What Lessons Have We Learned About Using NSSE Data?

Based on the collective experience of NSSE users, we offer the following suggestions for incorporating NSSE data into institutional improvement efforts:

Encourage faculty and staff to understand and endorse the concept of student engagement. The concept of student engagement and the value of engagement results for improving teaching and learning need to be clearly and convincingly explained to those less familiar with assessment.

Consult the NSSE Psychometric Portfolio. In the NSSE Findings section of our website, users can review information about NSSE’s validity, reliability, and other data qualities.

Student engagement results are used across all sectors and types of institutions. Discovering and sharing how this happens is one of NSSE’s most important activities. In addition to this document, our three-volume series Lessons from the Field provides rich, detailed narratives from institutions about how they are putting their results into action to improve the undergraduate experience.

nsse.indiana.edu/links/lessons_home

A database with more than 500 innovative, instructive, and inspiring accounts of how colleges and universities are using their NSSE results to improve undergraduate education is searchable by keyword, institution name, or Carnegie classification; by type of use, such as for accreditation or general education assessment; or by selecting results to study retention or strengthen advising.

nsse.indiana.edu/html/using_nsse_db.cfm

The institutional examples of using NSSE data presented in this document were collected from representatives of participating colleges and universities who provided feedback at conferences, through NSSE Project Services teams, and in response to our Report Card feedback process and other direct solicitations.

How Do Institutions Use NSSE Results?

Because NSSE focuses on student behavior and effective educational practice, colleges and universities have found many instructive ways to use survey results:

- Accountability
- Accreditation self-studies
- Alumni outreach
- Assessment and improvement
- Benchmarking
- Communication with internal and external stakeholders
- Faculty and staff development
- General education reform
- Grant writing
- Institutional advancement
- Institutional research
- Retention
- State system performance reporting

What is your NSSE data use story?

Our growing collection of ways NSSE institutions are using their results is a shared resource for colleges and universities and assists in our continuing efforts to improve the quality of the undergraduate experience for all. Please contact your NSSE Project Services team if you wish to share examples highlighting your institution’s uses of NSSE data, usage strategies, and special activities.

nsse.indiana.edu/html/staff.cfm
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Central Penn College
Review department- or unit-level data. NSSE’s census administration enables institutions to drill down to the department or unit level, which may increase faculty interest in using engagement data. The Major Field Report also facilitates department-level work.

nsse.indiana.edu/html/major_field_report.cfm

Link results to other information about the student experience and complementary initiatives. The positive impact of student engagement results will be multiplied if the data can be combined with other student information and made relevant to groups of faculty and staff working on different reform efforts around the campus.

Report student engagement results in a responsible way. NSSE encourages institutions to share their results in ways that lead to a better understanding of collegiate quality and promote institutional improvement efforts.

Combine numbers with explanatory text. Don’t expect the numbers to speak for themselves. Numeric results and statistical comparisons are more accessible when accompanied by an explanation and interpretation of what can and cannot be concluded from them.

Examine results from multiple perspectives. Normative comparisons may confirm or challenge assumptions about performance relative to other institutions. You may also consider a criterion-referenced view of student engagement in the context of your institution’s mission or program offerings (See p. 3 for details).

Build teams. The likelihood that changes in policy and practice will succeed increase when campus teams are formed and institutions work together in consortial arrangements on topics of mutual interest. Even greater success may be achieved when institutions develop these partnerships at the start of a NSSE administration cycle to make early decisions about priorities and strategic use of the data.

How Often Should an Institution Participate in NSSE?

Table 1 details institutional participation patterns. The most appropriate participation cycle for each institution depends on the purposes for the assessment, but five considerations might influence these decisions. Specifically, your institution may be:

1. Conducting NSSE as part of a regular assessment plan. Institutions that include NSSE in their assessment plans establish a cycle of administration that fits their assessment needs. A standard assessment plan might place NSSE administrations on a three-year cycle to collect periodic information about educational quality.

2. Evaluating the effectiveness of a new programmatic offering or change in the curriculum. If your institution is considering implementing a change in undergraduate education, then scheduling a NSSE administration both before and after the reform can help assess the impact of the initiative on student engagement.

3. Using engagement data for accreditation. One of the most common uses of NSSE data is for accreditation. If an institution is conducting its self-study over a three-year time span, the most useful time to register for NSSE is in year one. In years two and three of the self-study, an institution can review and share results across campus and determine a course of action to improve in specific areas. On a longer accreditation cycle, it may be wise to administer NSSE more than once. In the first year or two of the self-study, NSSE results can assist in determining where to focus attention. After obtaining results and implementing campus improvement plans, another NSSE administration three to four years later would help determine the impact of such changes. This would allow ample time for assessment of results and perhaps additional adjustments to priorities in subsequent progress reports.

4. Benchmarking performance against similar institutions. A key benefit of your NSSE participation is the ability to customize up to three comparison groups from a list of all prior and current-year NSSE participants. This feature allows building comparison groups based on

Table 1
NSSE Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Participating Colleges &amp; Universities by Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Participating Colleges &amp; Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000–2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Frequency of NSSE 2015 Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-time participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-to-three-time participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-to-five-time participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-to-seven-time participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight-to-sixteen-time participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Participation numbers represent all colleges and universities that participated in a standard NSSE administration wherein all sampling and participant recruitment were administered by NSSE.
similar peer groups, aspirational groups, or pre-existing groups. Sometimes NSSE participation is linked to membership in or affinity with a group of institutions such as consortia or state systems (See p. 17). A regular cycle of participation in a consortium or university system allows institutions to benchmark performance against peer institutions and to work collaboratively on mutual interests. Since consortia can append additional questions to NSSE, institutions can better measure institutional effectiveness in key areas of interest and explore data over time.

5. Other considerations. These might include the general allocation of institutional assessment resources such as costs, staff time, the desire to collect other data for triangulation purposes, and generally making time to put the data you have to good use before collecting more. Then, you will need to consider your schedule of undergraduate surveys to avoid survey fatigue among students.

Given the varied purposes and aims involved in NSSE participation, we recommend institutions let their assessment and improvement agendas guide their cycle of participation.

How Can Institutions Establish Standards of Comparison?

