Faculty Perceptions of Student Engagement: A Comparative Examination Across Advising Models

Susan D. Johnson Michael J. Schwarz Center for Postsecondary Research Indiana University – Bloomington NACADA National Conference October 20, 2006

National Survey of Student Engagement



- Student engagement defined
- Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) selected findings
- Questions and discussion of implications for student advisors



Defining Student Engagement – Part I

What students do—time and effort devoted to educationally purposeful activities



Defining Student Engagement – Part I

The research is unequivocal: students who are actively involved in both academic and out-of-class activities gain more from the college experience than those who are not so involved.

Ernest T. Pascarella & Patrick T. Terenzini, How College Affects Students

Defining Student Engagement – Part II

What institutions do—using effective educational practices to induce students to do the right things



Defining Student Engagement – Part II

"(I)f faculty and administrators use principles of good practice to arrange the curriculum and other aspects of the college experience, students would... write more papers, read more books, meet with faculty and peers, and use information technology appropriately, all of which would result in greater gains in such areas as critical thinking, problem solving, effective communication, and responsible citizenship."

> George D. Kuh et al, Student Success in College



Assessing Student Engagement

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

 Annual survey of first-year students and seniors at four-year institutions that measures students' participation in educational experiences that prior research has connected to valued outcomes

Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)

- Parallel survey designed to measure faculty expectations for student engagement in educational practices that are known to be empirically linked with high levels of learning and development
- Other surveys of student engagement
 - BCSSE, LSSE, HSSE, CCSSE

Today's Focus: FSSE

- Institutions sought ways to include faculty in the discussion of effective educational practices
- Institutions use with NSSE results to determine strengths and to target areas of improvement
- Also measures faculty expectations and perceptions of how often their students engage in different activities
- The nature and frequency of interactions faculty have with students
- 2006 was fourth year of FSSE administration



- Third party administration (IU Center for Survey Research)
- Faculty surveyed in the spring
- Institutions choose faculty to be surveyed
- Web version only
- In 2006, over 21,000 faculty from 131 institutions responded to the survey

ADVISING MODELS



National Survey of Student Engagement

Theoretical Framework

Organizational Structures for Advising (Pardee, 2004)

- Based on National Survey on Academic Advising conducted by ACT
- Asked which organizational structure was most common at various institutional types and the effectiveness of the structure
- Asked which variables to consider in selecting the appropriate organizational structure
 - Institutional enrollment
 - Institution's mission
 - Extent to which the faculty is interested in advising and willing to devote time to it

Research Questions

- How much time do faculty spend advising students (academic and non-academic) across advising systems and disciplines?
- Are there differences in the amount of time faculty spend on advising activities at different types of institutions?
- To what extent do institutions emphasize supporting students with academic and nonacademic responsibilities across advising systems?



- Requested contact list of advising members from NACADA
- Compared NACADA list to the 131 schools participating in the 2006 FSSE administration
 - Used primary FSSE contact and researched websites for schools not on the list
- Participating FSSE schools received an email asking which statement most closely described their campus advising system
- Received 92 responses (70% response rate)

Advising Models (Habley, 2004)

Faculty only

 All students are assigned to an instructional faculty member for advising. There is no advising office.

Supplementary

 All students are assigned to an instructional faculty member for advising. There is an advising office that provides general academic information, but all advising transactions must be approved by the faculty advisor.

Split

 There is an advising office that advises a specific group(s) of students (e.g. underprepared, undecided, etc.). All other students are assigned to academic units.

Dual

• Each student has two advisors. A member of the instructional faculty advises the student on matters related to the major. An advisor in an advising office advises the student on general requirements, procedures, and policies.

Advising Models

Total Intake

 Staff in an administrative unit are responsible for advising ALL students for a specific period of time and/or until specific requirements have been met. After meeting those requirements, students are assigned to a member of the instructional faculty for advising.

Satellite

• Each school, college, or division within the institution has established its own approach to advising.

Self-Contained

 Advising for all students from point of enrollment to point of departure is done by staff in a centralized advising unit.

Collapsed Advising Models

Centralized

 Where professional and faculty advisors are housed in one academic or administrative unit (Self-Contained)

Decentralized

 Where professional or faculty advisors are located in their respective academic department (Faculty Only, Satellite)

Shared

 Where some advisors meet with students in a central administrative unit (i.e., an advising center), while others advise students in the academic department of their major discipline (Supplementary, Split, Dual, Total Intake)

RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS



National Survey of Student Engagement

Respondent Characteristics: Advising Model



Respondent Characteristics: Carnegie Classification



Respondent Characteristics: Affiliation



Respondent Characteristics: Discipline Area



FSSE RESULTS: Faculty Perceptions of Student Engagement



National Survey of Student Engagement

Advising: Hours per Week by Model























- Create more comprehensive descriptions of advising systems
 - "The [university] does not use, in entirety, any of the models you offer below. Any answer I choose from the list below would be a misrepresentation of our advising system."
- Compare faculty responses to student responses on NSSE across advising models

Questions and Discussion

How can this information be useful for you as advisors of undergraduate students?



For More Information

- Email: sudjohns@indiana.edu or mijschwa@indiana.edu
- FSSE website: http://www.fsse.iub.edu



Copies of papers and presentations as well as other annual reports and other information are available through the website