Promoting Student Learning and Institutional Improvement: Lessons from NSSE at 13

Annual Results 2012
Along with a rich pool of evidence of effective practices, NSSE provides insightful guidelines for interpretation and productive use of the data.”

—Daniel J. Bernstein, Professor of Psychology and Director, Center for Teaching Excellence, University of Kansas
The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) documents dimensions of quality in undergraduate education and provides information and assistance to colleges, universities, and other organizations to improve student learning. Its primary activity is annually surveying college students to assess the extent to which they engage in educational practices associated with high levels of learning and development.

*Annual Results 2012* is sponsored by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
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As president of the American Council on Education and a former member of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) Advisory Board, I am so pleased to have the opportunity to offer my thoughts on the impact NSSE has had on institutions and higher education as a whole over the past 13 years.

The great strength of American higher education is its vast diversity. However, this diversity can at times make it easy to forget that regardless of our differences, our common passion for and dedication to the value of higher education is a constant. Our mission statements all reflect the ideals of engagement through learning, research, and service, and we have dedicated our professional lives to fulfilling their promise.

But rarely do mission statements, no matter how lofty their goals, directly affect student learning, especially for undergraduates. Rather, it is our responsibility to make those goals real by championing efforts to increase student learning and ensure the delivery of a quality education.

Learning is the partnership between students prepared to benefit from a college education and the institution whose faculty and staff guide their development. In the past, assessment of the success of this partnership was difficult because values and practices intended to be beneficial to students and faculty (including academic freedom, accreditation, and government oversight) have often stood as barriers.

Since 2000, the National Survey of Student Engagement has been a vital tool in the effort to get beyond these barriers, helping institutions and their stakeholders present a more accurate representation of the undergraduate learning experience and, thereby, what constitutes a quality education. Thanks to support from the Pew Charitable Trusts and dedicated leaders in higher education who recommended the establishment of the survey, colleges and universities can assess instructional practices and a wide range of activities that impact student learning.

In times like these, when there are so many pressures on a campus leader to ensure access and completion, we must not lose sight of the core issue of academic quality, and data from NSSE help presidents and provosts assess, improve, and communicate that quality.

NSSE’s major success is its position as a statistically valid approach to addressing issues that can impact student learning. The instrument is carefully structured, and NSSE has been most discerning about rigorous statistical analysis of the survey’s results. In particular, it achieves the difficult goal of respectfully treating not just variations between institutions, but those within each institution’s own diverse student body. In the face of many new and novel means of assessing academic quality, this one has withstood scrutiny, making a lasting contribution to American higher education and becoming the gold standard in our field—
a contribution I am certain will continue as the updated version of the NSSE survey is introduced in 2013.

Of course, the data and statistical analysis only go so far. A large part of NSSE's success over nearly a decade and a half has been the investment institutions have made in applying the lessons contained in the results—and it is gratifying to see how many colleges and universities have leveraged their NSSE results to improve demonstrably the quality of their students' learning experiences. In times like these, when there are so many pressures on a campus leader to ensure access and completion, we must not lose sight of the core issue of academic quality, and data from NSSE help presidents and provosts assess, improve, and communicate that quality. As ACE's National Task Force on Institutional Accreditation reminded institutions, assessing learning outcomes and academic quality is extremely complex, but that is not an excuse for inaction. NSSE has become one of the most important tools academic leaders have in doing this vital work.

Annual Results 2012 serves a dual purpose—in this time of transition, the report acknowledges the vast amount of actionable, diagnostic information NSSE has provided in its short 13 years. It also gives us a look into the future, introducing readers to the research, testing, and analyses that have been undertaken to prepare for the next generation of NSSE, the fruits of which we will see in the 2013 report.

My thanks and congratulations to Alex McCormick and the entire NSSE staff for their careful, thoughtful, and diligent work, which has been of great service to American higher education, its leadership, faculty, and students. If we are to sustain the hope of the American dream, with each generation enjoying a better quality of life in an increasingly competitive global economy, it is imperative that we have resources like NSSE to guide our activities inside the classroom and out.