NSSE data serve a diagnostic function by identifying institutional strengths and weaknesses with respect to effective educational practices. Comparisons with peer institutions and NSSE cohort averages reveal aspects of institutional and student performance not readily available from other sources. It is also important to examine internal variation in student engagement to identify groups of students who are least engaged and what may be done to improve their experience.

Benchmarking

Institutions use two basic approaches to benchmarking with NSSE: normative and criterion. One or both may be appropriate, depending on institutional priorities.

Normative Approach

The normative approach compares your students’ responses to those of students at other colleges and universities. If enough students have participated, this can also be done at the school, department, or major field level—a particularly effective way of stimulating faculty interest in the findings.

Tarleton State University formed an ad hoc group of campus leaders and held ongoing discussions to review their NSSE results. Thought-provoking findings emerged when the university compared its scores with those of other institutions within its Carnegie classification and the full NSSE cohort. In an attempt to gather additional insights, the group visited with other Tarleton campus leaders to outline its discussions and to seek other thoughts and ideas.

Criterion Approach

With the criterion approach you compare your institution’s results against a predetermined value that you and your colleagues deem appropriate, given your institutional mission, size, curricular offerings, funding, and so forth.

Tulane University’s Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges (SACS) established the Center for Engaged Learning and Teaching (CELT). The center is the hub for fostering engaged learning in four core areas of collegiate life: research, social, classroom, and experiential. Tulane used NSSE results along with other indicators of students’ interest in public service and research to validate the project. NSSE item responses of “expect to do” for first-year students showed high levels of interest in three High-Impact Practices: Internships (71%), Undergraduate Research (44%), and Study Abroad (62%). This suggested the need to expand opportunity based on student interest. NSSE results related to the types of engaged learning activities indicative of CELT serve as baseline indicators, and subsequent results will be used to continuously monitor student participation and educational effectiveness.
Who Should Receive Your NSSE Results?

Institutions often share their results with a wide variety of audiences (See Table 2).

Table 2
Data Sharing with and Use by Internal Institutional Audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Stakeholders</th>
<th>Results shared with</th>
<th>Results explicitly used by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President/senior administration</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department chairs/deans</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student affairs staff</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising staff</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions staff</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public affairs/news office</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing board</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus newspaper</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeted Committees/Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-year experience</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and learning</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing program</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data were collected from 159 institutional respondents to the NSSE 2014 Report Card, an assessment of the NSSE 2014 administration.

Selected Audiences

Targeting specific audiences who may have expressed an interest in one or more aspects of the results may spark focused dialogue about the implications of findings for policy and practice.

Clemson University created specialized reports to reflect the interests of various constituencies including student affairs, student government, and academic affairs. The data are also used extensively in presentations to the Board of Trustees and department head meetings.

Selected NSSE results are shared with faculty during Fall Faculty Workshops at Lindenwood University. Faculty are asked to consider the results as they plan and develop their curriculum and interact with students. Faculty members of the Retention Committee identify key areas that can be improved and ways to foster a more supportive campus environment.

The University of North Dakota (UND) has prepared brief reports for the university constituencies it identified as important. Using the campus’s NSSE data and Snapshot report, institutional researchers at UND created three separate summaries—each one communicating key messages developed specifically for a particular constituency. For instance, UND presented results of questions related to the Effective Teaching Practices Engagement Indicator to demonstrate a need for clarity of communication between students and faculty, especially regarding feedback on assignments.

Presenting the data graphically and clearly, they benchmarked UND’s standing in comparison to its public peers and Carnegie classification group, uncovering opportunities for improving instruction. By doing this, UND transformed a large data set into a digestible, useable format—exemplifying how an institution can selectively present NSSE results most important to specific groups within their institution.

Prompted by the findings in recent studies and Policy Recommendations from the SSRC–CLAA Longitudinal Project, members of the Academic Affairs subcommittee of the Board of Directors at Walsh University requested more information from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) about the kinds of data being collected on the academic performance of Walsh students. In response, OIE staff created a PowerPoint presentation charting five years of NSSE data that show longitudinal comparisons with Carnegie peers and overall NSSE cohorts.

NSSE questions used in the benchmark comparison included analyzing and synthesizing information, making judgments about information, applying theories or concepts to practical problems, as well as the amount of reading and writing students did, how much time they spent on academic tasks, and how hard they worked. All of these factors were tied to cognitive development in the studies named above.

The subcommittee members had a lively discussion about the data during which they asked perceptive questions. They recommended the presentation be given to the full Board at a future meeting.

Wofford College designed a four-page brochure, Measuring Student Engagement—Learn What Your Student Will Actually Get, for distribution to support groups, such as the Alumni Executive Council, and...
for use by admissions staff with visiting prospective
students and high school counselors. The brochure
provides a context for student engagement and
describes how purposeful activities promote student
learning. Graphs of NSSE benchmark results illustrate
the Q&A format. Questions such as “How does the
survey of student engagement work at Wofford and
other participating colleges?” and “How do colleges
measure their performance in engaged learning?” help
to interpret and explain Wofford’s NSSE results.

Campuswide
To distribute NSSE results broadly, many institutions
post summaries of important findings online and invite
colleagues to review the full report. Others share results
through displays created in public areas such as student
unions or dining halls.

Clayton State University (CSU) discusses
their NSSE results at faculty council meetings,
presidential retreats, student success forums,
and in various standing committee meetings. The president of the university has also led
a discussion regarding what the data mean
and how CSU can use the data to enhance its
institutional effectiveness.

Utah Valley University first administered NSSE
in 2008 and has been very active in disseminating
the results and fostering a campus dialogue
about improving the undergraduate experience.
Presentations have been given on the findings and
reports were posted on the institution’s website.
NSSE data were disaggregated by school and
provided to deans. This helped faculty recognize
the importance of NSSE data and ways they can
be used to inform their efforts.

NSSE’s Position on the Public Reporting
of Student Engagement Information
NSSE encourages public reporting of student
engagement results in ways that increase
understanding of college quality and support
institutional improvement efforts. Publicizing
institutional results from the NSSE survey
provides an opportunity to educate the public
about the value of student engagement in
assessing college quality. NSSE supports public
reporting of student engagement results in
ways that enable thoughtful, responsible
institutional comparisons while encouraging
and celebrating institutional diversity.
nsse.indiana.edu/html/Public_Reporting_
Engagement_Data.cfm

External Audiences
Prospective students, parents, the media, researchers, and
others express interest in seeing institutionally specific
NSSE results. Many NSSE institutions have publicized
some or all of their results in some form (e.g., websites,
alumni magazines, press releases) (See Table 3).

