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I. INTRODUCTION

The University of Calgary is committed to promoting our students’ success. One of the ways we are moving forward on this commitment is by measuring the level of our students’ engagement and satisfaction with the University of Calgary – both inside and outside the classroom. By implementing the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), the Canadian University Survey Consortium (CUSC) survey, and other surveys and research methodologies over the past years, we are now gaining a clearer picture of the level of student engagement at this institution.

This report, the Student Engagement Project - Statistical Summary, is a composite review of the 2007 and 2008 NSSE results, the 2007/08 CUSC results, plus University of Calgary’s retention and graduation data. Part I of the NSSE Action Team’s extensive plan, it is intended to be the foundational data report. Written by the NSSE Action Team, it provides a baseline of critical results from University of Calgary students, some recommendations regarding topics upon which to focus, plus a plan for the next steps. While moving along the next steps, the NSSE Action Team will expect institutional responses to the results, and Student Engagement Progress Reports will also be issued.

a. The Importance of Student Engagement

In the book, Student Success in College, the authors present a compelling argument for student engagement being the key factor in student success at post-secondary institutions.

The authors note the volumes of work that support the notion that “what students do during college counts more for what they learn and whether they will persist in college than who they are or even where they go to college...Research on college student development shows that the time and energy students devote to educationally purposeful activities is the single best predictor of their learning and personal development.”

Certain institutional practices are known to lead to high levels of student engagement. In 1987, Chickering and Gamson articulated “Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education” and these principles remain the best-known set of engagement indicators. These principles include:

- student-faculty contact
- cooperation among students
- active learning
- prompt feedback
- time on task
- high expectations
- respect for diverse talents and ways of learning.

Other factors that have also been shown to be important to student learning are institutional environments that are perceived by students as inclusive and affirming and where expectations for performance are clearly communicated and set at reasonably high levels.

These factors and principles, then, are what constitutes the backbone of the educationally purposeful activities that should be offered to students by every post-secondary institution that purports student success, as they “are positively related to student satisfaction, learning and development on a variety of dimensions, and persistence.”

Educationally effective colleges and universities must make every effort to get students involved in appropriate activities and engage them at a high level in these activities.

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) measures the extent to which students are engaged actively in learning. The Canadian Undergraduate Survey Consortium provides a survey that measures student satisfaction with a variety of programs and services at their institution. This Student Engagement Report uses the results from both of these surveys, allowing the University of Calgary to get a useful overview of how we’re doing in terms of student engagement and success.
b. About the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

Students who are actively engaged in their post-secondary journey are more motivated to succeed, do better in their studies and have a more complete and successful experience at university. That’s why one of the top priorities at the University of Calgary is to improve the level of student engagement.

Over the past two years, the University of Calgary has taken many steps to promote engagement and enhance student success. At the heart of these changes is the University of Calgary’s involvement in the National Survey of Student Engagement—NSSE (pronounced “Nessie”). A survey of hundreds of colleges and universities in Canada and the United States, NSSE measures student participation in school programs and activities to improve learning and personal development, both inside and outside the classroom.

There are nearly 100 questions asked of students, and many of the questions are divided between five benchmarks, or key areas articulated as critical factors and principles that support student engagement. The five benchmark areas are:

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

c. NSSE Methodology

The instrument used by NSSE has been in use since 2000; it is an annual survey administered to hundreds of thousands of randomly selected first year and senior university and college students at the beginning of each calendar year. In February 2008, the NSSE was sent to students at 1300 schools across Canada and the United States, including 7,970 University of Calgary students. A total of 1,370 first-year and 1,269 University of Calgary senior-year students responded—a significant response rate of 35.5 percent.

Institutions who use NSSE are allowed to compare their results to three different groups of their choosing. In 2008, the University of Calgary chose the following groups as their comparators:

Group 1 (small subset of G-13): University of Alberta, University of British Columbia, and Dalhousie University. This is the comparison group used in the NSSE additional questions, and is also seen in Tables 5 & 6 of this report as “G-13”.

Group 2 (entire G-13):
- University of Alberta
- University of British Columbia
- University of Calgary
- Dalhousie University
- Université Laval
- McGill University
- McMaster University
- Université de Montréal
- University of Ottawa
- Queen’s University
- University of Toronto
- University of Waterloo
- University of Western Ontario

When G-13 is referenced in this report, the above list is the comparison group. In Tables 5 & 6 only this comparison group is referred to as G-13 Cdn University. It should also be noted that when G-13 scores are provided throughout this report, it is the average score of all G-13 institutions, excluding UofC scores.

Group 3: A 26-institution group of American institutions that are large, research-driven, comprehensive institutions (see footnote 8 for complete list.)
d. About the Canadian University Survey Consortium (CUSC)

The Canadian University Survey Consortium conducts an annual survey of students across Canada. The purpose of the survey is to produce data that will allow participating institutions to assess their programs and services. Comparisons with other groups of institutions are also provided, in order to assist in the assessment. The University of Calgary has this survey administered every three years to all undergraduates.

