On balance, African Americans, foreign nationals, fraternity or sorority members, and varsity athletes are more likely to participate in one or more enriching activity.

- Older students, Asian/Pacific Islanders, students of Hispanic origin, first-generation students, part-time students, transfers, and commuters are less likely than their counterparts to participate in one or more of these activities.
Arts, Wellness and Spirituality

This year NSSE added items to the core survey related to attending fine and performing arts events, participating in exercise and physical fitness activities, and engaging in spiritual activities and spiritual development during college.

Fine and Performing Arts
Roughly one quarter of students (28% first-years, 24% seniors), indicated that they frequently (“very often” or “often”) attended an art exhibit, gallery, play, dance, or other theater performance. Yet, about 1 in 4 first-year students (26%) and about 1 in 3 seniors (31%) “never” attended one such event during the current school year. For both first-year students and seniors, the frequency with which they went to fine or performing arts events was positively related to the emphasis students perceived the institution placed on attending campus events and activities. Attending fine or performing arts events was negatively related to the number of hours per week the student worked off campus, provided care for dependents, or commuted to class.

Exercise and Physical Fitness
Although at least half of all students (56% of first-years, 50% of seniors) frequently exercised or participated in physical fitness activities, 17% of first-year students and 21% of seniors reported that they “never” participated in these activities during the current school year. The percentage of students who participated in exercise or physical fitness activities varied by type of institution attended, ranging from almost two-thirds (67% first-years, 64% seniors) at baccalaureate liberal arts institutions to about half (51% first-years, 44% seniors) at doctoral intensive institutions. Exercising was negatively related to the number of hours per week spent working off-campus, providing care for dependents, and commuting to class, but was positively related to students’ perceptions of the amount of support the institution provided to meet their social needs.

Spiritual Activity and Spiritual Development
During the current school year, about one-third of all students (32% first-years, 31% seniors) frequently participated in activities to enhance their spirituality; however, 42% never participated in these activities. Frequent participation in spirituality-enhancing activities was more common for students at denominational institutions (44% first-years, 41% seniors) than those at other types of colleges and universities (25% first-years, 26% seniors). At the same time, more than a quarter of the students at denominational institutions (26% first-years, 29% seniors) said they “never” engaged in such activities.

About a third of all students (33% first years, 30% seniors) reported that their experience at the institution contributed “quite a bit” or “very much” to their deepened sense of spirituality. Again, students at denominational colleges were more likely than their counterparts elsewhere to report gaining substantially in spirituality during college. Not surprisingly, how often students participated in spirituality-enhancing activities was strongly linked (r=.42) to gains in spiritual development, especially at denominational institutions (r=.52).
Arts, Wellness and Spirituality (continued)

Percent of students who attended a fine or performing arts event during their school year.

Percent of students who exercised during their current school year.

Percent of students who participated in activities to enhance spirituality during their current school year.

Percent of students who reported extent to which college experience contributed to their development of a deepened sense of spirituality during their current school year.
Civic Engagement

Many groups such as the Association of American Colleges and Universities are encouraging campuses to take a more active role in preparing students to practice democratic citizenship, on and off campus. For example, the American Democracy Project (ADP), a joint project of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and The New York Times, seeks to increase the number of undergraduate students who understand and are committed to engaging in meaningful civic actions.

To help document the level of college student involvement in civic activities, NSSE added five experimental items to the online survey (Table 6).

- 54% of male students and 46% of females at least “sometimes” expressed their opinions about a political or community issue in a public forum.
- 93% of all students used one or more media source to stay informed about political or community issues.
- Four-fifths (81%) of fraternity and sorority members participated at least once in a fundraising event, while more than half (57%) of non-Greek members “never” did so.
- More than one-fourth of all students attended a rally, vigil, or protest.

Students reporting higher levels of civic engagement also reported that their college experience contributed more to knowledge about voting in local, state or national elections and contributing to the welfare of their community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Students Responding to Civic Engagement Experimental Items</th>
<th>Very Often or Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressed your opinion about a political or community issue in a public forum (e.g., sent a letter or e-mail to the media, contacted a government official, made a speech, signed a petition)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used media sources (e.g., newspaper, radio, television, Internet) to stay informed about local political or community issues</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a fundraising event (e.g., phone-a-thon, run, walk, dance marathon)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a rally, vigil, or protest about an issue that is important to you</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Led meetings or activities for a local community organization or religious group</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Newspapers and magazines are the primary source of national and international news for only about 10% of students.”

- 22% of first-year students and 30% of seniors led meetings or activities for groups or organizations.
- Students at liberal arts colleges more frequently engaged in civic activities than their counterparts at other schools.
American Democracy Project (ADP)

About 12,000 students from a consortium of 32 ADP-member AASCU institutions answered an additional 18 civic engagement questions. Some key findings are highlighted in Table 7.

- The vast majority considered education, environmental, healthcare, and human rights issues to be at least “somewhat” important.
- Women students consider religious, safety/security, human rights, and civil rights issues to be more important than men do.
- About 25% of first-year students and 37% of seniors had voted in an election, either on- or off-campus.
- Only about 10% had contacted public officials about an issue; and less than 10% organized a petition, volunteered with a political campaign, or ran for an elected position.
- More than half of all respondents say that television is their primary source for news; newspapers and magazines are the primary source of national and international news for only about 10%.

"NSSE is an invaluable device for assessing the degree to which we are engaged in those practices that are known to promote student learning. I know of no better way to promote institutional improvement and accountability." —Michael S. Bassis, President, Westminster College

### Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voted in an election either on or off campus</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered with a local community organization or religious group</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundraised for a charitable organization</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signed a petition related to a political or community issue</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joined a local community group or association</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a fundraising run/walk/ride</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sent a letter or e-mail to the media</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted public officials about an issue</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displayed buttons, signs, or stickers about political or social issues</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ran for an elected leadership position on or off the campus</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a boycott, protest, or rally about an issue</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that is important to you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteered to work on a political or issue campaign</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized a petition</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deep Learning

Students have far more learning potential than traditional pedagogical methods often tap. One of the pleasant surprises from the first few years of NSSE findings was the substantial number of students engaged in various forms of active and collaborative learning activities. This shift from passive, instructor-dominated pedagogy to active, learner-centered activities promises to have desirable effects on learning. They take students to deeper levels of understanding and meaning, encouraging them to apply what they are learning to real life examples in the company of others (Lave & Wenger, 1990; Tagg, 2003).