Molly Corbett Broad
President
American Council on Education

ACE Releases Task Force Report to Strengthen Accreditation Process

In June 2012, the American Council on Education (ACE) National Task Force on Institutional Accreditation released a report that urges the higher education community to strengthen and improve the quality and public accountability of the institutional accreditation process. Assuring Academic Quality in the 21st Century: Self-Regulation in a New Era is designed to spark productive conversations throughout the higher education community to address the challenges of strengthening the system of voluntary self-regulation. It describes current approaches to accreditation, addresses criticisms of the process, and offers six recommendations that colleges, universities, and regional accrediting bodies can implement to ensure that the accreditation process is a meaningful guarantor of academic quality. The recommendations are:

1. Increase the transparency of accreditation and clearly communicate its results
2. Increase the centrality of evidence about student success and educational quality
3. Take prompt, strong, and public action against substandard institutions
4. Adopt a more “risk-sensitive” approach to regional accreditation
5. Seek common terminology, promote cooperation, and expand participation
6. Enhance the cost-effectiveness of accreditation

Of particular note is the emphasis on evidence in Recommendation 2. In response to the growing demand for public accountability, regional accrediting bodies now consider graduation and retention rates, student experiences and learning outcomes, supportive institutional resources, and placement data to be part of a standard comprehensive review that is made public. However, the report highlights the need to ensure that these metrics are explained and qualified within a unique institutional context to present a meaningful interpretation. Moreover, the requirements for evidence must be sensitive to institutional mission and the characteristics of entering students, and reflect the educational benefits the institution seeks to provide. Evidence of educational outcomes must be presented systematically and transparently.

The task force included academic leaders from two- and four-year, public and private institutions along with agency officials and experts on accreditation, evaluation of student learning, and the proliferation of business models for higher education providers.

The task force plans to issue a follow-up report in 2014 on the progress made on its recommendations. View the full report on the ACE Web site. acenet.edu

“The National Survey of Student Engagement is probably the single most important step in understanding quality in undergraduate education in more than a decade. It focuses our attention on the things that really matter.”

—Ernest T. Pascarella, Mary Louise Petersen Professor of Higher Education, University of Iowa
Going Deep with NSSE

The NSSE project has come a long way since its launch in 2000. What started as a bold experiment in changing the discourse about quality and improvement in undergraduate education—and providing accompanying metrics—is now an established and trusted fixture in higher education’s assessment landscape. That first national administration involved 276 colleges and universities. NSSE is now used at 580 to 770 institutions annually, for a cumulative total of more than 1,500 different schools since inception. Nearly all use NSSE on a continuing basis. For example, of the inaugural group of 276, 93% administered the survey in NSSE’s 10th year or later. Similar rates of repeat participation are typical of institutions that took up NSSE later and offer compelling testimony that NSSE users derive considerable value from the project.

As we approach the launch of an updated NSSE survey (see p. 15), this edition of Annual Results revisits and replicates a collection of important findings from NSSE’s first 13 years. I want to call special attention to two of these: the use of NSSE results to illuminate deep approaches to learning and evidence of positive trends in NSSE results at a broad range of colleges and universities.

Deep Approaches to Learning

Teaching and learning are not the same. For any given course, the same material can be taught in countless different ways, and these choices have consequences for student learning. When designing courses to achieve desired outcomes, faculty members

It is important to consider whether students have learning experiences that are likely to result in effective and enduring learning. NSSE provides evidence relevant to this question.

not only decide on the content itself—such as textbooks or other reading material—they also decide how to deliver that content, what to ask of students, and how to assess what they learn. Some of these decisions may be constrained by factors such as class size or physical characteristics of the classroom, but most faculty retain considerable flexibility in how they organize their courses. It is important, then, to consider whether students have learning experiences that are likely to result in effective and enduring learning. NSSE provides evidence relevant to this question.

Much is known about the experiences that promote learning (see Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 2000), and several questions on the NSSE survey capture important aspects of these experiences. For example, activities that call on students to construct, transform, and apply knowledge are generally more educationally effective than rote memorization and recall. This distinction is often characterized as deep- versus surface-level processing (Marton & Säljö, 1976; Tagg, 2003). One set of NSSE items asks students about the cognitive tasks emphasized in their coursework, corresponding to Benjamin Bloom’s widely referenced Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (1956). These questions separately assess how much coursework emphasizes memorization, analysis, synthesis, judgment, and application. Combining the last four of these with survey items tapping how often students integrate knowledge from various sources, revise previously held views, and consider others’ perspectives, NSSE researchers created a “deep approaches to learning” scale that has demonstrated strong correspondence with how much time students devote to their studies (see p. 10), perceived learning gains in college, and overall satisfaction. Students participating in high-impact practices (see Kuh, 2008) also evidence higher scores on deep approaches to learning, even with statistical controls for a range of student and institutional differences (p. 10). These findings point to the value of deep approaches to learning for a nuanced view of instructional practice.
Positive Change is Happening