There are five basic sections that the CUSC survey covers:
1. Profile of undergraduate students
2. Work and financing education
3. Perceptions of university
4. University experience
5. Overall satisfaction.

e. CUSC Methodology

For 2007-2008, 29,000 randomly-selected undergraduate students attending one of 31 Canadian universities were asked to complete the CUSC survey; typically 1,000 students from each institution are asked to complete the survey. Almost 12,000, or 41.2% replied. The University of Calgary also ran an over sample of 10,000 and 2,341 students answered the survey, providing the university with a 23.4% response rate. It should be noted that, when the University of Calgary’s scores are compared to Group 3 scores, the University of Calgary scores are based on our over sample (n=2,341) while the Group 3 scores are based on the 1,000 students from each institution that were asked to complete the survey (in this case, n=2,826); response rates from each institution ranged from 23.4% to 46.8%. For All Students scores, n=11,981 and institutional response rates ranged from 17.3% to 83.4%.

II. ABOUT OUR STUDENTS

Respondent characteristics and how this affects engagement

The demographic of University of Calgary students is somewhat unique when compared to their counterparts at other post-secondary institutions. The main differences are seen in their living arrangements, commuter status, how much they work, and the amount of debt they carry. The following provides an overview of the likely impact of the respondent characteristics.

Living arrangements – If an institution has far fewer students living in Residence and far more students living at home, their students may lack the deep friendships and complete experience of connecting to the campus.

Commuting - connected to living arrangements, if students tend to live far away from the campus, then the time they spend getting to the campus can become a large part of their day. This will invariably leave less time to stay on campus and become involved in meaningful activities.

Employment Status – If students spend considerable amounts of time working off-campus, they will not be spending as much time on campus and they also won’t be spending as much time focusing on their studies.

Debt – The amount of debt that students need to carry in order to attend university will have a direct impact on their ability to continue on with their education, and feel positive about the financial outlay required for their education. In addition, students will likely be very pressured to work while at school, thus splitting their time between work and their studies.
a. Living Arrangements

One of the key areas where University of Calgary students differ from much of the demographic of students from other institutions is in their living arrangements. Figure 1 shows the percentages of students who live: in rented housing (shared or alone); at home with parents or relatives; with parents or other relatives; in on-campus housing, and in a personally owned home. Fifty percent (50%) of University of Calgary students live at home; this is considerably higher than the 37% of Group 3 students and 28% of the All Students group that do the same. Also, the percentage of our students who live in residence (5%) is significantly lower than most post-secondary institutions. Interestingly, twice as many of our students (10%) live in a personally owned home than live in residence.

FIGURE 1 (CUSC, T9):

b. Commuter Students

Since a higher percentage of University of Calgary students live off-campus, it follows that a higher percentage of our students need to commute to campus compared to Group 3 students. Figure 2 shows that fewer University of Calgary students walk or take public transportation to campus, while more drive to campus, alone. University of Calgary students also have a longer average commute to campus (33 minutes, compared to 30.8 for Group 3 students and 22.7 minutes for All Students). A NSSE question confirms that University of Calgary students spend more hours commuting to class. It is also interesting to note, from the CUSC data, that 71% of University of Calgary students use parking facilities; this is considerably higher than the 59% of All Students and 49% of Group 3 students who use their parking facilities.
c. Employment Status

The NSSE and CUSC reports provide much information regarding the employment status of our students, including the percentage of our students currently employed, how many hours they work, and the negative impact of working. Figure 3 shows that a slightly higher percentage (52%) of University of Calgary students are currently employed, and 29% are not seeking work.
Figure 4 suggests that 70% of University of Calgary students who work are either not impacted (academically) by this work or feel only some negative impact on their academic performance. Nine percent (9%) of our students feel that their employment has a significant or substantial impact on their academic performance.

**FIGURE 4 (CUSC, T30):**

![Pie chart showing the percentage of students impacted by non-co-op related employment on academic performance.]

When reviewing the number of hours students work (see Figure 5), it is clear that fewer of both our first year and senior students do not work any hours, when compared to the G-13 comparator institutions. Not surprisingly then, both first year and senior University of Calgary students work more hours. The CUSC data informs us that, of University of Calgary students who work, the average number of hours they work is 17.6.

**FIGURE 5 (NSSE, 9C):**

![Bar graph showing the percentage of students working for pay off campus by hours worked.]

- None: 35%
- Some: 21%
- Moderate: 6%
- Significant: 3%
- Substantial: 3%
d. Debt

Compared to their counterparts, University of Calgary students fair reasonably well in terms of their debt load. Figure 6 shows that, overall, University of Calgary students have less debt: 41% have “any debt,” 24% have government student loan debt, 15% have a debt of $20,000 or higher, and 49% have no debt. The average amount of repayable debt, for all University of Calgary students is $8,765; for University of Calgary students with debt, the amount is $19,143. The difference between those who have debt and those who do not is $10,378; this is a wider margin than Group 3 students have ($9,492) or All Students have ($8,654).

