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Overview

• Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)
  • Background, administration, reports, options,...

• FSSE results on their own

• Combining NSSE & FSSE results

• Some cautions

• Discussion--thoughts, ideas, feedback
Why FSSE?

• Include faculty

• Understand faculty expectations and perceptions

• Some previous homegrown faculty surveys seemed to work
FSSE History

• Pilot-tested in 2003, officially launched in 2004

• To date, over 120,000 faculty members from 530 colleges and universities

• Average institutional response rates of about 50%
FSSE Registration

- Eligibility: concurrently participating in NSSE or participated in the previous year
- Online registration for both FSSE and NSSE
  [www.nsse.iub.edu](http://www.nsse.iub.edu)
- Registration closed, but it may not be too late!
- Institutions provide:
  - Institutional contact information
  - Estimation of number of faculty
FSSE Administration

- Third party admin--IU Center for Survey Research
- Faculty surveyed in the spring
- Institutions choose faculty to be surveyed
- Faculty responses are kept anonymous
- Administered online

Survey options
- Course-based questions
- Typical student questions
FSSE Survey

• Faculty perceptions of how often their students engage in different activities

• The importance or emphasis faculty place on various areas of learning and development

• Faculty perceptions of the campus environment

• How faculty members organize class time
Course-Based Option

- Each faculty member responds to questions about student engagement based on a course taught during the current academic year

- Option available since 2003 pilot
Key Question

Course-Based

• Please respond to the following questions based on one particular undergraduate course section you are teaching or have taught this academic year

Level of students in your selected course section

- Lower division (mostly first-year students and sophomores)
- Upper division (mostly juniors and seniors)
- Other (please describe)
Example Question & Items

Course-Based

• About what percent of students in your selected course section do the following?
  (None, 1-24%, 25-49%, 50-74%, 75% or higher)

Frequently ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions

Frequently come to class without completing readings or assignments
Example Question & Items

Course-Based

- How often do students in your selected course section engage in the following? (Never, Sometimes, Often, Very often)

  Receive prompt written or oral feedback from you on their academic performance.

  Have serious conversations in your course with students of a different race or ethnicity than his or her own
Typical Student Option

• Each faculty member responds to questions about student engagement based on the typical first-year student or senior taught during the current academic year

• Option first available in 2007
Key Question

Typical Student

- During the current academic year, have you had more first-year students or seniors in your classes?
  - More first-year students than seniors
  - More seniors than first-year students
  - I have taught neither first-year students nor seniors this academic year
Example Question & Items

Typical Student

- About how often has the typical [first-year student, senior, student] done each of the following?
  (Never, Sometimes, Often, Very often)

  Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions

  Come to class without completing readings or assignments

  Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on his or her academic performance

  Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than his or her own
FSSE Reports for Institutions

• **Respondent Characteristics**
  • Reported in aggregate form
  • Most variables in table not returned in data set

• **Frequency Distributions**
  • Item-level frequencies
  • No comparisons to other faculty

• **NSSE/FSSE Report**
  • Student/faculty frequency comparisons for similarly worded items
FSSE Resources

- **FSSE website** www.fsse.iub.edu
  - Sample reports and copies of surveys
  - Selected results
    - Downloadable syntax
    - Example tables and displays
  - Grand frequencies by Carnegie classification
  - Recent FSSE research and presentations

- **Special analyses** (contact fsse@indiana.edu)
### NSSE and FSSE 2009 Registration Closed

Spring 2009 registration for NSSE and FSSE has closed. Institutions still wishing to participate may click the registration link below to be placed on the waitlist. We will review the waitlist by October 3 to decide if we can accommodate waitlisted schools. The waitlist will be reviewed on a first-come, first-served basis for participation in NSSE 2009.

Here are the steps to complete your institution’s waitlist registration:

1. Navigate to the NSSE/FSSE website.
2. Follow the registration instructions for NSSE 2009.
3. Select the “Waitlist” option to be placed on the waitlist.
4. Wait for a decision by October 3.