For the 2009 edition of *Annual Results*, following NSSE’s 10th national administration, we undertook an analysis of trends in NSSE results among institutions that had administered the survey at least four times. We were gratified to find that an appreciable share of institutions showed upward trends on NSSE’s Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice, that positive trends outnumbered negative ones by a wide margin, and that instances of positive trends were found across institutional types. This issue of *Annual Results* updates the analysis for the much larger group of institutions that now meet the criteria for inclusion (see p. 13). The key findings from the previous analysis did not change, and that is very good news for higher education. It demonstrates that positive change is not only possible, it is taking place at a large and very diverse group of colleges and universities.

What can we learn from these campuses? We are now concluding a research project supported by the Spencer Foundation that seeks to answer this question. One thing we’ve learned is that the prime driver of change does not appear to involve external initiatives such as accountability regimes and governing board mandates. Rather, informants at successful campuses typically cited an institutional commitment to improving undergraduate education, data that revealed concerns, and faculty and staff interest in improving the undergraduate experience. There is more to be learned from this work, but it seems clear that a genuine desire to improve, coupled with broad consensus and commitment among those whose choices most directly impact the undergraduate experience, are necessary ingredients for positive change.

At 13, NSSE is a young and still-developing enterprise. The project has achieved a great deal, and I am excited by the potential of the updated survey to further advance the cause of assessment and improvement of undergraduate education. I am privileged to work with a talented and dedicated staff, and grateful for the wise counsel of NSSE’s National Advisory Board. Finally, NSSE could not have achieved so much without the collaboration of countless individuals at hundreds of colleges and universities—faculty, institutional researchers, student affairs staff, and senior leadership—who are committed to evidence-based improvement and genuine educational quality.

Alexander C. McCormick
Director, National Survey of Student Engagement
Associate Professor, Indiana University School of Education
Survey
The NSSE survey is available in paper and Web versions and takes about 15 minutes to complete.
nsse.iub.edu/links/surveys

Objectives
Provide data to colleges and universities to assess and improve undergraduate education, inform accountability and accreditation efforts, and facilitate national and sector benchmarking efforts, among others.

Partners
Established in 2000 with a grant from The Pew Charitable Trusts. Support for research and development projects from Lumina Foundation for Education, the Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College, the Spencer Foundation, Teagle Foundation, and the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.

Participating Colleges & Universities
Since its launch in 2000, more than 1,500 four-year colleges and universities in the US and Canada have participated in NSSE, with 554 U.S. and 23 Canadian institutions in 2012. Participating institutions generally mirror the national distribution of the Carnegie 2010 Basic Classification (Figure 1).

Participation Agreement
Participating colleges and universities agree that NSSE can use the data in the aggregate for reporting purposes and other undergraduate research and improvement initiatives. Colleges and universities can use their own data for institutional purposes. Results specific to each college or university and identified as such will not be made public except by mutual agreement.

Administration
Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research in cooperation with the Indiana University Center for Survey Research.

Data Sources
Census-administered or randomly sampled first-year and senior students from bachelor’s degree-granting institutions. Supplemented by other information, such as institutional records and data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

Validity & Reliability
The NSSE survey was designed by an expert panel and extensively tested to ensure validity and reliability as well as to minimize non-response bias and mode effects. Refer to our online Psychometric Portfolio for extensive information about NSSE data quality.
nsse.iub.edu/links/data_quality

Response Rates
In 2012, the average institutional response rate was 32%. The highest in NSSE 2012 was 70%, and 52% of institutions achieved a response rate of at least 30%.

Quick Facts

Audiences
College and university administrators, faculty members, advisors, student life staff, students, governing boards, institutional researchers, higher education scholars, accreditors, government agencies, prospective students and their families, high school counselors, and journalists.

Carnegie 2010 Basic Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RU/VH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/A&amp;S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/Diverse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages are based on U.S. institutions that belong to one of the eight Carnegie classifications above.
classifications.carnegiefoundation.org
Consortia & University Systems

Groups of institutions sharing a common interest and university systems receive group comparisons. Some groups add additional custom questions, and some share student-level data among member institutions.

Participation Cost & Benefits

The annual NSSE survey is supported by institutional participation fees. Institutions pay a fee ranging from $1,800 to $7,800, determined by undergraduate enrollment. Participation benefits include: uniform third-party survey administration; customizable survey recruiting materials; a student-level data file of all respondents; comprehensive reporting of results with frequencies, means, and benchmark scores using three customizable comparison groups; major field reports and special reports for executive leadership and prospective students; and resources for interpreting results and translating them into practice.