To examine more closely student behaviors related to deep learning we added six items to the 2004 online NSSE survey that attempt to measure this form of engagement. We then created a deep learning scale, combining the experimental items with selected questions from the core NSSE survey that tapped similar constructs (Table 8). These items represent three clusters of deep learning activities:

- Higher-Order Learning—activities that require students to utilize higher levels of mental activity than those required for rote memorization.
- Integrative Learning—activities that require integrating acquired knowledge, skills, and competencies into a meaningful whole.
- Reflective Learning—activities that ask students to explore their experiences of learning to better understand how they learn.

Regression analyses of the responses from the 61,000 students across 459 colleges and universities who answered these questions indicate that students who scored higher on the deep learning scale:

- Gained more in general education, practical knowledge and skills, and personal/social development.
- Participated more often in enriching educational activities.
- Perceived that their campus is more supportive of their academic and social needs.
- Were more satisfied with their overall educational experience.

Seniors, full-time students, and students at baccalaureate liberal arts colleges scored higher on the deep learning scale. Students majoring in arts and humanities and the social sciences scored higher on the deep learning scale than other majors; engineering majors scored lowest, due primarily to relatively low integrative and reflective learning scores.

Students who scored higher on the deep learning scale also made more purposeful use of their time (Table 9). Students in the top quartile of deep learning scores reported spending more time preparing for class, working on campus, and participating in co-curricular activities than students in the lower quartiles. Conversely, top-quartile students spent less time each week relaxing and socializing than students in the lower quartiles. Deep learners also appear to spend more time reading materials outside of class. About a third (31%) of top-quartile deep learners reported reading five or more books for their own personal enjoyment or academic enrichment during the school year as compared to only 17% of students in the lower quartile.
### Deep Learning Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Higher-Order Learning</th>
<th>Integrative Learning</th>
<th>Reflective Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 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>- Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources.</td>
<td>- Learned something from discussing questions that have no clear answers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships.</td>
<td>- Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments.</td>
<td>- Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 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>- Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions.</td>
<td>- Tried to better understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.</td>
<td>- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class.</td>
<td>- Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Spent per Week in Selected Activities by Deep Learning Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean hours per week</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom Quartile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quartile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quartile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Quartile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty Survey of Student Engagement

Designed to complement NSSE, the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE—pronounced “fessie”) measures faculty priorities and expectations of student engagement in effective educational practices and selected classroom faculty activities related to teaching and learning. After a successful pilot in 2003, about 20,000 faculty members from 132 four-year colleges and universities completed the survey in 2004.

FSSE findings point to important connections between faculty expectations, pedagogical approaches, and student engagement. For example, at institutions where faculty members have higher-than-average expectations for student engagement, students report being involved at higher levels in effective educational practices and report greater gains from their collegiate experience.

Table 10 highlights selected similarities and differences between faculty and student views of the student experience. Noting where there is either a match or mismatch between faculty and student perceptions can help a campus focus its teaching and learning conversations and challenge existing assumptions.

Class Preparation

FSSE asks faculty members how much time they expect students to spend preparing for their class and how much time they estimate students actually spend preparing for their course. In general, faculty expect students to study about twice as much (6 hours per class per week) as students actually reported (3 hours per class per week). Faculty members in the Physical Sciences, Engineering, and Biological/Life Sciences expected students to spend more time studying than their colleagues in other fields. Students in these majors do report actually spending more time preparing for class than do their peers in other fields. Additional information by discipline is included on NSSE’s 2004 annual report Web site.

“The combination of NSSE and FSSE is very powerful in getting faculty members’ attention. Focusing on ‘gaps’—areas where student-faculty responses differ significantly—is a particularly productive approach for stimulating improvement-oriented discussions and actions.”—Thomas A. Angelo, Director, University Teaching Development Centre, Victoria University of Wellington
How Faculty Spend Class Time
Faculty members devote about two-fifths (42%) of their class time to lecturing, 16% to small group work, and almost 14% to experiential activities such as labs and field work. The remainder of the time is spent on a variety of activities, such as instructor led discussions and student presentations (Table 11).

- Biological/Life Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Engineering faculty report spending more class time (between 57% and 60%) lecturing while Education faculty spend the least amount of time (around 25%).

- Faculty teaching lower and upper division courses spend approximately the same amount of class time on these activities. The most notable exception is that upper division Social Sciences faculty members spend less time (44%) than their lower division colleagues (53%) lecturing.

- Education faculty devote more class time (25% and 28% to lower and upper division courses, respectively) to small group work than their colleagues from other disciplines.

- Biological/Life Sciences faculty devote about one-quarter of their class time to experiential activities, which includes lab and field work.

The NSSE Web site contains more detailed information by discipline at www.iub.edu/~nsse.

Full-time and Part-time Faculty
Understanding how full-time and part-time faculty compare in terms of their expectations of students and their classroom practices becomes more important with institutions relying more heavily on part-time faculty.

- Part-time faculty expect students to study about one hour less per week than do full-time faculty, five hours and six hours per class, respectively.

- Part-time faculty also estimate that students actually spend less than three hours studying for their classes whereas full-time faculty estimate that their students spend about 3.5 hours preparing for class.

- At the same time, part-time faculty devote less class time to lecturing and more to involving students in small group work.

“We very much like the comparative information NSSE provides. The data are central to our efforts to individualize education for our students.”—Margaret Malmberg, Provost and Dean of the Faculty, University of Charleston
Using NSSE Data

NSSE was designed to provide information colleges and universities can use to improve the quality of the undergraduate experience. This section illustrates a variety of different applications and interventions of student engagement results.

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

Southern Illinois University Edwardsville (SIUE) uses NSSE for several purposes including curriculum planning and faculty development. As with increasing numbers of colleges and universities, in spring 2003 SIUE requested an oversample. That is, in addition to NSSE’s standard random sample, surveys were also sent to all freshman who had taken selected first-year courses including its freshman experience course (UNIV 112) and academic development courses. Four questions were of particular interest: asked questions in class or contributed to class discussion; attended campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural performances, etc.); understanding yourself; and evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution. In general, students who took UNIV 112, an academic development course, or the honors seminar, participated more in class, more frequently attended campus events, gained more in self-understanding, and were more satisfied with students in an intellectual community of students and faculty.

