SIA Report
Using NSSE Results to Improve the First Year Experience at WSU
Barbara Oertel
August 7, 2010

What is the NSSE?

In the spring semester of 2009 Winona State administered the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) to nearly three thousand first year and senior students. This instrument is used by colleges and universities throughout the United States and Canada to measure their students' engagement in activities considered to be effective educational practices that lead to desirable outcomes such as learning, personal development, satisfaction, and persistence to graduation. Winona State was one of 640 institutions that administered the NSSE in 2009. Although this was the first time that Winona State has used the NSSE, it has been in use at other institutions since 2000. To date, approximately 1400 colleges and universities have participated in NSSE.

The NSSE is often used in conjunction with the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BSSE) and/or the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE). All of these instruments are based on many years of research into the components of successful student learning. This research has shown that that student actions and behaviors in college have a significant impact on their success, in fact more impact than who they are or where they go to school (Kuh). Especially important to student success and development is the time and energy students put into activities that are "educationally purposeful" (Kuh). Thus, it is in the best interest of colleges and universities to engage their students as much as possible in the type of activities that contribute to college success. The NSSE helps institutions determine the engagement level of their first year and senior students and compare the results year-to-year or to other institutions. In the case of Winona State, the results from the 2009 survey are reported in comparison to three different groups: other MnSCU institutions, other institutions in the same Carnegie Classification, and all participating institutions. Institutions that use the BSSE can also compare their incoming students' expectations to their actual experience.

The NSSE is not a direct measure of student learning. Instead, it asks students to self-report on how often they engage in activities that are considered good educational practice, how they spend their time, their perceptions of features in their institution's environment that impact student success and satisfaction, and their estimate of their own level of personal and educational growth that they have experienced in college. NSSE also collects demographic information such as age, gender, major, etc. and provides that information to institutions as well.

NSSE has created the Five Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice from past survey results as a way of helping institutions identify areas of focus in using their NSSE results. Many of the items in the survey are related to these five benchmarks, which are as follows:

Level of Academic Challenge (LAC) – 11 items
Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL) – 7 items
Student – Faculty Interaction (SFI) – 6 items
Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE) – 12 items
Supportive Campus Environment (SCE) – 6 items

Institutions who participate in NSSE receive a mean score for each of the five benchmarked areas, which are then compared to the three other comparison cohorts. This allows for a simple way for institutions to track their strengths and weaknesses, and their progress or lack thereof in these focus areas. The benchmarks are reminiscent of and share many commonalities with the "Seven Principles for Good Practice in Undergraduate Education," first introduced by Arthur Chickering and Zelda Gamson in 1987 and later adopted by WSU as a guiding philosophy for its undergraduate experience.

In addition to the benchmark scores report, institutions participating in NSSE receive reports of their students' demographics or respondent characteristics, frequency distributions for all items, and mean comparisons for all items. All results are reported separately for the first year respondents and the senior year respondents.

How Are NSSE Results Used?

Campuses that administer NSSE use the results in a variety of ways, but for the most part the results are used to improve their institutional effectiveness for the purpose of increasing the level of student engagement. This may mean changing institutional policies, procedures, and practices; developing new initiatives, programs and services; or simply using the results to educate their own administrators, faculty, and staff about their students and their level of engagement.   Some campuses use NSSE results as a regular part of their assessment program or for accreditation self studies. Examples abound of specific ways in which institutions have NSSE data, some of which I have noted below:

- At Bellarmine University in Kentucky, the Student Affairs Division decided, based on their NSSE results, to focus on improving their performance on the Supportive Campus Environment benchmark (SCE). They used NSSE data to justify the hiring of a person to oversee this initiative, which included increasing internship opportunities for students and focusing on campus opportunities that students reported they were more likely to participate in while at college.

- The St. Mary's College of Maryland's Multicultural Committee used NSSE date to study work-life-school balance practices (time usage) among different populations of students, to determine if specific groups were using their time in ways that were not contributing to their academic success.

- At UW – Stevens Point, the Student Success Advisory Committee decided to create a "map of student success activities" available on their campus organized around the five benchmarks.