Overall, University of Calgary students have less debt and more students have no debt. However, the numbers suggest that there may be a bifurcated pattern of debt for our students; that is, we may be seeing more extremes of those who have substantial debt versus those who have no debt, with fewer students in between.

FIGURE 6 (CUSC T38, T41):

III. SELECTED RESULTS

The following section provides some of the key results from the NSSE and CUSC surveys, divided into issues revolving around the classroom experience, and those issues experienced outside class time, as follows:

“In the classroom” issues:
  a. areas most needed to be improved in the classroom
  b. satisfaction with the quality of teaching received
  c. engagement with and perceptions of professors
  d. satisfaction with courses issues
  e. satisfaction with classroom facilities.

“Out of the classroom” issues:
  a. sense of community
  b. time spent on campus and participating in co-curricular activities
  c. use of and satisfaction with academic (and other) support services
  d. quality of relationships
  e. satisfaction with facilities.
IN THE CLASSROOM ISSUES

a. Areas needing improvement in the classroom

Figure 7 provides the top six answers to the NSSE question, “From the list below, select one area your university most needs to address to improve student learning in the classroom.” For both 1st year and senior students, the top choice by far is “improving the quality of course instruction by professors.”

FIGURE 7 (NSSE, EXTRA QUESTIONS 2, 3):

Respondents were also asked to select a second area the university most needs to address to improve student learning in the classroom, and again, “improving the quality of course instruction by professors” was most frequently chosen by both 1st year students (at 17%) and senior students (at 15%).

From a list of services and facilities, the CUSC survey asked students to rank the top three priorities for improvement. Figure 8 shows that, by far the most chosen area for improvement is the emphasis on teaching excellence.

FIGURE 8 (CUSC, T70):

Areas requiring improvement: top three
A further CUSC question (results in T65) shows that 43% of University of Calgary respondents said that “Emphasis on teaching excellence (ability)” was an area ‘much or very much’ requiring improvement. This percentage was high compared to the Group 3 score of 31% and the All students score of 21%.

b. Teaching quality

The CUSC survey also asked students about their level of satisfaction with the quality of teaching they received. While the “Agree” levels are similar for University of Calgary and its comparators, University of Calgary has a higher percentage of students saying they “Disagree” (17%, compared to 15% Group 3 and 10% All Students) and “Disagree Strongly” (5%, compared to 3% Group 3 and 2% All Students). Figure 9 shows the results.

**FIGURE 9 (CUSC, T62):**

In the NSSE comments provided by the respondents, the majority of comments had to do with the quality of teaching and/or too much focus on research, and/or lack of good English skills of the professors.
c. Perceptions of professors

The following data (Table 1) shows that, when compared to the Group 3 and All students comparators, University of Calgary students rate their professors lower in terms of engagement with and perceptions of their professors.

**TABLE 1 (CUSIC, T60):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>U of C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most of my professors encourage students to participate in class discussions</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of my professors are reasonably accessible outside of class to help students</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At this university, professors treat students as individuals, not just numbers</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of my professors have taken a personal interest in my academic progress</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel free to turn to some of my professors for advice on personal matters</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NSSE asks a different set of questions around students’ interactions with faculty members. The full questions asked are as follows:

- Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor
- Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor
- Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class
- Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance
- Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.).

The results in Figure 10 show us that our students most frequently interact with their professors via e-mail, next by discussing grades then readings, next by talking about career plans, and last by working on activities other than coursework. In the majority of cases, for both our first-year and senior students, University of Calgary respondents’ scores are higher than the G-13 respondents’ scores.
**d. Satisfaction with courses issues – availability of courses, registering for courses**

The CUSC survey asks students about their ‘satisfaction with the availability of courses for your program,’ as well as with ‘the process of registering for your courses.’ Sixty-five percent (65%) of University of Calgary respondents said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the availability of courses, while 68% of both Group 3 and All Students respondents said the same (T51).

With regards to satisfaction with the process of registering for courses, while 80% of All Students respondents and 77% of Group 3 respondents said they were satisfied or very satisfied with the process of registering for their courses, only 59% of University of Calgary respondents said the same (T50).

Within the NSSE additional questions, there were two questions that provided an opportunity for students to give feedback about courses issues. When asked which factor posed the biggest obstacle to their academic progress, 4% of first year and 8% of senior students said it was “difficulties getting the courses you need” (NSSE additional question #1). When asked which area the university most needs to address to improve student learning in the classroom, 7% of first year and 18% of senior students chose “Increasing the number or variety of course offerings in your major” (NSSE additional question #2).
e. Satisfaction with Facilities (Classroom-related)

Students were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with a variety of facilities. The two areas shown in Figure 11 show the percentage of respondents who were satisfied or very satisfied with the average size of their classes and the instructional facilities (including classrooms, laboratories and equipment).

FIGURE 11 (CUSC, T53):

It can be seen that, overall, University of Calgary students are less satisfied than their counterparts with both the average size of their classes, and instructional facilities.