Westminster College

Westminster College in Utah uses NSSE results along with a variety of other sources of data in its strategic planning and performance indicator dashboard. President Michael Bassis and his colleagues have set goals to enhance student engagement across all five NSSE benchmarks by one decile over the next five years compared with other Carnegie master’s institutions as well as its own criterion referenced measures. Additionally, Westminster benchmarks against a selected aspirational peer group of liberal arts colleges. It also combines selected results from the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement with its annual local faculty and staff survey to monitor the degree to which faculty and staff perceive the College to be open, collaborative, and inclusive.

Indiana University Bloomington

To be able to discover engagement patterns of students in various majors, Indiana University Bloomington requested that all students in selected academic units be surveyed. Specifically, all seniors in the College of Arts and Sciences and all

“A study committee has recommended to the Faculty Senate Curriculum Council to require a freshman seminar for all first-year students and is using the NSSE data to support the recommendation.” —David Sill, Associate Provost, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

the first year of college. According to David Sill, Associate Provost, the results also showed that students who took UNIV 112 or an honors seminar tended to be more satisfied overall with the quality of relations with peers, faculty members, and administrators. Based on these findings along with other information, the campus has proposed that all new students be required to take a New Student Seminar designed to: assist new freshmen in making the transition from high school to college-level work and expectations, to orient the students to the services and culture of the University, and to engage sophomores, juniors, and seniors in the School of Education and the School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (HPER) were included. According to HPER Dean David Gallahue, his faculty and staff intend to use NSSE results as part of his school’s Markers of Excellence, indicators of progress toward meeting its eight strategic goals. “Birddogs”—chairs of various implementation committees—are charged with identifying strengths and weaknesses and adopting approaches to maximize strengths and enhance areas where performance is falling short. Other large institutions requesting oversamples with similar intentions
include University of Wisconsin-Madison, University of Toronto, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, University of Kansas, Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, and University of Texas at El Paso.

Judson College
Judson College, in Illinois, annually reviews its NSSE results at a faculty colloquium. From the perspective of Provost Dale Simmons, the data have helped faculty and staff members at this fairly young institution understand how they are performing. Prior to sharing the results with the faculty, focus groups are held with sophomores who completed the survey the previous year to get a richer sense about the areas that appear to be either a concern or a surprise. The combination of information has been instructive for changing some of the things the College does in its foundational freshmen orientation course. Finally, at the end of every academic year, each academic unit spends a day assessing its performance and discussing the results of campus-wide and departmental assessments including NSSE, CIRP, and SSI with an eye toward making changes in the curriculum or in other ways they interact with students.

Drew University
As with many schools, in some areas Drew University student responses were at or exceeded the desired level, in other areas they fell short. Christopher Van Wyk, Associate Dean and Director of Institutional Research, with assistance from a mathematics faculty member, compared Drew’s data with other baccalaureate liberal arts colleges. The results were especially instructive when put in the context of the three elements that the faculty had identified as important to a Drew education: a curriculum that integrates modes of learning; the application of advanced technologies to a liberal arts education; and strong faculty involvement helping students identify and explore opportunities for postgraduate education and personal and career development. In each of these areas, NSSE data revealed some areas of student performance that were below what the University considered acceptable. These findings prompted spirited discussion in both faculty meetings and the student government. Students, for example, spent over an hour critiquing the wording of the questions before someone pointed out that the same questions were asked everywhere (highlighting the value of the comparison data). The longer-term effect, according to Van Wyck, has been to make “engagement” part of the campus vocabulary, prompting increased attention to class size as well as a review of Drew’s course evaluation forms to what extent effective educational practices are represented.

Using NSSE Data (continued)

“Each time that we have used the NSSE survey we share the results with the faculty at a faculty colloquium. Comparative data help us understand that we are doing many things very well and give us important hints at where we need to improve.” —Dale H. Simmons, Provost & VP for Academic Affairs, Judson College (IL)
Using NSSE Data (continued)

**Elon University**

At Elon University, student engagement has long been a hallmark and its NSSE scores reflect this distinctive emphasis. Not resting on its laurels, Elon also uses the results to identify areas that could be further strengthened in the context of strategic planning. According to Provost Gerald Francis, Elon altered one of its General Studies mathematics course (statistics) in an effort to increase academic challenge by emphasizing analysis and interpretation. NSSE 2003 results showed a modest decrease in two areas that generated some concern: fewer students reported that they discussed their career plans with a faculty member or advisor, and fewer reported that they had serious conversations with students from different ethnic backgrounds. Steps were subsequently taken to increase the contact between Career Center staff and academic departments and to expand employment opportunity contacts throughout the eastern United States. The institution also implemented plans to increase the racial and ethnic diversity of students and faculty at the institution. Although this effort is designed to span multiple years, progress has been made after only one year.

**Taylor University**

Taylor University uses NSSE data in a variety of ways to inform practice, goal setting, and decision-making, according to Tim Herrmann, Associate Dean for Academic Assessment. For example:

- Disseminate the results in its annual assessment report distributed to all administrative and academic divisions including the Academic Council;
- Discuss how the data could be used to more effectively communicate with prospective students;
- Present and discuss the results at a meeting of the faculty as a whole;
- Use the data to guide campus-wide discussions about creating a more engaged model for teaching;
- Incorporate NSSE information along with the results from other surveys such as CIRP and faculty course evaluations in the planning of the new faculty orientation workshop;
- Adopt two NSSE benchmarks (active and collaborative learning and student-faculty interaction) as outcome measures for one of its initial Academic Quality Improvement Process Action Projects;
- Establish and Implement the Center for Teaching Excellence.

**Marlboro College**

Marlboro College students are “rather survey averse” in the eyes of Louise Allen Zak, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. Thus, the 67% response rate suggests to her that students appreciated the validity of the exercise and the potential value of the data. The results were published in the College’s Parent Newsletter and used in its NEASC self-study to confirm areas of strength. All in all, participating in NSSE has helped to bring a focus to tracking and analyzing data on student experiences.

**University of Kentucky**

In an effort to increase student volunteerism as measured by NSSE, the University of Kentucky implemented several initiatives: a Student Volunteer Center information clearinghouse to make community service opportunities known; the UK Fusion program that takes students to various community venues for a day of service; development of more living-learning communities, including one focused on community service; and using the freshman orientation seminar to introduce students to the

“NSSE results over three years showed a need for supplementary academic support services and in 2003 the College was awarded a Title III grant to address these and related issues.”—S. Margaret McGarry, Director of Institutional Research, Regis College, Massachusetts
larger Lexington community. NSSE results also are being used to compare student engagement in courses that incorporate a service-learning activity and those that do not.