Current Initiatives

The NSSE Institute for Effective Educational Practice is collaborating with the Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts and the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education to explore the relationships between NSSE measures of student engagement and a range of student learning gains. NSSE is also continuing the Spencer Foundation-funded project, Learning to Improve: A Study of Evidence-Based Improvement in Higher Education, an investigation of institutions that show a pattern of improved performance in their NSSE results over time, and working with the Linking Institutional Policies to Student Success (LIPSS), a project based at Florida State University to identify specific institution-wide policies that can influence student engagement.

Other Programs & Services

Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE), Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), Law School Survey of Student Engagement (LSSSE), NSSE Institute workshops and Webinars, faculty and staff retreats, consulting, and custom analyses.

Consortia & State or University Systems 2000–2012

American Democracy Project
Arts Consortium
Association of American Universities Data Exchange
Association of Independent Colleges of Art and Design
Association of Independent Technical Universities
Bringing Theory to Practice
California State University
Canadian Consortium
Canadian Research Universities
Catholic Colleges & Universities
City University of New York
Colleges That Change Lives
Committee on Institutional Cooperation
Concordia Universities
Connecticut State Universities
Consortium for the Study of Writing in College
Council for Christian Colleges & Universities
Council of Independent Colleges
Council of Public Liberal Arts Colleges
Flashlight Group
G13 X Ontario
Hispanic-Serving Institutions
Historically Black Colleges and Universities
Indiana University
Information Literacy
Jesuit Colleges and Universities
Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education
Lutheran Colleges and Universities
Mid-Atlantic Private Colleges
Military Academy Consortium
Minnesota State Colleges & Universities
Mission Engagement Consortium for Independent Colleges
New American Colleges and Universities
New Jersey Public Universities
New Western Canadian Universities
North Dakota University System
Ohio State University System
Online Educators Consortium
Ontario Universities
Penn State System
Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education
Private Liberal Arts Colleges and Universities
Qatar Foundation/Education Division/OFSS
South Dakota Public Universities
State University of New York
Sustainability Education Consortium
Teagle Diversity Consortium
Teagle Integrated Learning Consortium
Tennessee Publics
Texas A&M System
Texas Six
University of Hawai‘i
University of Louisiana System
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts
University of Missouri
University of North Carolina
University of Texas
University of Wisconsin Comprehensives
University System of Georgia
Urban Universities
Women’s Colleges
Work Colleges

See page 15 for details.
The selected results reported in this section are based on more than 285,000 census-administered or randomly sampled students attending 546 U.S. bachelor’s degree-granting institutions that participated in NSSE in Spring 2012 (eight U.S. institutions were excluded due to special circumstances). We also used three sets of experimental items appended to the Web version of the survey for a subset of 2012 institutions.

This section contains several themes. The first—Key NSSE Findings Revisited and Updated—not only revisits some of our strongest and most consistent findings to date, but refreshes and at times amplifies the prior results using 2012 data. Studies about deep approaches to learning, experiences with the academic major, and the amount of time students spend studying have provided keen insights to institutions looking for ways to enhance student success. Evidence on improvement patterns offers encouraging news about positive change at colleges and universities, and revisiting Project DEEP suggests what is needed to sustain success. Looking forward, our second theme reviews the updated NSSE survey for 2013 and introduces new content, summary measures, and customization options. Next, we present results from three sets of experimental questions, each of which delves into key issues and trends faced by today’s college students: choice of major, financial stress, and social networking.

Finally, we use data from the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) and the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) to provide additional evidence of the utility of these companion instruments. These include an analysis of high school engagement and campus support, and how faculty may differ in their teaching approaches by disciplinary area.

Quick Takes

- Engagement in high-impact practices, particularly doing research with faculty and service-learning, was positively related to deep approaches to learning.

- Participation in high-impact practices varied considerably by major. For instance, astronomy, biochemistry, and physics majors were most likely to do research with faculty; nursing and education majors participated most in service-learning.

- Upward institution-level trends in engagement continued through 2012 for a diverse array of institutions. More than half demonstrated a positive trend on at least one measure for first-year students, and more than one-third did so for seniors.

- On average, full-time seniors spent five to eight hours more per week preparing for class than what faculty believed they spent.