- Chico State in California analyzed their NSSE results to determine whether or not the Seven Principles of Good Practice were being practiced with first year students. They developed a First Year philosophy and recommended a restructuring of the first year learning environment.

- The University of Massachusetts Lowell examined the relationship between NSSE responses and their own data on retention of first year students and found that those students that spent more time engaged in "educationally purposeful activities" were also more likely to retain.

Because the NSSE data is indirect data, many institutions have found that there is greater value when this data is integrated with other institutional data. For example, Youngstown State University in Ohio triangulated three sets of NSSE data (2004, 2006, and 2008 results) with institutional and other survey data and reported this in the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) project, which is an initiative of AASCU to provide information on the undergraduate experience by providing a standardized, web-based report on each participating institution known as the College Portrait. (Winona State University, along with other MnSCU institutions, is also a participant in the VSA project, see our report at http://www.collegeportraits.org/MN/WSU.) At Youngstown State, they examine NSSE data in relation to GPA and student success and persistence rates to determine patterns among different types of students. They also used the NSSE data in creating their 2007-2013 academic strategic plan that emphasizes teaching, learning, and engagement, and they have begun participation in a national initiative that promotes civic engagement and service learning (NSSE, 2009).

Another university that has widely shared and acted upon their NSSE results is Pace University in New York. Pace makes it a practice to widely distribute their NSSE data with administrators, faculty, and staff. They have made "student-centeredness" a special emphasis in their strategic plan, and they use the NSSE results to monitor their progress. They have also used NSSE results, combined with data obtained from conducting focus groups, to improve and enhance the sophomore year by focusing on improved faculty relationships. Other initiatives born out of NSSE results have been comparisons between the experience of transfer and native students, and a revision of academic advising practices and of the freshman seminar course (NSSE, 2009).

Winona State's NSSE Results

Winona State administered the NSSE in the spring of 2009 to 688 seniors and 591 first year students. This was the first time NSSE has been used at Winona State.

Respondent Characteristics

The great majority of the respondents (99% of first years and 94% of seniors) were full time students. This was a significantly higher percentage than any of the other three comparison group (MnSCU institutions, Carnegie class institutions, and all NSSE institutions). Additionally, Winona State had a much higher percentage of traditional-aged (less than 24 years old) students in both respondent groups. The comparisons are below:

	WSU	MnSCu	Carnegie Class	All Institutions
First Year Fulltime	99%	90%	93%	95%
Senior Fulltime	94%	79%	81%	84%
First Year Traditional	99%	93%	90%	93%
Senior Traditional	81%	58%	61%	65%

Winona State respondents were also more likely to be female, and less likely to be transfer students, than any other comparison group. Again, the differences were significant:

	WSU	MnSCU	Carnegie Class	All Institutions
First Year Female	73%	62%	69%	64%
Senior Female	69%	62%	69%	63%
First Year Transfers	4%	17%	10%	9%
Senior Transfers	34%	55%	45%	42%

More Winona State first year students lived on campus than those in the comparison groups:

	WSU	MnSCU	Carnegie Class	All Institutions
First Year On-Campus	85%	67%	63%	67%
Senior On-Campus	8%	7%	18%	17%

Finally, there were significantly fewer non-white students and fewer international students among the NSSE respondents compared to other institutions:

	WSU	MnSCU	Carnegie Class	All Institutions
First Year non-white	4%	16%	24%	27%
Senior non-white	6%	13%	22%	24%
First Year International	2%	8%	5%	6%
Senior International	3%	7%	4%	5%

The dominant profile of the WSU first year NSSE respondent, which is consistent with the student profile at Winona State as reported in its College Portrait through VSA, is a traditional-aged, fulltime, white female student living on campus.

WSU Benchmark Comparisons

The NSSE report allows participants to compare their students' responses to other institutions in terms of the five Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice. These benchmarks are Level of Academic Challenge (LAC), Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL), Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI), Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE), and Supportive Campus Environments (SCE). Institutions can also compare themselves to above average institutions (top 50% of all NSSE institutions) and high-performing institutions (top 10% of all NSSE institutions). Below is a summary of WSU's results in each of the five benchmark areas:

1. Level of Academic Challenge (LAC): intended to measure the extent to which the university emphasizes the importance of academic effort and set high expectations for student performance.