The University of Hawaii-Hilo
The University of Hawaii-Hilo used NSSE results to demonstrate to faculty how it measures areas of desired improvement in relation to Chickering and Gamson’s (1987) “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Higher Education.” Experienced UH-Hilo faculty then led workshops about those practices, using examples such as a large lecture class where active learning was fostered by calling students up on stage to dance out the structure of DNA. Other faculty members discussed ways to involve students in community research projects.

Towson University
Towson University disaggregated its NSSE results from seniors by those who started at the institution as first-year students and those who entered as transfer students to better understand the transfer student experience. Toward this end, Towson administers the CIRP to all incoming transfers as well as first-year students and will oversample seniors in their next NSSE administration to develop a fuller portrait of the transfer student experience.

University of Wisconsin System
The 13 campuses in the University of Wisconsin system have coordinated NSSE administrations as a system twice, yielding comparable indicators for the system’s annual Achieving Excellence accountability reports. This approach allows for system-wide assessment while also providing each institution with data to guide local initiatives.

Additional examples of how colleges, universities, and state systems (Table 12) are using their NSSE data can be found in previous annual reports as well as in the “Using NSSE Data” section of the institutional report (www.iub.edu/~nsse).

“We’re using NSSE data to help us benchmark progress on our goal to promote and support excellence in teaching, learning and student development.” —David L. Gallahue, Dean of School of Health, Physical Education, & Recreation, Indiana University Bloomington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State &amp; University Consortia from 2000-04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut State Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Hawaii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NSSE Institute was established in 2003 in response to numerous requests for assistance in using student engagement data to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness. Institute associates have completed a major national study of high-performing colleges and universities, made dozens of presentations at national and regional meetings, and worked with several campuses to enhance student success.

Cosponsored by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Pew Forum on Undergraduate Learning, support for the initial set of NSSE Institute activities came from Lumina Foundation for Education and the Wabash College Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts. The following are examples of NSSE Institute outreach:

- Facilitated a day-long retreat of key administrators of a metropolitan university to identify institutional policies and practices that promote and inhibit student success with the goal of improving student persistence and satisfaction.
- Reviewed the NSSE results of a small comprehensive private university and met in small groups with faculty, administrators, and staff to identify areas where the institution could profitably focus to improve student engagement.
- Planned and facilitated a “back-to-school” faculty workshop for a regional liberal arts college aspireing to improve its national reputation by focusing on educational quality as measured by student success indicators.
- Helped a philanthropic organization design a symposium to examine the role of assessment and accountability for private colleges and universities.
- Contributed to an invitational conference that examined the changing role of student affairs professionals in promoting student engagement.
- Worked with teams from dozens of colleges and universities that participated in several regional workshops (Illinois, Ohio, Texas) and regional and national meetings on using NSSE and FSSE results.

Current Initiatives

Several other initiatives are underway to assist colleges and universities in using student engagement and related information to guide institutional improvement efforts. They include the Documenting Effective Educational Practice (DEEP) project, Building Engagement and Attainment of Minority Students (BEAMS), and the Accreditation Toolkit.

Documenting Effective Educational Practice (DEEP)

In partnership with the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), Project DEEP examined the everyday workings of 20 diverse educationally effective colleges and universities to learn what they do to promote student success. The research team completed 40 multiple-day site visits to DEEP schools, each of which is distinguished by higher-than-predicted graduation rates and higher-than-predicted scores on the five NSSE benchmarks of effective educational practice. The project was guided by the following questions:

- What do high-performing colleges and universities do to promote student success?
- What campus features—policies, programs, and practices—contribute to high levels of engagement and better-than-predicted graduation rates?

The first major DEEP product is a book entitled, Student Success in College: Creating Conditions That Matter, scheduled for publication by AAHE/Jossey-Bass in March 2005. The book is intended for institutional leaders, faculty members, student and academic affairs professionals, and other

Properties Common to DEEP Schools

1) A “living” mission and a “lived” educational philosophy
2) An unshakeable focus on student learning
3) Clearly marked pathways to student success
4) Environments adapted for educational enrichment
5) An improvement-oriented campus culture
6) Shared responsibility for educational quality and student success
campus stakeholders to stimulate new ways of thinking about student engagement and provide effective approaches to enhance educational quality. Six properties and conditions shared by the DEEP schools are featured along with a wide array of effective educational policies and practices that if adapted appropriately can help a campus create and sustain a culture that supports student success. The book can be used in faculty and staff development, strategic planning, institutional mission clarification, leadership development, and collaborative efforts between academic and student affairs.

Building Engagement and Attainment of Minority Students (BEAMS)

The BEAMS Project is a five-year initiative to assist historically Black, Hispanic-serving, and tribal colleges and universities use student engagement data and related information for institutional improvement. The project is a partnership among NSSE, the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), and the Alliance for Equity in Higher Education, and is funded by Lumina Foundation for Education. This year BEAMS worked with its second cohort of 40 schools, which brings the total number of institutions in the project to 80 (Table 13).

The final cohort of BEAMS will participate in NSSE 2005. The project continues to diversify the NSSE database of institutions and student respondents, providing a more comprehensive picture of student engagement at the nation’s colleges and universities; supply valuable information for institutional improvement efforts at minority serving institutions; and provide information used to promote the use of effective educational practices at these campuses.

“NSSE is useful to all types of institutions interested in improving the student experience. Through the BEAMS (Building Engagement and Attainment for Minority Students) project, NSSE and AAHE are helping more than 100 minority-serving institutions do just that.” —Clara M. Lovett, President, American Association for Higher Education

### Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams State College</td>
<td>Alcorn State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benedict College</td>
<td>Alliant International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethune Cookman College</td>
<td>Bennett College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Dominguez</td>
<td>Bowie State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Fresno</td>
<td>California State University, Northridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Los Angeles</td>
<td>Chicago State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, San Bernardo</td>
<td>Claflin University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Stanislaus</td>
<td>Dillard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central State University</td>
<td>Elizabeth City State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark Atlanta University</td>
<td>Florida International University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University, Pueblo</td>
<td>Herbert H. Lehman College, CUNY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayetteville State University</td>
<td>Huston-Tillotson College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida Memorial College</td>
<td>Inter American University of Puerto Rico-San German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Valley State University</td>
<td>Jarvis Christian College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskell Indian Nations University</td>
<td>Lane College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage College</td>
<td>Mercy College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of American Indian Arts</td>
<td>Miles College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson State University</td>
<td>Mississippi Valley State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medgar Evers College of The City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New York</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NSSE Outreach

In an effort to encourage even greater use of student engagement and related information and for institutional representatives to share information, NSSE annually hosts several regional and pre-conference workshops. The goal of these sessions is to increase participant proficiency in applying NSSE data toward institutional improvement.