### Luther College (Decorah, IA)

Luther College shares FSSE data in a variety of ways. The Faculty Assessment Committee, a group chaired by Dr. Jon Christy, Director of Assessment and Institutional Research, is instrumental in deciding how survey data can be best framed in ways that will be well-received. [Read more...](#)

### FSSE on the Road

FSSE team members are scheduled to present findings from participating faculty at the following upcoming conferences:

- **Professional and Organizational Development**
  - "Emphasizing a Shared Responsibility for Deep Approaches to Learning"
  - Reno, Nevada, October 22-25, 2008

- **Assessment Institute**
  - "How Faculty Chose to Improve their Teaching across Disciplinary Areas"
  - Indianapolis, Indiana, October 29-30, 2008

---

**Student Engagement**

Student engagement is part of our strategic plan and woven through our Quality Enhancement Plan for the reaffirmation of our accreditation through SACS. "Engaging Students in a Culture of Scholarship."

**John T. Masterson, Executive Vice President and Provost, Texas Lutheran University**
Website Tools

FSSE Selected Results – Example

FSSE Selected Results

2008 | 2007 | 2006

FSSE Selected Results describe interesting findings from FSSE and provide examples of how institution-based data users can showcase their own FSSE findings in order to initiate conversations about student engagement on their campuses.

By downloading SPSS syntax available with each selected result, schools can easily reproduce the illustrations featured below and compare their findings to faculty trends at the national level. Each link provides a visual representation of the data accompanied by an explanation of the result. Additional examples are available for previous FSSE years in the FSSE Archives.

2007

Faculty Time
- Time spent on teaching, research, & other activities
- Class time allocated to teaching activities

Comparing NSSE-FSSE Results
- Student/Faculty Expectations: Hours per week students spend preparing for class
- Campus Environment: Perceived high quality student relationships of others on campus
- Classroom Practices: Student participation in selected learning tasks
Comparing NSSE and FSSE Results:
Student and Faculty Expectations

The FSSE survey asks faculty members how much time students are expected to spend preparing for their selected course and how much they believe students actually spend preparing for their course. In comparison, the NSSE survey asks students to report how much time they spend preparing for a class.

NSSE and FSSE results reveal a considerable gap in what faculty members expect students to spend and how much time students actually report spending preparing for class. On average, faculty members expect students to study about six hours per week for a single class, but students tend to report nearly half that amount of time (a little over three hours per week per class). Although faculty members have higher expectations, their estimation of the actual time students spend preparing for class is very close to students’ self-reported data.

The gap fluctuates when disciplinary area is considered. For example, faculty members in the Physical Sciences expect more per-class study time than any other subject area, and Biological/Life Sciences and Social Science faculty members slightly underestimate how much time students spend per week preparing for classes.

Average Hours per Week Students Spend Preparing for Class by Academic Discipline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Area</th>
<th>Faculty Expectations</th>
<th>Faculty Estimated of Actual</th>
<th>Student Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological science</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical science</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social science</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Disciplines</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Disciplinary area represents students' reported major and courses taught by faculty member.
Note 2: Results in this table based on student and faculty responses at institutions that used NSSE.
Website Tools

******************************************************************************
**COMPARING NSSE-FSSE RESULTS
**TIME SPENT PREPARING FOR CLASS - EXPECTATIONS AND REALITY.

*****COURSE-BASED SURVEY OPTION ONLY

****STEP 1 TYPE IN FILE LOCATION AND NAME FOR FSSE08 FILE**************

GET FILE='C:\FSSE08.sav'.

****STEP 2 RECODE INTO MEDIAN HOURS PER CLASS (FACULTY EXPECTATIONS AND ESTIMATES).

RECODE femrep factprep
(1=0) (2=1.5) (3=3.5) (4=5.5) (5=7.5) (6=9.5) (7=11.5) (8=13.5) (else=sysmis)
INTO `femrepl1 factprepl1'.

VARIABLE LABELS femrepl1 'RECODE (CE) expected avg. time students spent preparing for class'
/factrepl1 'RECODE (CB) actual avg. time students spent preparing for class'.