	WSU Mean score	MnSCU	Carnegie Class	All Institutions
First Year	52.1	52.0	53.1	53.7
Senior	56.3	56.5	57.7	57.0

An examination of the eleven items included in this benchmark reveals that, with the exception of the number of assigned readings of book length and amount of time spent preparing for class, WSU first year students' mean scores are lower in all of the items. WSU seniors' mean scores are higher in three items, all of which deal with the number of papers or reports assigned. WSU first year students do report that they are more likely to have to memorize facts or ideas in their courses, but this is not considered an effective practice for this benchmark. Overall, these results would indicate that WSU respondents do not report

that they experience a high level of academic challenge when compared to students at other institutions.

2. Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL): intended to measure the level of active involvement students experience in their education which includes collaborating with others and solving real-life problems.

	WSU Mean score	MnSCU	Carnegie Class	All Institutions
First Year	43.6	42.2	44.7	43.2
Senior	54.5	51.4	53.2	51.0

WSU fares better on this benchmark. WSU seniors report a high level of active and collaborative learning, scoring higher than the comparison groups in six out of seven items. WSU first year students score slightly higher than all institutions overall, and they report they are more likely than any of the other cohort groups to study with classmates outside of class, and they are more likely than all NSSE institutions respondents to make class presentations, work with other students during class, and participate in a community-based project as part of class. They also score higher than the comparison group made up of other MnSCU institutions. The one item that both WSU first year and senior students scored lower on than all comparison groups was "discussed ideas from your reading or classes with others outside of class."

3. Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI): intended to measure student level of interaction with faculty members inside and outside the classroom.

	WSU Mean score	MnSCU	Carnegie Class	All Institutions
First Year	32.0	32.1	35.8	34.7
Senior	42.9	39.1	43.6	42.0

WSU seniors report a relatively high level of student-faculty interaction in three of the six items. Compared to other MnSCU institutions, the scores for all six items are higher, with the most significant differences being items that ask about working with faculty members on activities other than coursework and working on a research project with a faculty member. First year students at WSU show a lower mean score on five of the six items when compared to all institutions, but they compare favorably to other MnSCU institutions in four of the items. Another notable point is that WSU students show a larger gap between the first year and the senior score than any of the other groups – does this show a drop off in the level of interaction between the classes or a tendency on WSU's part to provide seniors with more opportunities for interaction than are provided for first year students? While the latter is probably true at many institutions, it seems to be more pronounced at WSU than it is for the other comparison groups.

4. Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE): intended to measure the level of opportunities students experience to engage in diverse learning experiences that require the ability to integrate and apply knowledge.

	WSU Mean score	MnSCU	Carnegie Class	All Institutions
First Year	23.1	24.4	26.9	28.1
Senior	41.5	36.1	40.0	40.0

WSU seniors had a mean score higher than that of the whole group in six out of the twelve items, while first year students did not have any scores higher than the all-institution average. The highest scores for seniors occurred on items asking about internships and practicums, opportunities for community service or volunteer work, opportunities for learning community experiences, and experiencing a culminating senior experience such as a capstone course or project. The lowest scores for both first year and senior student occurred on items that asked students how often they had conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity or a different religious or political affiliation.

5. Supportive Campus Environment (SCE) – intended to measure the level to which students perceive their college as being committed to their success and supportive of positive working and social relations among different groups on campus.

	WSU Mean score	MnSCU	Carnegie Class	All Institutions
First Year	60.4	60.2	62.8	61.6
Senior	59.0	57.5	61.1	58.2

With the exception of two items (relationships with faculty members and experiencing the support needed to succeed academically), WSU seniors had higher mean scores than the average of all institutions in this category. However, first year students scored lower on three of the six items (same as above plus relationships with administrative personnel and offices). Both seniors and first year students reported higher than average levels of support needed to thrive socially and positive relationships with other students.