Table 3
Data Sharing with External Audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Audiences</th>
<th>Results shared with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accreditation agencies</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective students and parents</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State agencies and commissions</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools/counselors</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data were collected from 159 institutional respondents
to the NSSE 2014 Report Card, an assessment of the NSSE 2014
administration.

Iona College uses NSSE benchmark data in its
communication with parents and students. To
help increase students’ commitment to Iona, letters
discussing the institution’s emphasis on engagement are
sent to first-year parents and students over the summer.

After several years of NSSE participation, the
University of Maryland Baltimore County Office
of Institutional Research (OIR) staff compiled
a comprehensive analytical report that tracked
benchmark scores over time. The comparisons
included groups within the university community,
comparisons to research universities, and a special
science and technology public peer group. This report
was posted to OIR’s website, where prospective
students and parents could review the report online.
How Are Institutions Using NSSE Data in Their Improvement Efforts?

In this section we present examples of how colleges and universities use NSSE data in the following categories: academic advising, general education, academic challenge, collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, enriching the undergraduate experience, supportive campus environment, civic engagement, fostering collaboration and focus, faculty and staff development, enrollment management and recruiting, accreditation, first-year experience, planning and accountability, and writing programs.

Academic Advising

Academic advisors play an integral role in fostering student engagement through early contact with new students and shaping their experiences inside and outside of the classroom. NSSE results can inform institutional efforts to improve academic advising.

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville (UT Knoxville) sought to improve the effectiveness of advising programs. To accomplish this goal, the university administration and advising community examined a number of indicators such as the ratio of students per advisor, information from student focus groups regarding their advising experiences, and a comprehensive program review by external consultants. They also used NSSE responses to explore students’ use of academic support programs, frequency of discussions about career plans with advisors or faculty, perceptions of the academic experience, level of participation in service-learning and undergraduate research, and their experiences with diversity.

All of these indicators align with the university’s advising program goals and learning outcomes, and are related to the overall undergraduate academic experience. Advisors are expected to guide students toward academic support services, programs in service-learning and undergraduate research, co-curricular opportunities, and a comprehensive campus initiative on understanding the diversity of our world and global affairs.

As a result of this two-year assessment process, the university increased the number of full-time academic advisors; restructured orientation advising for first-year students, which includes extended contact with college academic advisors and individual advising sessions; and implemented a new advising policy that targets students who are most at risk of not graduating, such as new transfers, students on probation, and those without declared majors.

General Education

General education (GE) provides the foundation on which essential learning outcomes are developed. Given the increasing focus on specialization and career preparation, GE introduces students to topics vital to a liberally educated citizenry and helps them develop valuable skills—such as integrative thinking, communication, quantitative reasoning, and critical thinking—that will serve them over the course of their lives.

Based on its NSSE results, Kenyon College, a liberal arts institution in central Ohio, found its students generally to be engaged and highly satisfied with their educational experience. Yet digging deeper into the data on educational gains brought Kenyon new insights regarding students’ perceptions of the college’s contribution to their acquiring work-related skills and clarifying a personal code of values or ethics.
These findings helped make the case for an initiative to reimagine general education on campus. The Working Group on Curricular Essentials at Kenyon was charged to think critically about general education; to convene discussion among faculty, staff, and administrators on the ideal liberal arts education; and to explore ways of delivering that ideal to their students. The Working Group developed guiding principles and compiled a short list of different approaches to general education to continue faculty discussion of these issues at a retreat and to develop recommendations about how best to reimagine general education on campus.

High-Impact Practices (HIPs)

Because of their positive effects on student learning and retention, special undergraduate opportunities such as learning communities, service-learning, research with a faculty member, study abroad, internships, and culminating senior experiences are called high-impact practices (HIPs) (See G. D. Kuh & K. O’Donnell, Ensuring Quality and Taking High-Impact Practices to Scale, AAC&U, 2013). High-impact practices can result in life-changing educational experiences for participants because they:

- Demand considerable time and effort,
- Provide learning opportunities outside of the classroom,
- Require meaningful interactions with faculty members and students,
- Encourage interaction with diverse others, and
- Provide frequent and meaningful feedback.

An institutional example of using NSSE data to advance the implementation of high-impact practices follows:

The Committee on Student Engagement at Ramapo College of New Jersey was charged to develop a comprehensive plan to more fully engage students in their undergraduate college experience, motivated in large part by a thorough examination of NSSE results relating to high-impact practices and comparisons to institutions with similar missions. The committee held a series of retreats and meetings that reviewed results, created an inventory of campus experiences that meet student engagement outcomes, placed these activities on a four-year continuum, and identified how students benefit from the experiences. The committee then created a four-year development model that included four student learning goals for academic, social, personal, and campus/civic engagement.

They also identified Key Points of Student Engagement (KPEs)—high-impact activities that contribute to student learning and achieve the four goals. For example, existing first-year KPEs are the summer reading program, Convocation, Orientation, and Welcome Week activities. KPEs provide an explicit indicator about factors important to achieving student learning goals, and they represent institutional commitments to supporting and strengthening student engagement.

Currently, the model is available for first-year students and sophomores. Future plans include creating a model for juniors and seniors, determining the best way to incorporate transfer students, and offering a co-curricular transcript that records student progress throughout the collegiate journey. Long-term assessment of the model will include a triangulation of NSSE data with other institutional data sources, such as retention data and student satisfaction surveys, to determine the validity and effectiveness of the overall model.

NSSE TIP #1: Posting Your NSSE Results

About 40% of NSSE participating institutions post NSSE results on their websites. This is an effective way to highlight institutional strengths and demonstrate commitment to quality improvement. Some institutions display all of their NSSE reports online, while others post selected results highlighting institutional strengths or news releases that emphasize institutional participation and findings relevant to performance priorities. Another option is to post short reports summarizing key student engagement findings.