OUT OF THE CLASSROOM ISSUES

a. Sense of community

In the CUSC survey, students were asked about areas requiring improvement. Of those who offered a rating, 46% of the University of Calgary students said that they much/very much thought that a “sense of community among students” needed improvement (T69). This score was considerably higher than the 37% given by Group 3 students and 30% by All Students. In that same question, 31% of University of Calgary respondents said that “opportunities for a social life” was an area that much/very much required improvement (compared to 26% from Group 3 students and 25% from All Students).

When asked, from a list of 10, what their top 3 areas requiring improvement were, 42% of University of Calgary students cited “sense of community among students,” which was the second most highly chosen issue (T70).

The additional questions in NSSE asked how strongly students had experienced a sense of community during this academic year, at their university. Figure 12 shows the most highly chosen response to this question, for both first year and senior students, was “somewhat,” at 48% for first years and 45% for seniors. Also, 1/5 of our first-year students felt no sense of community, while close to 1/3 of our senior students felt the same.
b. Time spent on campus and in co-curricular activities

Time spent on campus

A third of University of Calgary students (33% of first year and 32% of senior University of Calgary students) spend 5 hours or less on campus, while 32% of first year and 24% of senior students spend between 6-10 hours per week on the university’s campus, outside of time spent in class. When considering the amount of time that a student could spend on campus outside of class, on such activities as studying, researching, socializing, working, eating, and working out, it is clear that many of our students don’t engage in many of these activities. Figure 13 provides a breakdown of the hours spent on campus, outside of class time.
FIGURE 13 (NSSE ADDITIONAL QUESTION 7):

**HOURS SPENT ON CAMPUS OUTSIDE OF CLASS**

As seen in Figure 14, less than half of our students (42% first year and 48% senior students) spend any time participating in co-curricular activities at the University of Calgary. One quarter of our students (24% first year and 26% senior students) spend between 1 and 5 hours per week; this leaves 22% of our senior students and only 18% of our first year students participating in 6 or more hours a week of co-curricular activities.

FIGURE 14 (NSSE 9D):

**TIME SPENT PARTICIPATING IN CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES - 1ST YEARS**

**TIME SPENT PARTICIPATING IN CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES - SENIORS**

Time spent on co-curricular activities
As seen in Figure 14, less than half of our students (42% first year and 48% senior students) spend any time participating in co-curricular activities at the University of Calgary. One quarter of our students (24% first year and 26% senior students) spend between 1 and 5 hours per week; this leaves 22% of our senior students and only 18% of our first year students participating in 6 or more hours a week of co-curricular activities.
The CUSC survey asks specific questions about activities that respondents participated in on campus. Table 2 shows the percentage of our students who are often and very often involved with a variety of activities; the activities are listed from the most-to-least often undertaken.

**TABLE 2 (CUSC, T71, T72):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>All Students (%)</th>
<th>Group 3 (%)</th>
<th>University of Calgary (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended campus lectures (in addition to regular classes)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in student clubs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in on-campus student recreational and sports programs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended campus social events</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended campus cultural events</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended home games of university athletic teams</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in student government</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Academic (and other) Support Services

Academic Advising

One of the three summative questions that the NSSE asks is, “Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?” The results, seen in Figure 15, suggest that our senior students are less enthusiastic about the quality of academic advising than are our first year students. From both our first year and senior students we receive slightly higher scores in the “good” category, but considerably lower in the “excellent” category.

**FIGURE 15 (NSSE, 12):**

**QUALITY OF ACADEMIC ADVISING**
In the NSSE survey students were asked to choose from a list of 8 issues, the biggest obstacle to their academic progress. Six percent (6%) of our first-year students and 11% of our senior students chose “Lack of good academic advising.”

Also from the NSSE additional questions (#4), the survey asked respondents to select from a list of 9 issues, the one area your university most needs to address to improve student learning outside the classroom. From our first-year students, the second-most highly chosen issue (at 17%) was “Expanding and/or improving the quality of academic support services.” Sixteen percent (16%) of University of Calgary senior students chose this issue, and this was the 3rd most highly chosen issue.

When asking students to select a second area your university most needs to address to improve student learning outside the classroom, 17% of our first-year students chose the academic support services issue (tied with two other issues for the most highly chosen issue). Regarding our senior students’ choice, their 3rd choice (at 14%) was the academic support services issue.

The CUSC results are more positive about academic advising. When asked about their satisfaction with special services, of the 63% of the University of Calgary respondents who said they used academic advising services, 81% said they were satisfied or very satisfied with University of Calgary’s academic advising, comparing well to Group 3’s 74% score (see Table 3).