Comparing NSSE Data to other WSU Assessment Data

For several years Winona State has surveyed all entering first year students very early in the academic year to measure, among other things, their intentions and expectations. Although we learn many things about our first year class by studying this data, such as their reason for attending college, why they chose WSU, information about their families, what their intentions are at WSU, etc., most of the items are not related to their engagement in academic practices and activities that result in desirable learning outcomes, which is of course the focus of the NSSE survey. The WSU pre-enrollment survey does, however, ask

students about time usage and some of their expectations of their college experience using questions that are similar to some of the NSSE items. And, like the BSSE, the WSU pre-enrollment survey instrument is measuring expectations while the NSSE survey is measuring experience.

There are a couple of important reasons to pay attention to data that measures student expectations. One is that "expectations are significantly and moderately correlated with actual experiences." Students' expectations, much like a self-fulfilling prophecy, will impact their experiences on campus. Another reason is that wherever there are discrepancies between expectation and experience, there are opportunities for dissatisfaction. Since student satisfaction leads to student success and persistence, it is important to determine these areas of discrepancy and eliminate them if possible and desirable (Cole, Kennedy, and Ben-Avie, 2009).

One point of similarity between the two instruments is a question about how often students do or will work with other students outside of class. In the pre-enrollment survey, about two thirds of WSU first year students report that they intend to do that once a week or more (67% in 2008 and 63% in 2009). In the 2009 NSSE, 62% of first year respondents reported that they worked with classmates outside of class either often (42%) or very often (20%). Only 3% said that they never worked with classmates outside of class. These percentages were much higher than those reported in any of the comparison groups. Thus, this is an example of an expectation met, or perhaps an expectation coloring an experience. In any case, first year WSU students expect to work collaboratively with other students and they do.

Another question that can be compared across the two surveys is a question about community service and volunteering. In the pre-enrollment survey students are asked if they will perform volunteer work while in school. More than half (58% in 2008 and 56% in 2009) say that they will perform volunteer work once a week or more. The NSSE results show that 33% of respondents have already done community service or volunteer work in their first year and another 52% still intend to do so, and 68% of seniors have done this work with another 13% still intending to do so. For the WSU seniors, these rates are higher than any other comparison group. This is another point of congruence between expectation and the WSU experience.

One area in which expectation may not meet reality is the experience of communicating with faculty members outside of class. A significant number of incoming WSU students (88% in the 2008 Pre-enrollment Survey and 79% in 2009) believe they will be asking teachers for advice outside of class on a fairly regular basis (2-3 times a month, 1-2 times a week, or twice a week or more). However the NSSE data showed much lower percentages of students actually experience that kind of out of classroom contact with faculty members. While 45% of first year respondents did discuss grades or assignments with instructors often, only 30% discussed career plans and only 18% discussed ideas with faculty members outside of class on a regular basis.

Another area of dissonance between expectation and experience are the interactions that students have with students of a different race or ethnicity than their own. In the 2008 pre-enrollment survey, 75% of the first year students reported that they expected to socialize with students from a different race or ethnicity group. In the spring of 2009, only 32% of the first year NSSE respondents said that they regularly had "serious conversations" with students of a different race or ethnicity group.   Although these questions were worded differently enough that it may be difficult to compare expectations to experience in this area ("socializing" versus "serious conversation"), there are other items on the NSSE that are related to this topic and show similar results. For example, only 36% of first year NSSE respondents at WSU said that their experiences at the university had contributed to an "understanding of today's international/multicultural world" quite a bit or very much. That is in comparison to 43% at all MnSCU institutions.

Winona State also surveys its students each year in February on Assessment Day using an institutionally designed instrument that includes some "social behavior" questions that are the same as some that appear on the pre-enrollment survey. However, since this assessment is not limited to first year students it is difficult to look at direct comparisons with either the pre-enrollment survey or the NSSE. Another limitation is that this data cannot be used to compare our students to students at other institutions, as the NSSE data can. Thus we could see where growth and trends occur if we examine this data over a period of several years, but we cannot see how we compare to like institutions or to high-performing institutions.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Studying the NSSE data does lead to an increased understanding of WSU students and their level of engagement in activities that contribute to student success. More could be learned by correlating the data with our own student record data to see which activities and characteristics are tied to student success and persistence, or by conducting the survey multiple times over a period of years to see where progress or lack of progress occurs, or by adding the BSSE or a similar survey to be able to more directly compare student expectations to student experience. It would also be more useful if Winona State were to select their own comparison groups to compare ourselves with other institutions that we consider to be our peers, or that we consider to be best practice or high performing institutions. Because WSU did not specify comparison groups for the 2009 report, the default comparisons were other MnSCU universities, all institutions in our Carnegie class, and all NSSE institutions.