Participants in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) that elect to feature NSSE results have the opportunity to post additional information about their performance (see the NSSE website for VSA–NSSE updates). nsse.indiana.edu/html/vsa.cfm
Transfer Students

Transfer students who attend more than one institution are increasingly common. Indeed, more than 50% of seniors responding to NSSE in 2013 started at a different institution. Understanding the experiences of this large subpopulation should be of keen interest to faculty and administrators.

As part of Western Michigan University’s (WMU) planning priorities for 2011–12, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) presented findings to the Provost’s Council about how engagement for transfer students (growing in number at WMU) differed from students who began their undergraduate careers at WMU. Selected findings from the staff’s examination of results from NSSE administrations in three consecutive years showed that transfer students were less likely to work with faculty outside of class, complete a field-based experience, carry out community service, or complete a culminating senior project—important goals of WMU’s strategic plan.

Furthermore, transfer students were less likely to participate in co-curricular activities due to family responsibilities and time spent commuting to campus. These were important considerations for university programs and practices that support the nonacademic responsibilities of students. Recommendations included a range of initiatives to support transfer student transition, including more evening course offerings and expansion of WMU offerings at local community colleges to ensure smooth transfer.

In addition, WMU implemented a plan to facilitate NSSE data use at the college level to examine other high-priority planning outcomes. WMU developed long-term trend workbooks that display comparison results for individual survey items—over seven years for NSSE and six years for FSSE. The workbooks are posted on the WMU institutional effectiveness website. http://www.wmich.edu/assessment/inst-assess.html

Experiences with Faculty

The level of student interaction with faculty members is a frequently expressed concern. For instance, some small liberal arts colleges were surprised to find that students did not report as much contact with faculty as institutional leaders expected. NSSE results related to student-faculty interaction are also disquieting for many research-intensive universities.

Winona State University (WSU) in Minnesota has a long history of assessment and evaluation of student engagement and learning outcomes. Most notably, since 1998 they have conducted an institution-wide Assessment Day to gather feedback from students, faculty, and staff and to evaluate student learning outcomes. Data from WSU’s NSSE administration and a WSU preenrollment survey were compared and analyzed and then presented to all Student Life and Development (SLD) staff and to the campus committee preparing for WSU’s upcoming accreditation visit.

NSSE results showed that WSU students were very likely to engage in collaborative learning, volunteerism, and service-learning—recent areas of focus at WSU—but were not experiencing as much student-faculty interaction as WSU had anticipated, especially in the first year. These findings persuaded SLD staff to focus on programming efforts that would involve faculty and promote student-faculty interaction both in and out of the classroom. Additionally, some sections of the first-year orientation course were linked to other courses taught by the same faculty member, serving to increase the amount of contact students had with that instructor.

NSSE results also indicated that more attention was needed to increase student interaction with peers from different racial or ethnic backgrounds. This was not surprising given the relatively homogeneous student body at WSU, but the finding underscored the need for WSU to put increased emphasis on the importance of diversity in multiple arenas. In addition, WSU used results from its first BCSSE administration to explore entering students’ experiences and expectations for engagement and developed a reporting tool that allows faculty and staff to quickly and easily view NSSE results broken down by class, gender, and ethnicity.
Enriching the Undergraduate Educational Experience

Several institutions responded to their NSSE results by increasing opportunities to study abroad, adding service-learning components to courses, creating living-learning communities, and further developing capstone experiences for seniors.

Norfolk State University (NSU) has participated in numerous administrations of NSSE, BCSSE, and FSSE. Results from all three surveys were used for the Walmart Minority Student Success Grant. NSU was concerned about the gaps between faculty perceptions and students’ expectations and experiences. Results from interviews with students and faculty members indicated that more faculty involvement was needed to improve the student experience. The grant provided funding for a faculty-led mentoring program for students who participate in the Summer Bridge Program, an orientation program for first-generation, potentially at-risk students who are about to enter their first semester at NSU. Mentoring clusters consist of five to seven students, one faculty member, and peer leaders.

Service-Learning

Students who are engaged in service-learning activities create meaningful connections with the community, as well as with their faculty and peers.

NSSE data revealed that University of Georgia (UGA) students wanted more opportunities to engage in service-learning experiences. In response, to provide students and faculty opportunities to integrate service-learning into the formal curriculum, UGA created the Office of Service-Learning, which launched the Service-Learning Fellows Program to assist faculty in incorporating service-learning into their teaching, research, and service. More than 70 faculty members from various disciplines across campus have already participated in this program.

Fostering Collaboration and Focus

NSSE results can serve as a mechanism for fostering collaboration among campus constituencies and developing broader ownership in efforts to improve the educational experience. Some institutions invite undergraduates to interpret NSSE results. Student representatives are included on assessment committees at some institutions. Sharing results with student government and other student organizations is another approach to obtaining student insights into what NSSE data mean and suggestions for how the institution might respond.

In its self-study for NEASC reaffirmation, Worcester State University (WSU) shared data from two NSSE administrations via roundtable discussions as well as provided results at the program and department levels. To support Standard 4: The Academic Program, Assessment of Student Learning, WSU compared results from a FSSE administration with previous NSSE responses as indirect measures of student and faculty engagement. A third survey, the Commuter and Off-Campus Student Experience Survey (COSES), has provided WSU additional data on the needs and experiences of its commuter students. These three surveys will continue to be administered over time to identify long-term trends and patterns.

NSSE TIP #3: Improving Campus Confidence in Results

Faculty members and administrative staff often raise questions about the validity and reliability of student self-reported data. It may be helpful to build a case for the validity of the findings at your institution.

NSSE is committed to data quality and continuous improvement and embraces the responsibility to share detailed information about the survey with the higher education community. The Psychometric Portfolio is a framework for presenting our studies of validity, reliability, and other NSSE data indicators, including breakdowns by a variety of student and institutional characteristics. It serves higher education leaders, researchers, and professionals who have a vested interest in using NSSE data and trusting their results.

nsse.indiana.edu/links/psychometric_portfolio
Faculty and Staff Development

NSSE results are appropriate for faculty and staff development workshops and retreats, such as those sponsored by the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). Presenting student engagement data is one way to initiate discussions about a variety of teaching and learning issues, and results from the FSSE can be used to compare faculty and student perceptions.