Patterned after well-attended events held in Illinois, Texas, and Ohio, regional workshops are designed for faculty members and administrators with commitments and responsibilities for enhancing the quality of the undergraduate learning experience. More specifically, workshop topics address how to use NSSE data for different purposes, such as assessment, accreditation, self-studies, general education reviews, and faculty development (Table 14).

Through a combination of plenary sessions, concurrent interest sessions, group activities, and hands-on work in a computer lab, participants learn more about how to link NSSE data to other institutional data, use the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) to understand faculty expectations for student engagement, and gain insight into educationally effective practice.

Accreditation Toolkit

NSSE’s Accreditation Toolkit first appeared in the 2004 Institutional Report, and is now available on the NSSE Web site. The toolkit provides suggestions for incorporating NSSE into regional accreditation processes with an emphasis on mapping student engagement results to accreditation standards specific to each region (Table 15). The Toolkit also offers illustrative timelines to help institutions determine when and how often to collect student engagement data for accreditation and examples of how colleges and universities are incorporating their NSSE results.

Highlighted below are two examples of how institutions are putting NSSE data to use in the accreditation process.

Lawrence Technological University

Lawrence Technological University (LTU) participated in NSSE in 2002 and used writing item results as additional data in their university- and department-level assessment efforts. LTU’s NSSE results encouraged the institution to conduct a more in-depth study of the type and amount of writing required of students. This led to the development of a university-wide writing matrix, which documented the type and amount of writing assignments for each undergraduate major offered at the university. LTU developed an action plan to improve student writing, including initiatives such as stating clearer expectations about the quality of writing required in courses, a junior writing portfolio required for graduation, and a junior writing course for students needing improvement. The institution incorporated the results of their data and their improvement plan into their North Central Association (NCA) self-study. Future administrations of NSSE will be used to help assess the effectiveness of the writing improvement initiatives.

Agnes Scott College

Agnes Scott College’s Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) outlined a comprehensive approach to increase intellectual vibrancy on campus. These included enriched First-Year Seminars, a new

---

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSSE Workshop Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and Using NSSE Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSE and Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to Institutional Needs Using NSSE Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Student Engagement Information to Stimulate Conversations about Teaching and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating a Pilot Freshman Seminar Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectively Communicating Student Engagement Information on Campus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Information about student engagement is an excellent foundation for the accreditation review process, providing much needed evidence of areas of strength as well as where improvement may be needed.”—Ralph Wolff, Executive Director, WASC Senior College Commission
As Thomas Ehrlich observed in the Foreword, NSSE’s top priority is to provide high-quality information about the undergraduate experience that can be used for institutional improvement and for informing the public about dimensions of collegiate quality. Toward this end we are committed to making our various reports and services as user-friendly as possible. Under the auspices of the NSSE Institute for Effective Educational Practice, we will work with colleges and universities and institutional consortia to refine ways to use student engagement results productively. We will also collaborate with states, professional associations, accreditation agencies, and other entities such as the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) that share the goal of enhancing the undergraduate experience. Some of these ongoing initiatives were briefly described earlier in this report. Others are just getting started.

For example, with support from Lumina Foundation for Education and the Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College, we have launched a study to learn more about the relationships between student engagement and key indicators of student success in college. Working with about 18 colleges and universities around the country, the “Connecting the Dots” project will link student-level records including SAT/ACT scores, high school rank, financial aid information, persistence, transcripts, and outcome measures with NSSE results for those students who completed the survey in 2000, 2001 or 2002. The findings promise to help us better understand the student behaviors and institutional practices that are most important in predicting student success, after controlling for a host of potentially confounding influences.

We also intend to learn more about the relationships between new students’ expectations and high school experiences and their engagement in effective educational practices during the first year of college by comparing their responses to the new Beginning College Student Survey (BCSS) just prior to starting college and to NSSE at the end of their first year. This will enable us to isolate the relative importance of institutional policies and practices on student engagement after controlling for student input variables. Institutions will be able to use these findings to improve pre-college communications with prospective students as well as early college socialization experiences such as orientation, fall welcome week, first-year seminars, service learning, and so forth. Schools will also be able to document their contribution to fostering student engagement.

To further validate the BCSS, we are conducting individual cognitive interviews and focus groups with students at a handful of four-year colleges and universities.

Over the next 18 months, NSSE staff along with colleagues at the IU Center for Postsecondary Research will conduct a major review of the research on student success as part of a National Postsecondary Education Cooperative and National Center for Education Statistics initiative. This work complements NSSE’s workscope and promises to make a valuable contribution to the literature as well as better inform NSSE Institute associates who work with colleges and universities on this critical issue. In addition, we plan to undertake some collaborative research projects with scholars at other institutions who have intellectual interests and goals compatible with NSSE’s philosophy and purposes.

All of these activities will help us better understand how institutions can use information about the activities and experiences of their students to create pathways that lead to student success and to improve collegiate quality. It is a privilege and pleasure for NSSE to be involved in this important work.
Supporting Materials on NSSE Web Site
For more detailed information on the 2004 Annual Survey, please visit NSSE’s Web site at:


- Copy of NSSE’s survey instrument, The College Student Report 2004
- Profiles of all participating colleges and universities
- NSSE 2004 benchmark percentiles and descriptive statistics by first-year students and seniors by Carnegie Classification
- Creating the National Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice
- NSSE’s conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties
- Additional findings from the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement
- NSSE Research and Publications
- NSSE Workshop Information

Resources


National Survey of Student Engagement (2002). From promise to progress: How colleges and universities are using student engagement results to improve collegiate quality. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.

National Survey of Student Engagement (2003). Converting data into actions: Expanding the boundaries of institutional improvement. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research.


Summary Statistics—National Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice

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

The benchmarks are based on the results from 2004 and reflect responses from about 163,000 first-year and senior students at 472 different four-year colleges and universities.