George Kuh offers general recommendations for institutions based on nationwide NSSE results over several years (Upcraft, Gardner, Barefoot, 2005). He points out that there are two facets to student engagement: one is the time and effort put in by the student, the

other is the way institutions use their resources and the curriculum, learning opportunities, and student support services they provide. According to Kuh, institutions that put sufficient resources and emphasis on academic advising and tutoring are doing more to engage their students. Institutions must also create a success-oriented campus climate and recognize that expectations can and should be high but must be consistently communicated to students. He also notes that students must receive regular feedback, and that faculty and student service professionals must recognize that students have changed, which means that educators may need to explain what was once taken for granted, such as "You must buy the book. You must read it and come to class. You must observe deadlines or make special arrangements when you miss one" (p.101).

These are recommendations that every institution can benefit from, but what can we learn specifically from the Winona State NSSE results? While the conclusions that can be drawn from one year of NSSE results are limited, there are some patterns that emerge. Tying these results to our current campus climate, practices, and procedures can produce some possibilities for increasing the level of engagement of our students.

Closing the First Year/Senior Year Divide

It is notable that in several areas of the WSU NSSE results seniors report high levels of engagement and compare favorably to other comparison groups in these engagement levels. However, this is less true of WSU first year students. While other institutions' results also show that seniors tend to be more engaged than first year students as a general rule, there is more of a gap between the two groups in some cases at WSU than what is seen at other institutions. This is particularly true in the Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI) area and the Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE) area.

Many of the survey items included in the EEE area ask about experiences that a senior would be far more likely to have experienced than a first year student, such as a capstone experience, study abroad, and independent study. Some, however, are engaging experiences that could be as beneficial to a first year student, such as community service or volunteer work, work on a research project with a faculty member, and foreign language coursework. WSU does offer many of these opportunities but may not be promoting them to first year students as much as we could be. ***Winona State may have an opportunity for increased student engagement in their first year students by increasing these options and promoting them more to first year students.***

In the SFI area, there is even more opportunity for Winona State to improve student engagement, particularly at the first year level. Many of the SFI items have to do with interactions that students experience outside of class. Again, as a general rule, first year students have larger sized-classes than seniors, and this lack of interaction is probably a by-product of that fact. However, while this is not unique to Winona State, our first year students still scored significantly lower than first year students at other institutions on items that asked if students discussed grades or assignments with faculty outside of class, and if

10

they received prompt feedback from faculty, as well as on the overall SFI benchmark score. And as noted earlier, this relatively low level of interaction with faculty not only compares unfavorably with other institutions, it also does not meet the expectations that these first year students had coming into the institution.

At Winona State, not all classes taken by first year students are large classes. Typically there are at least three classes taken by first year students with 30 or fewer in the class – Orientation 100, English 111, and Speech 191. There are many other university studies classes that enroll 40 or fewer students, such as mathematics courses, history courses, social science courses, and science labs. These smaller classes do offer the opportunity for more student/faculty interaction, both inside and outside the classroom. ***Changes in curricular design or delivery could result in increased student/faculty interaction.*** For example, the current Faculty Director for Orientation has proposed a model in which orientation classes are thematically linked to other, smaller first year classes, offered contiguously when possible and taught by the same instructor. Although the increased student/faculty interaction is not one of the current objectives stated in the proposal, this would be an opportunity created by this type of rethinking of the way first year classes are packaged and delivered.

Promoting and Increasing Diversity in a Homogenous Population

The recruitment and retention of diverse populations of students has been a priority at Winona State for some time, and there has certainly been progress in this area. Minority students are already showing higher retention rates, and theoretically the gap in graduation rates between the general population and underrepresented minorities that has been reported for Winona State by Education Trust in the College Results Online website (http://www.collegeresults.org/default.aspx) should be narrowing as well. However, the Winona State 2009 NSSE results still show a largely homogenous population of students when compared to other institutions and, perhaps more significantly, a student population that reports relatively little interaction with students of a different race or ethnicity, a lack of encouragement on the part of the university to do so, and a lack of experiences that contribute to their understanding of today's international/multicultural world. These are potential areas of growth for Winona State, even with a relatively homogenous population of students.