Staff from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment at Holy Family University (HFU), in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, coordinated two lunch-and-learn sessions on campus to introduce NSSE and FSSE, to share 2013 survey results, and to encourage faculty and staff to use the results in campus assessment and improvement projects. The first session, focusing on NSSE, began with a presentation about what NSSE is, why the campus participates, how the NSSE instrument has changed, and HFU’s participation history. Staff conveyed the benefits of NSSE participation, highlighting the reports and resources from their latest administration along with results demonstrating the link between NSSE’s themes and HFU’s mission. The opening presentation concluded with examples of other institutions’ uses of NSSE results (from Lessons from the Field, Volumes 1 and 2). For the interactive portion of the session, the staff split the audience into two groups—one taking the role of first-year students and the other the role of seniors. Each group was tasked with predicting HFU student responses on Engagement Indicator items and how these would compare to comparison-group responses. As actual results were revealed, attendees discussed how they differed from the predicted results, why that might be, and how the campus could work together to improve student engagement. For the final portion of the session, the whole audience, taking the role of seniors, predicted senior responses on the High-Impact Practice items. HFU’s second lunch-and-learn session introduced FSSE and detailed why HFU participates, presented results in HFU’s NSSE–FSSE Combined Report, discussed differences between faculty and student responses, and generated suggestions from the results for improving instructional strategies. Following up on these sessions, institutional research and assessment staff created for faculty and staff an internal Blackboard web page displaying both NSSE and FSSE reports.

Illinois State University uses NSSE, FSSE, and BCSSE findings to guide campus conversations among students, faculty, student affairs personnel, and other stakeholders. Solution-based programming has been designed using data from NSSE, FSSE and BCSSE, providing a vehicle for meaningful conversations about student engagement and effective and timely support to faculty and staff. For example, a four-part series cosponsored with the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Technology titled “Improve Student Writing and Still Have a Life” was developed for faculty based upon results from the NSSE and FSSE surveys. This series focused on the information learned about student and faculty perceptions of writing and manageable methods faculty can utilize to improve the quality of student writing in their classes.

Enrollment Management and Recruiting

NSSE data are also used to provide more accurate and realistic descriptions of campus life to prospective students and parents. Some institutions use NSSE data to present empirically derived portraits of the typical student in viewbooks, recruitment literature, brochures, and gatherings of prospective students to accurately convey expectations for college life.

The University of Massachusetts–Lowell examined differences in NSSE responses between first-year students who had been retained and those who were no longer enrolled by the subsequent spring. The reported frequency of exposure to effective teaching and learning practices was greater for students who were retained. Because half of their students are commuter students, Lowell’s classroom experiences are particularly vital. NSSE data supported the emphasis on students’ classroom experiences in order to maintain high student persistence rates.

“We promote the NSSE results in meetings with faculty committees, the university senate, and occasionally with smaller faculty groups. Because we have participated for a number of consecutive years, we are also now able to pool results by college within the university, which really helps get deans’ attention.”

—Iryna Johnson, Associate Director for Assessment, Auburn University
Accreditation

Accreditors are the most common external audience for NSSE results (See Table 3, p. 5). More than half of NSSE institutions tell us that they use their results in self-studies and accreditation reports.

The University of Texas at Tyler, accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools–Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), has used NSSE data during the development of its Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). The university’s QEP proposal states, “The data that initially drew the faculty’s attention to the need for more cross-cultural exposure at UT Tyler were the results of the National Survey of Student Engagement.” UT Tyler’s 2009 NSSE results indicated that its students would benefit from increased interaction with students who had different cultural values and that significant work could be done in developing understanding of others’ opinions and beliefs.

Based on the finding from the NSSE data that less than half of the UT Tyler student respondents answered in the affirmative to several specific NSSE items, campus leadership determined that the university’s academic quality could be enhanced significantly by including education on global or cultural topics. To meet this need, the university developed the Global Awareness Through Education (GATE) program. Since this initial use of NSSE data as part of the QEP rationale, NSSE results have been used in the ongoing assessment of GATE, the analysis of the program’s university-wide effects and implications, and the study of the feasibility of the program to significantly impact the UT Tyler student population going forward.

Georgia State University’s QEP for SACS, Critical Thinking Through Writing (CTW), used NSSE results to assess gains in work-related knowledge and critical thinking skills. The CTW initiative is nested within academic departments where faculty members serve as CTW ambassadors and train instructors in CTW classes. As a new graduation requirement, GSU students must pass two CTW courses. The QEP will use direct assessments including departmental annual reports of student learning outcomes by major, surveys of instructors and students, written reports from CTW faculty ambassadors, as well as indirect assessments such as NSSE results and senior exit surveys.

Other examples can be found in the regional and specialized Accreditation Toolkits on the NSSE website. nsse.indiana.edu/links/accred_resources

NSSE TIP #4: Contextualize Your NSSE Data Using Cognitive Interviews and Focus Groups

Techniques such as cognitive interviews and focus groups can be used by institutions to provide a more contextualized understanding of students’ responses to NSSE. Cognitive interviewing can be employed to gain an enriched sense of respondents’ perceptions of particular items. Focus groups provide an opportunity to contextualize and validate the meaning of NSSE aggregate results and can help enhance understanding of results to increase the likelihood that reform efforts based on survey results would prove effective. NSSE has created a step-by-step guide to conducting cognitive interviews and focus groups. A PDF is available on the NSSE website. nsse.indiana.edu/links/cognitive_interviews

First-Year Experience

First-year experience programs are commonplace today, and students’ responses to relevant survey items can assist institutions in determining their effectiveness.

Bowling Green State University (BGSU) has participated in eight NSSE administrations to date and uses the results as indicators of student learning, development, and success. For a recent campus visit for NCA–HLC accreditation, BGSU used NSSE data in a self-study of behaviors reported by first-year students participating in academic enrichment activities such as internships, community service, and learning communities.