Other Academic-related Services
Students were asked whether they used specific “special” services, as well as their satisfaction with these services. The following chart compared the percentage of University of Calgary students who use special services, as well as the percentage that are satisfied/very satisfied with those services, versus All Students and Group 3 students:

**TABLE 3 (CUSC T56, T58):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>U of C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Use</td>
<td>% Satisfied + Very Satisfied</td>
<td>% Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic advising</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for students needing financial aid</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career counselling services</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study skills/learning support services</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience programs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal counselling services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International student services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for students with disabilities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services for First Nation students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other than academic advising, which is used by 63% of University of Calgary respondents, the other academic-related services are not used by many of our students. In particular note that while 19% of University of Calgary respondents use the services for students needing financial aid, 34% of All Students and 26% of Group 3 students use their financial aid services.

Regarding work-related services, our respondents are more satisfied than their Group 3 or All Students counterparts regarding the employment services, career counselling services, and work experience programs.

Other Services
All CUSC survey respondents use other services more frequently than they use their institution’s academic-related services. In Table 4 we note that University of Calgary students have a higher usage of most all of the services, but a considerably lower use of university residences and student life programs. When compared to their counterparts, our students are more satisfied with food services, athletic facilities, other recreational facilities, campus medical services, and facilities for student clubs, while they are considerably less satisfied with university residences and slightly less satisfied with parking facilities.

TABLE 4 (CUSC T54, 55):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>U of C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Use</td>
<td>% Satisfied + Very Satisfied</td>
<td>% Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus book stores</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library facilities</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer facilities</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food services</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic facilities</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking facilities</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other recreational facilities</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities for student clubs, etc.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University-based social activities</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus medical services</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student life program</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University residences</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Quality of relationships – students, faculty members, administrative personnel

Relationships with students
Seventy-two percent (72%) of our first year students and 74% of our senior students rate their relationship with other students to be a 5, 6, or 7 (7 being “friendly, supportive, sense of belonging”); both these scores are in keeping with the G-13 scores.
It should be noted (in Figure 16) that 1/8 of University of Calgary students rate their relationship with other students as being 1, 2, or 3 (1 being “unfriendly, unsupportive, sense of alienation”).

FIGURE 16 (NSSE, 8A):

![Quality of Relationships with Other Students - 1st Years](image1)

![Quality of Relationships with Other Students - Seniors](image2)

Relationships with faculty members

As seen in Figure 17, just over half (53%) of our first year students rate the quality of their relationships with faculty members as a 5, 6, or 7 (7 = available, helpful, sympathetic), lower than the 60% given to G-13 institutions. Sixty percent (60%) of our senior students gave a 5, 6, or 7, slightly lower than the 63% give to G-13 institutions. Nearly ¼ (22%) of our first year and 19% of our senior students rate the quality of their relationships with faculty members as a 1, 2, or 3 (1 = unavailable, unhelpful, unsympathetic).

FIGURE 17 (NSSE, 8B):

![Quality of Relationships with Faculty Members - 1st Years](image3)

![Quality of Relationships with Faculty Members - Seniors](image4)
Relationships with administrative personnel

Only 40% of our first year students rate the quality of their relationships with administrative personnel as a 5, 6, or 7 (7=helpful, considerate, flexible), considerably lower than the 49% given to the G-13 institutions (NSSE, 8c). The score that our senior students gave for the same was 39%, nominally lower than 43% given by G-13 students. However, it should be noted that 38% of our senior students rated the quality of their relationships with administrative personnel as a 1, 2, or 3 (3=unhelpful, inconsiderate, rigid); 1/3 of our first year students (32%) gave the same scores.

The CUSC survey, in Table 63, shows that 83% of University of Calgary respondents agreed or strongly agreed that, “Most university support staff (eg, clerks, secretaries, etc.) are helpful.”

e. Satisfaction with Facilities (outside the classroom)

In the NSSE additional questions students were asked to select ‘one area your university most needs to address to improve student learning outside the classroom.’ The answer “improving the quality/availability of study spaces” was chosen by the highest percentages of both first-year students (at 27%), and senior students (at 26%). In the NSSE comments, one of the most frequent topics was about the lack of study space. In Figure 18, it can be seen that University of Calgary students are less satisfied/very satisfied with their study space, social and informal meeting places, and the general condition of buildings and grounds.

FIGURE 18 (CUSC, T53):
IV. THE OVERALL PICTURE

a. NSSE Benchmarks

Many of the 85 NSSE questions are organized into the following five benchmarks that are key areas of focus when discussing issues of student engagement:

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

Overall, the University of Calgary’s 2008 NSSE results indicate improvement over our 2007 benchmark scores. For senior University of Calgary students, scores improved for all benchmarks. For first year students, benchmark scores improved for Active and Collaborative Learning, Level of Academic Challenge, and Student-Faculty Interaction. When compared to the G-13 average, the University of Calgary’s mean scores for both first year and senior students are higher for Active and Collaborative Learning and Student-Faculty Interaction benchmarks. The following provides further details about each benchmark, as well as charts that show University of Calgary’s 2007 and 2008 Benchmark mean scores, compared to the G-13 scores. It should be noted that benchmark scores are weighted by gender, enrolment status and institution size.