Student cases are weighted for gender and enrollment status (full-time, less than full-time). Comparison group benchmarks (Carnegie classification and national) are the mean of institutional benchmarks within the respective category. To facilitate comparisons across time, as well as between individual institutions and types of institutions, each benchmark is expressed as a 100-point scale. For more details on the construction of the benchmarks, visit our website at www.iub.edu/~nsse.

As in previous years, smaller schools generally have higher benchmark scores across the board. However, the variation of benchmark scores within categories of institutions is substantial. 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 ask for student engagement results or comparable data from the specific institution under consideration.

Revision to NSSE Benchmarks

In 2004, the process for calculating benchmark scores was revised. The changes are intended to make the process easier to understand and to allow institutions to make their own calculations, particularly intra-institutional comparisons. The following list describes the primary changes in the process.

- All items that comprise the benchmark scores are converted to a 0-100 point scale.
- The items that contribute to each benchmark are the same as in 2003 with one exception. Enriching Educational Experiences now includes a measure of whether or not a student participated in a learning community.
- The adjustment part-time students receive on four of the items that contribute to the Level of Academic Challenge benchmark are based on national averages for those items.
- Student-level scale scores (i.e., precursors to the benchmarks at the student level) are calculated by taking the mean of each student’s responses to the set of items that contribute to a benchmark as long as the student has valid responses for at least 60% of the items.
- Benchmarks are calculated by taking the weighted average of student-level scale scores for the randomly sampled students at a given institution.
- Due to the change in the response categories for question seven as well as changes in our process for calculating weights, only one year of data is used in calculating and comparing benchmarks.

Although not directly comparable on a yearly basis, analyses of the results produced by the revised benchmark calculation process compared with the one used previously show that institutions’ scores are highly correlated (e.g., r > .90 for 2003 scores) and that percentile rankings remain generally unchanged. NSSE will work with schools that

Notes:

1 This marks a departure from our practice in past years when three years worth of data were used.
2 Thus, differences between multi-institution groups (Carnegie Classifications and national) represent only institution-level variance and not student-level variance.
Summary Statistics—National Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice (continued)

have participated in multiple years to understand yearly comparisons based on the revised calculation process.

More information about the calculations for 2004, examples of intra-institutional analyses, and descriptions of how to calculate student-level scale scores for 2004, as well as previous years, are posted on the NSSE 2004 annual report Web site.

Guide to Benchmark Figures

The benchmark figures are a modified “box and whiskers” type of chart. Each column shows the benchmark scores at the 5th, 25th, 50th (median), 75th, and 95th percentiles. The circle signifies the median—the middle score that divides all institutional benchmarks into two equal halves. The rectangular box shows the 25th to 75th percentile range, i.e. the middle 50% of all scores. The “whiskers” on top and bottom are the 95th and 5th percentiles, as illustrated below:

This type of chart gives more information than a chart of simple point-estimates such as means or medians. One can see the range and variation of institutional scores in each category, and also where mid-range or normal scores fall. At the same time one can see what score is needed (i.e., 75th or 95th percentile) to be a top performer in the group.

Benchmark Frequency Tables

Following each benchmark is a table of frequencies based on data from 2004. These tables show the percentages of how students responded to each of the survey items within the benchmark. The values listed are column percentages. Frequencies are shown by class standing for each of the Carnegie Classification types and national dataset. A weight was applied to adjust for non-response and to ensure that students from a single institution contribute to the figures in the same proportion as if every first-year and senior student from that institution responded to the survey.

In addition, a special column labeled “Top 5%” shows the response percentages of students attending schools that scored in the top 5% of all institutions (roughly 24 schools) on the benchmark. Thus, the pattern of responses among the Top 5% institutions shows what would need to be achieved in order to be among the top performers on a particular benchmark.

**Notes:**

3 A percentile is a score within a distribution below which a given percentage or scores is found. For example, the 75th percentile of a distribution of scores is the point below which 75 percent of the 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th %</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th %</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th %</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th %</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th %</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th %</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th %</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th %</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th %</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th %</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Level of Academic Challenge (in percentages)

### First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5-10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 11-20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5-10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 11-20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of written papers or reports between 5-19 pages</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5-10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 11-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 11-20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework: Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, and considering its components</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework: Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework: Making judgements about the value of information, arguments, or methods</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursework: Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours per 7-day week spent preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional: Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32</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.

**Benchmark Scores** First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th %</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th %</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th %</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th %</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th %</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark Scores** Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th %</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th %</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th %</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th %</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th %</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Active and Collaborative Learning (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Doc-Ext</strong></td>
<td><strong>Doc-Ext</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very often</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes</strong></td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very often</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very often</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very often</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very often</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very often</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sometimes</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Often</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very often</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student-Faculty Interaction

Students learn firsthand how experts think about and solve practical problems by interacting with faculty members inside and outside 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>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th %</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th %</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th %</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th %</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th %</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentile First-Year Students

Benchmark Scores Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th %</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th %</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th %</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th %</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th %</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Student-Faculty Interaction (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doc-Ext</td>
<td>Doc-Int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance (written or oral)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Done</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
National Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice (continued)

Enriching Educational Experiences

Complementary learning opportunities inside and outside 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.

Benchmark Scores First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th %</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th %</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th %</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th %</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th %</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benchmark Scores Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th %</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th %</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th %</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th %</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th %</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guide to Benchmark Figures

Percentile First-Year Students

Percentile Seniors
## Enriching Educational Experiences (in percentages)

### First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat'l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional: Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hours spent participating in co-curricular activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1-5</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-15</th>
<th>16-20</th>
<th>21-25</th>
<th>26-30</th>
<th>More than 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Have not decided</th>
<th>Do not plan to do</th>
<th>Plan to do</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Community service or volunteer work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Have not decided</th>
<th>Do not plan to do</th>
<th>Plan to do</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Foreign language coursework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Have not decided</th>
<th>Do not plan to do</th>
<th>Plan to do</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Study abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Have not decided</th>
<th>Do not plan to do</th>
<th>Plan to do</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Independent study or self-designed major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Have not decided</th>
<th>Do not plan to do</th>
<th>Plan to do</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Culminating senior experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Have not decided</th>
<th>Do not plan to do</th>
<th>Plan to do</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Participate in a learning community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Have not decided</th>
<th>Do not plan to do</th>
<th>Plan to do</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**National Survey of Student Engagement | Annual Report 2004**
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.