Currently Winona State has a very active and visible Office of Inclusion and Diversity, which sponsors a great deal of university wide programming designed to engage students of all kinds in activities that increase their contact with and understanding of students of different racial and ethnic groups. A recent development in the Division of Student Life and Development has been the adoption of a program sponsored by the American Association of Colleges and Universities called "Core Commitments: Education Students for Personal and Social Responsibility" (http://www.aacu.org/core_commitments/index.cfm). The Core Commitments are made up of five dimensions, and Winona State's SLD Division has decided

to focus on the fourth dimension, which is described as follows on the Core Commitment website:

> **Taking seriously the perspectives of others:** recognizing and acting on the obligation to inform one's own judgment; engaging diverse and competing perspectives as a resource for learning, citizenship, and work.

This focus and the adoption of the Core Commitments as a whole, especially if shared across academic and well as student service units, could be a vehicle by which Winona State could promote and encourage an increased understanding of diversity amongst all students. Rather than leaving this task to one department on campus, ***the entire campus community should be engaged in efforts to encourage contact between majority and minority student populations and encourage activities that promote an understanding of the diverse society that we live in.***

A specific example of an opportunity for this type of activity is the New Student Orientation program at Winona State. Currently the incoming international students experience a different, separate orientation program than the other new students. Many efforts to provide interaction between the groups have been made over the last few years, but in reality the interaction is still limited. Part of the issue in completely combining the groups has been time constraints and the need of the International Services Office to offer programming and information that is unique to students coming into this country for the first time. However, if this separate programming could be done in advance of the start of the orientation experience for the majority students, then it might be possible to have a more integrated orientation experience across different student populations. Since WSU's international student population is a significant part of the diverse student population, it is important to give domestic and international students the opportunity to interact and learn from one another.

Increasing the Value of the NSSE Data

One year of NSSE data does offer us some insight into the level of engagement of our students, but the data could be more valuable if repeated or if correlated with other data. As mentioned earlier, one approach would be to repeat the NSSE, perhaps every two years as is generally recommended, to track progress on specific benchmarks or items. This could be made even more valuable by adding the BSSE, so that not only trends over time could be observed, but also direct comparisons could be made between incoming student expectations and experiences. Another way to make the NSSE results more valuable is to correlate the results with data in our own student record system to identify what types of activities and engagement are associated with persistence and success at Winona State.

Although these approaches may give us more usable data, the key is still using the data. In order for students to benefit from these types of studies, action must be taken based on the results. ***Winona State must determine how the results should be shared and to whom,***

and must establish some goals to increase levels of engagement in one or more of the areas in which we have room for growth. This could be done by focusing on one of the benchmark areas, such as Student Faculty Interaction, or on a theme that cuts across the whole instrument, such as increased opportunities for experiencing diversity, and developing both program-specific and campus wide initiatives in that area. If we want to go beyond good intentions in creating a campus environment that encourages a high level of student engagement, we need to offer appropriate educational experiences, a supportive environment, a high level of student/faculty interaction, and learning that is active and challenging. We can begin to improve how we do that by using the lessons learned from the NSSE survey.

References

Cole, J. S., Kennedy, M., & Ben-Avie, M. (2009). The role of precollege data in assessing and understanding student engagement in college. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 141*, 55-69.

Lotkowski, V.A., Robbins, S.B., & Noeth, R.J. (2004). The role of academic and non-academic factors in improving college retention: ACT policy report. Retrieved July 2010 from www.act.org/research/policy/index.html.