Active and Collaborative Learning

Students learn more when they are intensely involved in their education and have opportunities to think about and apply what they are learning in different settings. And when students collaborate with others in solving problems or mastering difficult material, they acquire valuable skills that prepare them to deal with the messy, unscripted problems they will encounter daily during and after college. Survey questions that contribute to this cluster include:

- Asking questions in class or contributing to class discussions
- Making class presentations
- Working with other students on projects during class
- Working with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments
- Tutoring or teaching other students
- Participating in community-based projects as part of a regular course
- Discussing ideas from readings or classes with others.

Figure 19 shows that, not only are University of Calgary’s ’08 mean scores better than our ’07 scores, but for both our first year and senior students, scores are higher than the G-13 institutions.

FIGURE 19

ACTIVE AND COLLABORATIVE LEARNING
BENCHMARK 2008 VS 2007 AND G-13

![Chart showing mean scores for Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark for U of C 08, U of C 07, G-13 with bars for First year and Senior year.]
Level of Academic Challenge
Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. A number of questions from NSSE’s instrument correspond to three integral components of academic challenge. Several questions represent the nature and amount of assigned academic work, some reflect the complexity of cognitive tasks presented to students, and several others ask about the standards faculty members use to evaluate student performance. Specifically these questions are related to:

- Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing)
- Reading and writing
- Using higher-order thinking skills
- Working harder than students thought they could to meet an instructor’s standards
- An institutional environment that emphasizes studying and academic work.

Figure 20 illustrates that for both our first year and senior students 2008 mean scores are higher than the scores given in ’07, although lower than our G-13 counterparts’ scores.

FIGURE 20

Student Interactions with Faculty Members
In general, the more contact students have with their teachers the better. Working with a professor on a research project or serving with faculty members on a college committee or community organization lets students see first-hand how experts identify and solve practical problems. Through such interactions teachers become role models, mentors, and guides for continuous, lifelong learning. Questions in this cluster include:

- Discussing grades or assignments with an instructor
- Talking about career plans with a faculty member or advisor
- Discussing ideas from readings or classes with faculty members outside of class
- Working with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student-life activities, and so forth)
- Getting prompt feedback on academic performances
- Working with a faculty member on a research project.

For the Student-Faculty interaction benchmark, University of Calgary’s 2008 mean scores are higher than both our ’07 scores and the G-13 scores; this can be seen in Figure 21.
Enriching Educational Experiences

Educationally effective colleges and universities offer many different opportunities inside and outside the classroom that complement the goals of the academic program. One of the most important is the exposure to diversity, from which students learn valuable things about themselves and gain an appreciation for other cultures. Technology is increasingly being used to facilitate the learning process, and when done appropriately, can increase collaboration between peers and instructors, which actively engages students in their student learning. Other valuable educational experiences include internships, community service, and senior capstone courses that provide students with opportunities to synthesize, integrate, and to apply their knowledge. As a result, learning is deeper, more meaningful, and ultimately more useful because what students know becomes a part of who they are. Questions from the survey representing these kinds of experiences include:

- Talking with students with different religious beliefs, political opinions, or values
- Talking with students of a different race or ethnicity
- An institutional climate that encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds
- Using electronic technology to discuss or complete assignments
- Participating in: internships or field experiences, community service or volunteer work, foreign language coursework, study abroad, independent study or self-designed major, co-curricular activities, a culminating senior experience.

In Figure 22 we note that our 2008 mean scores are slightly lower than the 2007 mean scores; they are also slightly slower than the G-13 institutions’ scores.
FIGURE 22

**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. Survey questions contributing to this cluster describe a campus environment that:

- Helps students succeed academically
- Helps students cope with nonacademic responsibilities (work, family, and so forth)
- Helps students thrive socially
- Promotes good relations between students and their peers
- Promotes good relations between students and faculty members
- Promotes good relations between students and administrative staff.

While the first year’s mean scores were lower in 2008 than in 2007, the senior students’ scores remained comparable; both mean scores are lower than the G-13 scores. These results can be viewed in Figure 23.

FIGURE 23
Each benchmark has several questions that help assess the effectiveness of educational practice. However, rather than solely focusing on the benchmark scores, we have found that it is the questions behind the benchmarks that provide much richness of data.

The questions within each benchmark and their scores are provided in Figures 24-29.

**FIGURE 24 - ACL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a class presentation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with other students on project during class:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ACTIVE AND COLLABORATIVE LEARNING**

- **NEVER**
- **SOMETIMES**
- **OFTEN**
- **VERY OFTEN**
FIGURE 25: LAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Academic Challenge</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coursework emphasizes analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience or theory:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution emphasizes spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework emphasizes applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework emphasizes synthesizing and organizing ideas, information or experiences:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursework emphasizes making judgements about the value of information, arguments or methods:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* VERY LITTLE * SOME * QUITE A BIT * VERY MUCH

* NEVER * SOMETIMES * QUITE A BIT * VERY MUCH
FIGURE 26 - SFI

STUDENT-FACULTY INTERACTION

Received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance (written or oral):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worked on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FIGURE 27 - EEE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENRICHING EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES</th>
<th>1st Year</th>
<th>4th Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community service or volunteer work:</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment:</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language coursework:</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating senior experience:</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together:</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study or self-designed major:</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad:</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DO NOT PLAN TO</th>
<th>HAVE NOT DECIDED</th>
<th>PLAN TO DO</th>
<th>DONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Community service or volunteer work
- Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment
- Foreign language coursework
- Culminating senior experience
- Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together
- Independent study or self-designed major
- Study abroad
### ENRICHING EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES (CONT.)

**Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Used an electronic medium to discuss or complete an assignment:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Institution encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, University of Calgary students provide the highest scores for the questions within the Supportive Campus Environment and Level of Academic Challenge benchmarks. Unfortunately, the Supportive Campus Environment benchmark is where the scores drop between first year and senior students; this is true of all comparison groups.

However, when compared to our G-13 counterparts, the Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark is where University of Calgary shows its strength.

b. Overall satisfaction measures

NSSE asks respondents three summative questions:
- Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?
- How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?
- If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?

The results for these questions are found in Figure 30.
Figure 30, regarding academic advising, was discussed earlier in this report (see page 18). Seventy-two percent (72%) of University of Calgary’s first year students evaluate their entire educational experience as good or excellent. This percentage drops to 65% for our senior students. When asked if they would go to University of Calgary again, 78% of our first year and 63% of our senior students said they probably yes or definitely yes. Again, there is a substantial drop between our first year and senior students’ scores; our comparator groups also have a drop in their scores between first year and senior students. For each question, both the University of Calgary first year students’ and senior students’ results are lower than our G-13 comparators.

While the CUSC survey does not have the same summative questions, there are some questions asked that are similar to NSSE’s questions.

- Satisfaction with concern shown by the university for students as individuals
- Satisfaction with overall quality of education
- Agreement level: I feel as if I am part of the university
- Agreement level: I am satisfied with my decision to attending this university.

Figure 31 shows the University of Calgary results for these questions, as well as for our comparison groups.
Overall, University of Calgary doesn’t do as well as its counterparts in any of the above areas.
c. Overall experience

FIGURE 32:

VARIATION IN NSSE BENCHMARK SCORES BY CLASS AT UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

Figure 32 above shows us the deviation in median scores for each benchmark, and thus, the range of experience that University of Calgary students are having. From the ten benchmark deviation scores, there are six that have percentile ranges that are more than 50%, indicating a wide range of experiences for our students.

The lowest median score, for both first year and senior students, is for the Student-Faculty Interaction benchmark; it also has the widest range of scores for senior students. The highest median score, for first year students, is tied between Level of Academic Challenge and Supportive Campus Environment; for senior students, it is also Level of Academic Challenge.

Key:
The dot/small triangle signifies the median (the score that divides all students' scores into two equal halves). The box shows the middle 50% of our scores (from the 25th to 75th percentiles) and the whiskers show the range of scores excluding outliers (from the 5th to the 95th percentile).
d. Highest performing areas
Tables 5 and 6 were provided in the NSSE Executive Summary report.

**TABLE 5 (NSSE):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Percent of students who...</th>
<th>Comparison Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The U of C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-Year Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d.</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Said courses emphasized making judgments about the value of information</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c.</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Wrote at least one paper or report of 20 pages or more</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b.</td>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Made a class presentation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1g.</td>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Worked with other students on projects during class</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h.</td>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seniors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c.</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Wrote at least one paper or report of 20 pages or more</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b.</td>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Made a class presentation</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1h.</td>
<td>ACL</td>
<td>Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1n.</td>
<td>SFI</td>
<td>Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p.</td>
<td>SFI</td>
<td>Discussed ideas from classes with faculty outside of class</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. Lowest performing areas

TABLE 6 (NSSE):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Percent of students who...</th>
<th>Comparison Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The U of C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First-Year Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a.</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Read more than 10 assigned books or book-length packs of readings</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a.</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Said the institution emphasizes studying and academic work</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b.</td>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>Participated in community service or volunteer work</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.</td>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>Completed foreign language coursework</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b.</td>
<td>SCE</td>
<td>Said the institution provides substantial support for academic success</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seniors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a.</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Spent more than 10 hours/week preparing for class (studying, etc.)</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a.</td>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Said the institution emphasizes studying and academic work</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a.</td>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>Did a practicum, internship, field experience, clinical assignment</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b.</td>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>Participated in community service or volunteer work</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7e.</td>
<td>EEE</td>
<td>Completed foreign language coursework</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above charts show that our best performing benchmarks are within Level of Academic Challenge and Active and Collaborative Learning; for senior students, Student-Faculty Interactions also rank well.

Regarding the lowest performing area, questions within the Enriching Educational Environment benchmark are most frequently seen for both first year and senior students. And although questions within the Level of Academic Challenge benchmark show up three times in our highest performing area table, other questions within the Level of Academic Challenge benchmark shows up in the lowest performance questions as well.