Benchmark Scores First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th %</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th %</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th %</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th %</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th %</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benchmark Scores Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th %</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th %</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th %</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th %</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th %</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Supportive Campus Environment (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emphasis: Providing the support you need to thrive socially</th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis: Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically</td>
<td>Doc-Ext</td>
<td>Doc-Int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis: Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)</td>
<td>Doc-Ext</td>
<td>Doc-Int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Quality: Your relationships with other students | Unfriendly, unsupportive, sense of alienation | Doc-Ext | Doc-Int | Master’s | Bac-LA | Bac-Gen | Top 5% | Nat’l | Doc-Ext | Doc-Int | Master’s | Bac-LA | Bac-Gen | Top 5% | Nat’l |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 2 |
| 4 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 4 | 10 | 9 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 |
| 5 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 19 | 22 | 15 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 19 | 15 | 21 | 21 |
| 6 | 33 | 32 | 31 | 33 | 30 | 34 | 32 | 33 | 31 | 33 | 32 | 36 | 31 | 33 | 33 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality: Your relationships with faculty members</th>
<th>Available, helpful, sympathetic</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality: Your relationships with administrative personnel and offices</th>
<th>Unhelpful, inconsiderate, rigid</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality: Your relationships with administrative personnel and offices</th>
<th>Helpful, considerate, flexible</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
<th>Doc-Ext</th>
<th>Doc-Int</th>
<th>Master’s</th>
<th>Bac-LA</th>
<th>Bac-Gen</th>
<th>Top 5%</th>
<th>Nat’l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participating Colleges and Universities: 2000-2004