For its newly implemented First-Year Experience (FYE) program, The Catholic University of America (CUA), in Washington, DC, launched a comprehensive assessment plan. The FYE program—comprised of numerous components that support student success
including a streamlined summer registration process; first-year advising; learning communities; a weekly FYE newsletter; increased tutoring and assistance programs; and, at its core, academic and intellectual elements—represented a substantial investment in helping the newest members of the campus community enter into the life of the university and improve student retention. CUA used a range of data to inform the creation and improvement of FYE, including NSSE, the Classroom-Level Survey of Student Engagement (CLASSE), advising surveys, course and instructor evaluations, and institutional retention data.

CUA has administered NSSE annually since 2000 and examined results longitudinally to assess improvements in first-year student engagement and, in particular, to assess the impact of implementing learning communities and enhanced first-year courses. CUA's NSSE scores for student-faculty interaction increased significantly over time and in comparison to its Carnegie peers. For example, results demonstrated improvements in teaching and learning in the first year, including discussing ideas from readings with faculty members outside of class and receiving prompt feedback on academic performance. Similar improvements also occurred for collaborative learning activities such as discussing ideas with peers outside of class and participating in community-based projects.

By combining NSSE with other assessment results, including course and instructor evaluations, CUA further revised the curriculum of their introductory writing course, implemented block scheduling of learning communities, and established an FYE reading room. CUA concluded that assessment results supported incorporating learning communities, first-year advising, and co-curricular enhancements into the FYE, and also indicated that the FYE’s academic core needed further attention. CUA plans to expand faculty development activities and continue striving to make the educational experience academically rich and personally nurturing to ensure student success.

The University of Akron used NSSE results for its Foundations of Excellence® self-study to help identify ways for the campus to improve. These included developing and distributing a campus-wide first-year philosophy; creating more exposure to diversity in first-year and general education courses; more professional development for faculty and administrators who work with first-year students; creation of more common components in the first-year curriculum; better and more effective ways of communicating with first-year students; and promoting service-learning, mentoring, and undergraduate research programs as vehicles to foster student-faculty interaction outside of the classroom.

Reporting by Majors and Programs

NSSE results disaggregated by categories of related majors and programs may be used for assessment by deans, department chairs, and faculty. NSSE’s Major Field Report facilitates department-level work.

To emphasize program-level data, benchmarking, student reflection on learning, and other campus goals, a cycle of student surveys including NSSE are administered by the office of Institutional Analysis at the University of Colorado Boulder (CU–Boulder), and results are reported publicly by college, school, division, and department. CU–Boulder is also the national coordinator of the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) program. The AAUDE–NSSE consortium allows institutions to add optional questions and/or share NSSE response-level data among participating institutions. Information from these efforts was used for reaccreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (HLC–NCA) in CU–Boulder’s self-study, Shaping the New Flagship.

At Fayettville State University, NSSE data are disaggregated by major and provided to department chairs so that they can determine areas of improvement. Student participation in a capstone course or learning community has been of particular interest. The institution has invested more in learning communities and developing capstone courses in an effort to strengthen writing across the curriculum and increase the amount of time students spend preparing for class.

Iona College
**Student Affairs**

Student affairs departments use NSSE data to create programs that support a climate of success on their campuses. Through collaborative ventures with academic affairs, they have initiated numerous assessment and improvement efforts:

**University of Texas at Tyler** (UT Tyler) uses NSSE data as indicators of student learning and a positive overall college experience. Directors within the student affairs division have identified NSSE items that are specifically related to their unit’s mission, goals, and expected outcomes. Each year, the directors and staff review these items and track longitudinal progress on both internal and external comparisons. Action plans for improvement are determined using the comparative data. The staff has identified the selected NSSE items in the annual assessment plan so that the results and action plans and follow-up are reported annually. The assessment plans are reviewed formally by members of the University Assessment Committee, the Assessment & Institutional Effectiveness staff, and by the Vice President for Student Affairs.

**Texas A&M University–Corpus Christi** prepares targeted reports for individual departments in the Division of Student Affairs, such as first-year programs and student housing, that include longitudinal analysis of relevant NSSE items. For example, University Center and Campus Activities receives results on the time students spend in co-curricular activities and the extent to which students perceive an emphasis on attending campus events. A main report for University Housing examines whether students who live on campus are more engaged than students who live off campus. These results provide evidence to support departments’ assessment reports for the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). In addition, breakout reports comparing NSSE and BCSSE data have been used by first-year programs to better understand how the institution is meeting first-year students’ expectations.

**Planning and Accountability**

NSSE results are used along with other surveys and existing institutional data for strategic planning and key performance indicators to fulfill standards established by state systems and other governing agencies.

On its website, **Denison University** launched a new page, Student Outcomes: The Denison Difference, devoted to assisting internal and external audiences in understanding the value of a Denison education. The page is a comprehensive marketing web resource that captures positive student outcomes at Denison. Displaying Denison’s NSSE results in an innovative and interactive format, the page combines internal survey data, acceptance rates, and alumni narratives with NSSE results.

Denison has identified 13 core undergraduate student outcomes, derived from its institutional mission and general education requirements and developed by a committee of faculty and student affairs staff: Civic Life, Global Perspective, Difference Among Persons, Issues of Power & Justice, Agency, Identity Awareness, Quantitative Reasoning, Oral Communication, Written Communication, Analytical Thinking, Critical Thinking, Creative Thinking, and Ethical Thinking. On Denison’s new web page, these core student outcomes are arrayed around a colorful wheel and, when selected, each one reveals corresponding NSSE data that demonstrate how students at Denison reach that outcome. Denison also aggregated responses to NSSE items about how students spend their time, including the amount of hours spent participating in co-curricular activities and volunteering, to create a profile of civic life among seniors.

NSSE data help Denison’s administrators assess the achievement of their core student learning outcomes and align their work to the institutional mission and commitment to liberal arts education. NSSE data also help the university communicate its accomplishments to the external community.

University of Massachusetts–Amherst
A task force composed of faculty, administrative staff, and one student was charged with establishing a plan to highlight the “distinctiveness” of the State University of New York Oneonta (SUNY Oneonta) from other comparable institutions. To derive “important attributes” and “distinguishing strengths,” the task force reviewed numerous resources including internal and external survey results (Student Opinion Survey [SOS], NSSE, Collegiate Learning Assessment [CLA]), strategic planning documents, and enrollment data. Additional information was collected through an email survey of academic department heads and an open forum held for the campus community. Four themes of “distinctiveness” emerged: reputation, engagement, service, and environment. Scores from the SOS, admissions data, a rigorous assessment program, and participation as an early adopter in the VSA program were used as evidence of SUNY Oneonta’s reputation of excellence in teaching and learning. NSSE benchmark scores provided support for claims that SUNY Oneonta fostered high levels of student engagement inside and outside of the classroom. In addition, NSSE results for seniors on survey items related to technology demonstrated that students were using computer and information technologies more frequently than were their SUNY system counterparts.