V. RETENTION, TIME TO COMPLETION, AND GRADUATION RATES

The most recent retention statistics that were submitted for a G-13 comparison showed that, for the 2007 cohort that were registered in their first year of a 4-year degree program, their first to second year retention rate was 83.9%.

When reviewing U of C’s undergraduate students who graduated in 2008, of those who had started at U of C in a 4-year program and in a full-time capacity, the average length of time to completion was 5.1 years.

For students entering 4-year degree programs at the University of Calgary, 61.4% graduated in six years.

The above statistics are all based on University of Calgary’s students entering directly from high school only.
VI. RECOMMENDATIONS AND PRIORITY AREAS

The NSSE Action Team recommends a number of issues be continued and/or addressed to respond to the results found in the 2008 NSSE and 2007/08 CUSC survey.

Student success is one of the University of Calgary’s top priorities as identified in its Academic Plan, and thus, student engagement is a high priority. When departments submit their Business Plans, they are asked to show that a number of indicators, that are related to student engagement and the NSSE results, are being met. This measurement should continue for the foreseeable future.

Some of the areas where University of Calgary does well in the results and should continue doing include:

- Undergraduate research projects
- Students working together on projects inside and outside of class
- Students e-mailing with their instructors.

The main, overarching areas that need to be addressed at the University of Calgary include the following:

- Students’ sense of community (connected to the particulars about University of Calgary’s students’ unique demographics)
- Classroom learning/teaching
- Academic Advising.

The above recommendations of the NSSE Action Team will require much dialogue within all levels of the institution before a concrete plan can be implemented.

VII. NEXT STEPS

As previously mentioned, this Student Engagement Project – Statistical Summary, is the first part in a many layered process. Subsequent reports will include institutional responses to earlier analysis. The NSSE Action Team will also be releasing Progress Reports throughout the entire process. The following outlines the remaining steps to be covered in the next few months:

**Student Engagement Project – Results from the Inventory of Student Engagement and Success (ISES)**

The NSSE Action Team has recently completed the Inventory of Student Engagement and Success (ISES) and is currently analyzing the results of the collected data. The scholars connected with NSSE recommend ISES as a critical step for a campus to truly understand student engagement best practices and the challenges that exist at a post-secondary institution. Through this inventory, the University of Calgary aims to dig deeper into the collective understanding of each of six areas of focus:

- The institution’s mission
- Its student-learning focus
- The orientation towards educationally enriching environments
- The existence of clear pathways to student success
- Its improvement-oriented ethos
- The extent to which there is shared responsibility for educational quality and student success.

A variety of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies have been used, including surveys, questionnaires, interviews, and focus groups, and all stakeholders from the campus community (students, staff, faculty members, senior executive) have taken part.

The results of this inventory will soon be shared with the senior executive, then the campus community.

**Student Engagement Project – The Action Plan**

The NSSE Action Team is aiming to create a three-year Student Engagement Action Plan by the end of the year. Referring back to this Student Engagement Project - Statistical Summary, the action plan document will encapsulate the specific blueprint to move forward student engagement issues throughout the institution.


Further information about NSSE methodology can be found at: www.ucalgary.ca/nsse/methods.

“Research extensive” comparison group includes the following institutions:
- Colorado State University
- Florida State University
- Georgia Institute of Technology
- Indiana University Bloomington
- Iowa State University
- Montana State University-Bozeman
- Penn State University - University Park
- Rutgers University-New Brunswick/Piscataway
- Stony Brook University
- The University at Albany, SUNY
- The University of Tennessee
- The University of Texas at Austin
- University at Buffalo, SUNY
- University of Colorado Denver
- University of Delaware
- University of Florida
- University of Georgia
- University of Hawaii at Manoa
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- University of Iowa
- University of Massachusetts Amherst
- University of Minnesota-Twin Cities
- University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- University of Virginia
- University of Wisconsin-Madison
- Washington State University

“Group 3” institutions include: University of British Columbia (Vancouver), University of Calgary, Concordia University, Dalhousie University, University of Manitoba, Université de Montréal, University of Ottawa, University of Saskatchewan.

“All Students” include respondents from the following institutions: Brandon University, University of British Columbia (Okanagan and Vancouver campuses), University of Calgary, Carleton University, Concordia University, Dalhousie University, University College of the Fraser Valley, University of Lethbridge, University of Manitoba, Université de Montréal, Mount Allison University, University of New Brunswick (Fredericton and Saint John campuses), Nipissing University, University of Northern British Columbia, Nova Scotia Agricultural College, University of Ottawa, Redeemer University College, University of Regina, Ryerson University, University of Saskatchewan, Simon Fraser University, St. Thomas University, St. Francis Xavier University, Trent University, Trinity Western University, Tyndale University College & Seminary, University of Victoria, Wilfrid Laurier University, University of Winnipeg.

Please see the explanation of this group on page 5, under “Group 1”

Please see the complete list of institutions within “Group 2” on page 5.