Kuh, G.D. The National Survey of Student Engagement: Conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties. Retrieved June 2010 from http://www.nsse.iub.edu/

National Survey of Student Engagement. Using NSSE to assess and improve undergraduate education: Lessons from the field 2009. Retrieved July 2010 from http://www.nsse.iub.edu/

National Survey of Student Engagement. Using NSSE to assess the first year experience. Retrieved July 2010 from http://www.nsse.iub.edu/

National Survey of Student Engagement. How AASCU Colleges and Universities are using their NSSE data. Retrieved July 2010 from http://www.nsse.iub.edu/

National Survey of Student Engagement. Using NSSE data in student affairs. Retrieved July 2010 from http://www.nsse.iub.edu/

Upcraft, M.L., Gardner, J.N., & Barefoot, B.O. (2005). Challenging and supporting the first year student: A handbook for improving the first year of college.San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Workshop One: What Do We Know About Our First Year Students?

Target Population: Orientation Instructors

Description: A profile of WSU students will be presented to WSU Orientation Instructors. Data from the NSSE survey, the Pre-Enrollment survey, and Institutional Research will be used to produce the profile, which will include demographic information, student characteristics and aspirations, study behaviors, and social behaviors. The workshop will include a discussion of the differences and similarities in the expectations and experiences of first year students, and a discussion of how these profiles can be used in the delivery of the orientation course.

I.   Demographic Information
    a. Traditional, on-campus, fulltime students
    b. Parent/family/socioeconomic information
    c. Retention rates and academic probation/suspension patterns

II.   Aspirations and Motivations
    a. Reasons for attending college
    b. Intentions in college

III.   Study Behaviors
    a. Expectations
    b. Experience
    c. Study behaviors and student engagement

IV.   Social Behaviors
    a. High level of social connectedness with like peers
    b. Need for increased interaction with diverse groups
    c. Social behaviors and student engagement

V.   Using What we Know in the Orientation Course
    a. Importance of student/faculty interaction
    b. Establishing and communicating high expectations
    c. Creating Effective Educational Opportunities

Workshop Two: NSSE results and Student Life Programming

Target Population: SLD Directors

Description: A profile of WSU students and information about the Five Benchmarks will be presented to WSU SLD Directors. Data from the NSSE survey, the Pre-Enrollment survey, and Institutional Research will be used to produce the profile, which will include demographic information, student characteristics and aspirations, study behaviors, and social behaviors. WSU student engagement results will be shared, organized around the Five Benchmarks. The workshop will include a discussion of how this information can be used in student service programming.

I.   Demographic Information
    a. Traditional, on-campus, fulltime students
    b. Parent/family/socioeconomic information
    c. Retention rates and academic probation/suspension patterns

II.   Aspirations and Motivations
    a. Reasons for attending college
    b. Intentions in college

III.   Study Behaviors
    a. Expectations
    b. Experience
    c. Study behaviors and student engagement

IV.   Social Behaviors
    a. High level of social connectedness with like peers
    b. Need for increased interaction with diverse groups
    c. Social behaviors and student engagement

V.   WSU NSSE Results
    a. Understanding the Five Benchmarks
    b. WSU strengths and opportunities for growth in student engagement

VI.   Student Engagement and Student Services
    a. Incorporating the NSSE results into Student Service Programming
    b. Creating a supportive student environment

Workshop Three: What Do We Know About Our First Year Students?

Target Population: Academic Advisors

Description: A profile of WSU students will be presented to Academic Advisors. Data from the NSSE survey, the Pre-Enrollment survey, and Institutional Research will be used to produce the profile, which will include demographic information, student characteristics and aspirations, study behaviors, and social behaviors. The workshop will include examples and a discussion of how academic advisors can encourage student engagement.

    I.   Demographic Information
- a. Traditional, on-campus, fulltime students
- b. Parent/family/socioeconomic information
- c. Retention rates and academic probation/suspension patterns

    II.   Aspirations and Motivations
- a. Reasons for attending college
- b. Intentions in college

    III.   Study Behaviors
- a. Expectations
- b. Experience
- c. Study behaviors and student engagement

    IV.   Social Behaviors
- a. High level of social connectedness with like peers
- b. Need for increased interaction with diverse groups
- c. Social behaviors and student engagement

    V.   How Academic Advisors can impact Engagement
- a. Importance of student/faculty interaction outside of the classroom
- b. Encouraging effective educational opportunities (extra-curricular, community services, study abroad, other high engagement activities)
- c. Encouraging use of campus resources (supportive campus environment)