Wagner College links NSSE data with other results to inform programmatic change. Wagner’s distinctive curriculum, The Wagner Plan for the Practical Liberal Arts, combines interdisciplinary learning with experiential learning in New York City through three learning community formats across students’ undergraduate experience. To develop The Wagner Plan to its full potential, Wagner administrators and faculty wanted to determine whether there were variations within subgroups of students on a number of NSSE benchmarks.

Following NSSE’s recommendations for predictive validity studies (see NSSE’s Psychometric Portfolio), Wagner linked NSSE data with students’ SAT scores, enrollment records, and GPAs. Results revealed that for most students across all five benchmarks, higher levels of engagement were linked to higher rates of retention after one year. For students with SAT scores in the low to middle ranges, engagement was a better predictor of retention than SAT scores. In an effort to assess engagement early in the fall semester, Wagner devised a survey that first-year students will complete in learning-community courses in the third week of the semester. Students will be asked about how they spend their time, if they have missed any classes or assignments (and in which courses), what they anticipate as a major, and how they feel they fit in on campus. Results will be shared with the learning-community faculty, also the students’ advisors, and with campus life administrators so that appropriate follow-up contact can be made with students as needed to support their persistence and success.

NSSE Reports and Commitment to Data Quality

The following publications provide detailed information about NSSE data and measures.

Annual Results—An extensive report, published each November, disseminating new research on the quality of students’ educational experiences using recent data from NSSE, FSSE, and BCSSE. nsse.indiana.edu/html/annual_reports.cfm

Psychometric Portfolio—As part of NSSE’s commitment to transparency as well as continuous improvement, we routinely assess the quality of our survey and resulting data, and we embrace our responsibility to share the results with the higher education community. The Psychometric Portfolio is a framework for presenting validity, reliability, and other data quality indicators for NSSE data.

Summary Tables—Basic tables of survey responses by student and institutional characteristic are updated annually. We also provide summary characteristics of participating colleges and universities. nsse.indiana.edu/html/summary_tables.cfm

Publications & Presentations—Papers, publications, and conference presentations by NSSE, FSSE, and BCSSE staff and collaborators are available online. Search by author, date, or keyword, or limit your search to publications. nsse.indiana.edu/html/pubs.cfm

Institutional Website Examples—Many colleges and universities post NSSE results online. These examples of institutional websites that display NSSE results go a step beyond the simple posting of standard NSSE reports. They format results for different audiences, integrate results with other institutional data, or present analyses beyond those provided in the standard reports. nsse.indiana.edu/links/website_displays
NSSE results were an obvious data source to assess the Engagement outcome. Though McKendree first-year students scored at or above the mean for many items in the Enriching Educational Experiences Benchmark, the SLATE committee wanted to improve areas where seniors scored below the mean. NSSE results were used in conjunction with results from their Fall Student Survey to demonstrate the need for increased service-learning opportunities and improvements in teaching resources for faculty. McKendree plans to administer NSSE every three years to continuously measure student engagement scores.

Writing Programs

NSSE results can be helpful for institutions seeking to improve the use of student writing for learning in their courses. Faculty and staff can explore the extent to which students engage in writing experiences and can analyze their own effectiveness in promoting such engagement. Through consortium participation or addition of NSSE survey modules, institutions can gain a deeper understanding of student writing.

Auburn University has participated consistently since 2002. While it reviews NSSE results at the institution level to provide a general view of the student experience, Auburn also drills down to specific department data. When comparing its students’ scores to those of students at peer institutions, Auburn identified areas of concern with student writing skills. Coupling NSSE results with similar results from the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA), the institution targeted writing for improvement and launched an initiative that established an Office of University Writing and a formal University Writing Committee.

The new committee and newly hired Director of University Writing outlined specific practices to help departments improve their students’ writing skills. These included common program-level practices, such as identifying competencies expected of graduates in the department, and common course-level practices, which provided students the opportunity to revise their writing after receiving feedback from peers and the instructor.

Auburn University monitors progress on student writing plans through its participation in NSSE and the NSSE Consortium for the Study of Writing in College. By reviewing results on the consortium items and surveying faculty to gain a better understanding of how faculty approach writing in the classroom, Auburn continues to assess and foster improvement in the writing skills of its students.
NSSE results for Harvey Mudd College (HMC) revealed that HMC students felt they were not acquiring as much as students in their peer comparison group in professional writing skills. Viewed in light of findings from its Strategic Planning Process (SPP), HMC began an overhaul of its core curriculum. A Writing Course Subcommittee was charged with working on a new curriculum. The committee recommended the addition of two required writing courses—research-based and academic writing—to help bridge what was seen as the gap in skills. The core curriculum was implemented in 2010 and HMC continues to assess its progress.

Experiences with Diversity

Engaging diverse perspectives is an important goal and effective educational practice to promote learning and development. Several NSSE items indicate students’ experience with diversity and can be a meaningful gauge.

NSSE results from Allegheny College indicated that students had limited experiences with diversity. The findings were shared with deans and faculty and informed the goal-setting process for Allegheny’s strategic plan, in effect through 2010. The strategic focus on diversity helped Allegheny to increase the diversity of faculty, staff, and students and to advance diverse experiences in the curriculum. A continued focus on diversity is evident in the “Global & Local Diversity” initiative, one of the four goals of Allegheny’s new strategic plan, Combinations 2020. Other initiatives to increase diversity on campus provide international students with more opportunities to join the Allegheny community; require students to participate in study “away,” either traditional study abroad or domestic internships; and offer an increased number of scholarship awards to students with limited financial resources to expand the socioeconomic background of Allegheny’s student population. The continuing need to increase diversity in terms of faculty and students at Allegheny emerged as an important part of strategic planning in 2009. NSSE results directly influenced this inclusion in the plan and were used to drive decision-making.