****STEP 3 MEAN HOURS PER WEEK FACULTY EXPECT AND ESTIMATE STUDENTS PREPARE FOR CLASS BY ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE

CTABLES
/LABELS VARIABLES=femrepl1 factrepl1 apdiscol DISPLAY=DEFAULT
/TABLES apdiscol BY femrepl1 [MEAN] factrepl1 [MEAN]
/CATEGORIES VARIABLES=apdiscol [1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9].
OTHER(1) EMPTY=INCLUDE POSITION=AFTER.

****STEP 4 TYPE IN FILE LOCATION AND NAME FOR NSSE07 OR NSSE08 FILE.

GET FILE='C:\NSSE.sav'.
SELECT IF (SMPLO5 LE 3 AND INELIG EQ 1).
EXEC.

****STEP 5 RECODE INTO MEDIAN HOURS PER CLASS (STUDENT-REPORTED).

RECODE acadpr01(1=0) (2=3) (3=8) (4=13) (5=18) (6=23) (7=28) (8=32)(else=sysmis) INTO ACADPR.

VARIABLE LABELS acadpr 'RECODE avg. time students spent preparing for class'.

COMPUTE ACADFP4=ACADPR/4.

****STEP 6 MEANS HOURS PER WEEK STUDENTS REPORT PREPARING FOR CLASS BY ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE.

CTABLES
/TABLE MAJRCOL
   BY ((ACADFP4) [mean F8.1])
/CATEGORIES VAR=MAJRCOL TOTAL=YES.
FSSE Results as a Part of Assessing Student Engagement
Stand Alone FSSE Findings
Percentage Who Find it Important for Students to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do a practicum, internship, field experience...</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do community service or volunteer work</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do research with a faculty member</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a learning community</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Both*
Percentage Who Find it Important for Students to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lower Division</th>
<th>Upper Division</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work with classmates outside of class</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put together ideas or concepts for different courses when completing</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare 2 or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Structure Courses “Quite a bit” or “Very much”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-GEC</th>
<th>GEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To promote understanding of people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To promote acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Percentage of Class Time

Physical Sci
- Lecture: 57%
- Other: 20%
- Small Grp: 11%
- Exper: 12%

Education
- Other: 36%
- Lecture: 23%
- Exper: 16%
- Small Grp: 25%

Both
Differences in Emphasis on Deep Learning

Standardized mean differences between indicated disciplinary area and the biological sciences
Combining NSSE and FSSE
Percentage with Positive Perceptions

- **Faculty**
- **First-Years**
- **Seniors**

Perceived high quality relationships with faculty: 50, 48, 63
Perceived high quality relationships with other students: 51, 60, 57
Perceived high quality relationships with administration: 24, 33, 33

*Both*
Gaps in Faculty Perceptions and Student Reports

- Fac who teach FYS: 40
- FYS: 57
- Fac who teach SR: 71
- SR: 69
- Fac who teach FYS: 85
- FYS: 53
- Fac who teach SR: 88
- SR: 62

- Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions
- Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance
Avg Hours Spent Preparing For Class

- **Fac Expectation (Up Div)**
- **Fac Estimate (Up Div)**
- **Seniors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Physical Sci</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Hum</th>
<th>Social Sci</th>
<th>Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Both</strong></td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Average Hours**:
  - Engineering: 6.9
  - Physical Sci: 3.7
  - Arts & Hum: 3.3
  - Social Sci: 2.7
  - Education: 3.3

- **Fac Expectation**: 4.7, 4.1, 3.6, 3.3, 3.4
- **Fac Estimate**: 4.0, 4.1, 3.6, 3.3, 3.4
Deep Learning Differences by Disciplinary Area

Standardized mean differences between indicated disciplinary area and the biological sciences
Some Cautions
Issues to Consider

- Comparability with student results
- Suspicions about survey methods
  - General
  - Representativeness
- “Those results may be true of ..., but they don’t apply to me”
- You may need more data
  - More questions
  - Points of confusion
Discussion
For More Information

- Email: tflaird@indiana.edu
  fsse@indiana.edu

- FSSE website: www.fsse.iub.edu
  NSSE website: www.nsse.iub.edu

Resources for users as well as copies of papers, presentations and various reports are available through the websites.