A
Abilene Christian University
Adams State College
Adelphi University
Agnes Scott College
Alaska Pacific University
Alhambra College of Idaho
Alcorn State University
Alfred University
Alice Lloyd College
Allegheny College
Alliant International University
Alma College
Alvernia College
Alverno College
American University
Angelo State University
Announce College
Appalachian State University
Arcadia University
Arizona State University
West
Arkansas Tech University
Armstrong Atlantic State University
Ashbury College
Auburn University
Auburn University Montgomery
Augusta College
Augusta University (IL)
Augustana College (SD)
Austin College
Austin College
Austin Peay State University
B
Baker University
Balboa-Wallace College
Ball State University
Baptist Memorial College of Health Sciences
Barry University
Barton College
Bayern University
Beacon College
Belhaven University
Belmont University
Beloit College
Benedict College
Benedictine College
Berea College
Bernard M. Baruch College of The City University of New York
Berry College
Bethel College
Bethune Cookman College
Birmingham-Southern College
Black Hills State University
Blackburn College
Bloomfield College
Boise State University
Boston University
Bowling Green State University
Bradley University
Brenau University
Brigham Young University
Brigham Young University-Hawaii
Brooklyn College of The City University of New York
Bryant College
Bryant College
Bryce Mower College
Bucknell University
Butler University
C
California College of Arts and Crafts
California Lutheran University
California Polytechnic State University
California State University, San Marcos
California State University, Bakersfield
California State University, Chico
California State University, Dominguez Hills
California State University, Fresno
California State University, Fullerton
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, Stanislaus
Calumet College of St. Joseph
Calvin College
Campbell University
Canisius College
Capella University
Cardinal Stritch University
Carlow University in Ottawa
Carroll College (MT)
Carroll College (WI)
Carthage College
Case Western Reserve University
 Catawba College
Cazenovia College
Cedar Crest College
Cedarville University
Central College
Central Connecticut State University
Central Methodist College
Central Michigan University
Central Missouri State University
Central State University
Central Washington University
Centre College
Chadron State College
Champlain College
Chapman University
Charles University
Chicago State University
Christian Heritage College
Christopher Newport University
Chrice College
City College of The City University of New York
Clifton University
Clark Atlanta University
Clark University
Clarkson University
Clayson College & State University
Claymen University
Cleveland State University
Coker College
Colby-Sawyer College
College of Saint Mary
College of the Ozarks
College of William and Mary
The Colorado College
Colorado School of Mines
Colorado State University
Colorado College
Colombia College
Colombia College
Colombia College
Colombia University
Concordia College
Concordia University
Concordia University Iowa
Concordia University Nebraska
Concordia University River Forest
Concordia University Wisconsin
Concordia University, Ann Arbor
Concordia University, St. Paul
Connecticut College
Converse College
Coppin College
Columbia College of Art and Design
Cottey College
Covenant College
Creighton University
D
Daemen College
Dakota State University
Dakota Wesleyan University
Dalhousie College
Davis & Elkins College
Delta State University
Debrecen University
DePaul University
DePauw University
Dickinson College
Dickinson State University
Dillard University
Dominican University
Drake College
Drake University
Drew University
Drexel University
Drury University
Duquesne University
E
Elon College
Emory- rigged University, Daytona Beach
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University-Prescott
Emmanuel College
Emory & Henry College
Emporia State University
Endicott College
Eureka College
Fairfield University
Fairleigh Dickinson University-All Campuses
Fairmont State College
Fayetteville State University
Ferrum College
Fitchburg State College
Florida Atlantic University
Florida Gulf Coast University
Florida Institute of Technology
Florida International University
Florida Memorial University
Florida Southern College
Fontbonne University
Ford Hills State University
Fort Lewis College
Fort Valley State University
Framingham State University
Franciscan University of Steubenville
Franklin & Marshall College
Franklin Pierce College
Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering
Fresno Pacific University
Friends University
Furman University
Georgetown College
George Mason University
Georgia College & State University
Georgia Institute of Technology
Georgia Southern University
Georgia Southwestern State University
Georgia State University
Georgia Court College
Gettysburg College
Goldey-Beacom College
Gonzaga University
Gordon College
Goucher College
Graceland University
Grand View College
Greensburg College
Greenville College
Grinnell College
Gustavus Adolphus College
Gwynedd Mercy College
Hamilton College
Hamline University
Hampden-Sydney College
Hanover College
Hardin-Simmons University
Harris-Stowe State College
Hartwick College
Harvey Mudd College
Haskell Indian Nations University
Hastings College
Hendelburg College
Henderson State University
Herbert H. Lehman College of the City University of New York
Heritage College
High Point University
Hiram College
Hobart and William Smith Colleges
Hollins University
Holy Family College
Holy Names College
Hope College
Houghton College
Howard Payne University
Howard University
Humboldt State University
Hunter College of The City University of New York
Huntingdon College
Huntington College
Husson College
Huston-Tillotson College
Idaho State University
Illinois College
Illinois Institute of Technology
Illinois State University
Illinois Wesleyan University
Indiana State University
Indiana University Bloomington
Indiana University East
Indiana University Kokomo
Indiana University Northwest
Indiana University Southeast
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Indiana Wesleyan University
Institute of American Indian Arts and Arts Development
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Springfield College
St. Andrews Presbyterian College
St. Ambrose University
St. Bonaventure University
St. Cloud State University
St. Edward's University
St. Francis College (NY)
St. John's University
St. Joseph's College, New York (Brooklyn Campus)
St. Joseph's College, New York (Suffolk Campus)
St. Lawrence University
St. Mary's College of Maryland
St. Mary's University
St. Olaf College
St. Thomas University
State University of New York College at Brockport
State University of New York College at Fredonia
State University of New York College at Geneseo
State University of New York College at Oneonta
State University of New York College at Oswego
State University of New York College at Plattsburgh
State University of New York College at Potsdam
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
State University of New York-Binghamton University
State University of New York-Stony Brook University
State University of West Georgia
Stephen F. Austin State University
Stetson College
Stillman College
Suffolk University
Susquehanna University
Sweet Briar College
Syracuse University
T	Tarlton State University
Taylor University-Upland
Teddy Post University
Temple University
Texas A&M International University
Texas A&M University
Texas A&M University at Galveston
Texas A&M University-Commerce
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Texas A&M University-Texarkana
Texas Christian University
Texas Lutheran University
Texas State University, San Marcos
Texas Tech University
The Catholic University of America
The College of New Rochelle
The College of Saint Rose
The College of St. Catherine
The College of St. Scholastica
The College of Wooster
The Evergreen State College
The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
The University of British Columbia
The University of Georgia
The University of Maine at Farmington
The University of Memphis
The University of South Dakota
The U of Iowa
The University of Tampa
The University of Tennessee
The University of Tennessee in Chattanooga
The University of Tennessee-Martin
The University of Texas at Arlington
The University of Texas at Austin
The University of Texas at Brownsville
The University of Texas at Dallas
The University of Texas at El Paso
The University of Texas at San Antonio
The University of the Texas at Tyler
The University of Texas of the Permian Basin
The University of the Arts
The University of the South
Thiel College
Thomas University
Towson University
Transylvania University
Trinity Christian College
Trinity College
Tulane University (LA)
Tulane University
Union University
United States Air Force Academy
United States Merchant Marine Academy
Valdosta State University
Universidad Central Del Caribe
University at Buffalo State University of New York
University of Akron, The
University of Alabama at Birmingham
University of Alabama in Huntsville
University of Alabama, The
University of Alaska Anchorage
University of Alberta
University of Arizona, The
University of Arkansas
University of Arkansas at Fort Smith
University of Calgary
University of California, Santa Cruz
University of Central Arkansas
University of Central Florida
University of Central Oklahoma
University of Charleston
University of Cincinnati
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
University of Colorado at Denver
University of Connecticut
University of Dayton
University of Delaware
University of Denver
University of Detroit Mercy
University of Dubuque
University of Florida
University of Hawaii - West O'ahu
University of Hawaii at Hilo
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Houston
University of Houston - Downtown
University of Idaho
University of Illinois at Springfield
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of Indianapolis
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of La Verne
University of Louisiana at Monroe
University of Louisville
University of Maine
University of Maine at Fort Kent
University of Maine at Presque Isle
University of Maryland
University of Maryland Eastern Shore
University of Maryland, Baltimore County
University of Massachusetts Amherst
University of Massachusetts Boston
University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
University of Massachusetts Lowell
University of Miami
University of Michigan
University of Michigan-Dearborn
University of Minnesota Duluth
University of Minnesota, Morris
University of Mississippi, The
University of Missouri-Columbia
University of Missouri-Kansas City
University of Missouri-Rolla
University of Missouri-St Louis
University of Montana
University of Nebraska at Kearney
University of Nebraska at Omaha
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
University of Nevada, Reno
University of New Haven
University of New Mexico - Main Campus
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 at Wilmington
University of North Dakota
University of North Florida, The
University of Oklahoma, The
University of Oregon
University of Pittsburgh
University of Pittsburgh at Greensburg
University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown
University of Puerto Rico at Humacao
University of Puerto Rico - Rio Piedras
University of Puget Sound
University of Rhode Island
University of Richmond
University of San Diego
University of San Francisco
University of South Carolina
University of South Carolina at Aiken
University of South Florida St Petersburg
University of Southern Colorado
University of Southern Indiana
University of Southern Maine
University of St Francis
University of St Thomas
University of the District of Columbia
University of the Incarnate Word
University of the Oyares
University of the Pacific
University of the Sciences In Philadelphia
University of the Virgin Islands
University of Toledo, The
University of Toronto
University of Tulsa, The
University of Utah
University of Vermont, The
University of Virginia
University of Washington
University of Waterloo
University of West Florida
University of Western Ontario
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
University of Wyoming
Ursinus College
Utah State University
V
Valparaiso University
Vassar College
Villa Maria College
Villanova University
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Military Institute
Virginia Union University
Virginia Wesleyan College
Voorhees College
W
Wabash College
Wagner College
Warner Pacific College
Warner Southern College
Warren Wilson College
Washington College
Washington and Lee University
Washington College
Washington State University
Wayne State College
Wayne State University
Waynesburg College
Webb Institute
Wellesley College
Webster University
Wellesley College
Welday College
West Texas A&M University
West Virginia University
West Virginia University Institute of Technology
West Virginia Wesleyan College
Western Carolina University
Western Connecticut State University
Western Illinois University
Western Kentucky University
Western Michigan University
Western New England College
Western New Mexico University
Western Washington University
Westminster College (MO)
Westminster College (UT)
Westmont College
Wheaton College (IL)
Wheaton College (MA)
Wheaton College
Whitman College
Whitman College
Whitman College
Whitewater College
Wichita State University
Widener University-Main Campus
Wiley College
Wilkes University
Williams College
William Carey College
William Jewell College
William Patterson University of New Jersey
William Woods University
Wilmington College
Winona State University
Worcester College
Wright State University
X
Xavier University
Xavier University of Louisiana
York College of Pennsylvania
York College of The City University of New York
York University
Youngstown State University
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