NSSE results at the State University of New York at Geneseo revealed that diversity and academic advising were two important areas of concern. Responses to items related to diversity reinforced the need to address issues repeatedly brought up by students. A number of initiatives were implemented including the Campus Diversity Plan, Real World Geneseo, and Deliberative Dialogues. The Multi-Cultural Organization Space for Activities, Inclusion, and Collaboration (MOSAIC) was also installed on campus. The goals of the Campus Diversity Plan included recruitment, support, and retention of a diverse student body, faculty, staff, and administration; addition of international learning experiences and important components to the curriculum; promotion of an inclusive campus community; and enhancement of students’ knowledge and appreciation of diverse populations and cultures.

MOSAIC provides a dedicated meeting space where activities such as the Deliberative Dialogues sessions led by faculty, staff, and student moderators provide opportunities to discuss diversity issues and suggest solutions. “Real World Geneseo,” modeled on MTV’s “Real World,” is a four-day intensive workshop, held in a Rochester hotel, in which students explore their differing perspectives on such issues as race, gender, sexual identity, and class differences. All major divisions at Geneseo also sponsor diversity-related activities. The Vice President’s Diversity Grant provides funding for innovative programs that promote campus diversity. Departments report to Academic Affairs annually on progress made toward advancing diversity through their curricular offerings and opportunities for research with Geneseo faculty. A number of administrative departments also sponsor workshops and speakers as evidence of a continued commitment to diversity on campus.
How Do Consortia Use NSSE Results?

More than 750 colleges and universities have participated in 55 self-selected consortia that supplemented the NSSE core survey with questions related to shared interests. Consortia often represent very distinctive types of institutions—women’s colleges, urban universities, Jesuit institutions, engineering colleges, art and design colleges, and research universities. Multi-campus university systems and state systems of higher education also regularly coordinate survey administration within the same year to standardize assessment initiatives.

Using data from additional NSSE questions on writing experiences, the University of Colorado Boulder was able to explore the influence of good writing practices on their students’ learning and compare CU-Boulder’s performance to that of other schools in the Consortium for the Study of Writing in College (CSWC). A major component of CU-Boulder’s NCA Self-Study described the Program for Writing and Rhetoric (PWR) and the creation of the campus Writing Center to address a decentralized and diffuse writing curriculum and lack of focus on first-year writing programs. PWR expanded upper-division courses, redesigned lower-division courses, and established a full-service Writing Center to reinforce pedagogical reforms driven by assessment. Results on several NSSE survey items related to student writing from four NSSE administrations showed that CU–Boulder students improved over time and compared well to students at peer institutions.

Recommendations for Using NSSE Results

More than a decade of working with NSSE data and interviews with campus project managers led to the following recommendations:

1. Create a NSSE committee, team, or task force on your campus.
2. Share NSSE results widely throughout the campus to stimulate action.
3. Share NSSE results at the department level.
4. Validate findings by linking NSSE data to other data sources.
5. Post NSSE results on your institutional website to enhance communication and promote transparency.

Using NSSE Data to Address Campus Issues and Problems

NSSE results can be used as a lens into current campus issues or concerns. Institutions often share common challenges, such as less than desired retention or completion rates, or are simply interested in improving the learning environment. There is no single approach to tackling these issues. However, when examining your NSSE data and considering possible strategies for your action plan, consider the following questions:

- What data confirm known facts?
- What results are surprising?
- What results meet your expectations?
- What results need further investigation?

Answers to these questions can provide a framework for a more substantive action plan to tackle an issue.

“We have made several presentations including one at the Celebration of Teaching and Learning, which over 200 faculty attended. We have formed a university-wide committee called Persistence to Graduation Committee in which there is a strong faculty representation. We are using the results from NSSE especially from Student-Faculty Interaction to help with strategic planning and programming to improve retention and graduation of our undergraduates.”

—Cheryl Gilchrist, Director of Retention Management and Research, University of Louisville
## Overcoming Obstacles to Using NSSE Data Effectively

Converting assessment information into action is a challenge for all colleges and universities. Below, we provide ways to address some of the more common obstacles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small number of respondents</td>
<td>Look at various demographics of your NSSE respondent file to check its representativeness of your campus population. Review sampling error. Average response rate by institution type can help put response patterns in perspective. NSSE research indicates that a sufficient number of respondents is more important than a high response rate for institution-level survey estimates. If possible, combine two years of data to increase numbers. Specific questions about response rate and its significance to data quality are addressed on the NSSE website. <a href="http://nsse.indiana.edu/pdf/Resp_Rate_FAQ.pdf">nsse.indiana.edu/pdf/Resp_Rate_FAQ.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions about validity and reliability</td>
<td>NSSE has conducted a number of validity and reliability studies including a study of the role of response rates in college surveys, stability analyses, test-retest, focus groups, and nonrespondent bias checks. The Psychometric Portfolio section of the NSSE website provides information on these issues. <a href="http://nsse.indiana.edu/links/psychometric_portfolio">nsse.indiana.edu/links/psychometric_portfolio</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited capacity to analyze and report results</td>
<td>The reports that NSSE sends to institutions can be quickly packaged and sent to faculty and staff with little extra analysis. All data files, reports, and supporting documents related to your NSSE Institutional Report are available in electronic format from the Institution Interface on the NSSE website home page, allowing easy print or electronic distribution. The easily shared Online Institutional Report is also available from the Institution Interface. The NSSE Report Builder generates reports of user-selected student and institutional characteristics. Two versions are available: Public and Institution. <a href="http://nsse.indiana.edu">nsse.indiana.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Average” results across the board</td>
<td>If your results are comparable to those of your selected comparison groups, try using a different comparison group or consider a criterion-referenced approach to determine the degree to which student performance is consistent with institutional expectations. Analyze results by subgroup (e.g., departments or special programs) to reveal variation within your institution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of faculty awareness or interest in student engagement results</td>
<td>Consider administering the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) to look at student engagement from the faculty perspective. Results may be useful for retreat or workshop discussions. Make available a summary of the literature on student engagement’s value in effective educational practices. <a href="http://fsse.indiana.edu">fsse.indiana.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>