- Job opportunities were among the top factors influencing seniors’ choice of major, but this varied by racial/ethnic background, where students of color were generally more concerned than Whites about their ability to find a job.

- Concern for finances appears to affect students’ academic performance. Many students chose not to purchase required academic materials due to their cost and believed that financial concerns interfered with their academic performance.

- First-year students who frequently interacted with peers, faculty, and campus units by way of social media were more engaged, but those who used social media during class reported lower grades.

- Though high school engagement was positively related to first-year engagement, all students reported higher engagement when they also perceived higher levels of campus support.

- Student-faculty interaction varied by field of study. For example, education faculty were more likely than nursing or engineering faculty to engage their classes in question and discussion sessions.
Deep Approaches to Learning

Deep approaches to learning (DAL) help students make richer, more lasting connections to material through an emphasis on activities such as integration, synthesis, and reflection. DAL can be measured by NSSE using an overall score or by three subscales:

- **Higher-Order Learning**—How much courses emphasize advanced thinking skills such as applying theories to practical problems or synthesizing information into new interpretations
- **Integrative Learning**—Integrating ideas from various sources, including diverse perspectives in coursework, and discussing ideas outside of class
- **Reflective Learning**—Examining one’s own thinking and the perspectives of others

How Deep Learners Spend Their Time

Replicating an analysis from 2004, we found that students who participated in DAL at higher levels made more purposeful use of their time. Seniors in the top quartile of the overall DAL scale spent more time preparing for class, working (on- or off-campus), and participating in co-curricular activities. Yet, they spent less time relaxing and socializing (Figure 2). The pattern was the same for first-year students.

Deep Learning and Other Forms of Engagement

In 2007, DAL was positively related to participation in first-year learning communities, and to research with a faculty member, study abroad, and culminating experiences for seniors. In 2012, we found significant positive relationships between deep learning and all high-impact practices (Table 1).

Deep Learning Across Fields of Study

In 2005, we found that participation in DAL varied by major field category. Again in 2012, seniors majoring in arts and humanities, education, social sciences, and professional fields other than business or engineering had the highest levels of participation in deep learning activities. Although students majoring in engineering and the physical sciences participated less often in integrative and reflective learning activities than their peers in biological sciences, students in these fields experienced greater emphasis on higher-order learning.

Our analysis of faculty from 75 FSSE institutions uncovered significant variation by discipline in how much they emphasized deep learning activities. Faculty in arts and humanities, education, professional, and social sciences all placed more importance on these activities than their colleagues in biological sciences. A loose connection can be seen between the faculty and student responses—fields where DAL activities were important to faculty tended to have students participate in more of these learning activities.

### Table 1: Relationships Between High-Impact Practices and Deep Approaches to Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Senior Capstone</th>
<th>Internship/Practicum</th>
<th>Research with Faculty</th>
<th>Service-Learning</th>
<th>Study Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Learning Overall</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrative Learning</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Learning</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Continuous variables were standardized before entry into regression models. Controls included gender, enrollment, race/ethnicity, age, first-generation, self-reported grades, transfer, living on campus, major, working, international, distance education, Carnegie Basic Classification, and institutional control.

Key: + * p<.001, ++ * * p<.001 and unstd. B > .2, +++ * * * p<.001 and unstd. B > .4
Looking Within: Analysis of Student Subgroups Tells a Richer Story

NSSE has consistently reported that most of the variability in engagement is among students within institutions, rather than between institutions. For this reason, we highly encourage analyzing learning experiences by student subpopulations to better understand who is most and least engaged. Below is a selection of significant comparisons from previous editions of Annual Results that have been replicated using 2012 results.

Background Characteristics

To serve the needs of all students, it is important to investigate differences related to student background characteristics, for example:

- Senior transfer students experienced a less supportive campus environment, participated less often in internships, study abroad, and research with faculty, and talked less often with faculty about future plans. However, they were more likely to prepare multiple drafts of papers and assignments before turning them in.

- Full-time first-year women spent more time preparing for class, as 26% spent more than 20 hours per week compared to 21% of men. Conversely, first-year men were a bit more likely to work with faculty members on activities other than coursework, with 19% of men and 16% of women frequently doing so.

- Black students engaged in more active and collaborative learning compared to all other racial/ethnic groups.

- Nontraditional seniors (age 25 and older) participated less often in high-impact practices than their traditional-age peers. For example, they were less likely to do internships (33% vs. 59%), service-learning (40% vs. 53%), learning communities (20% vs. 31%), study abroad (6% vs. 19%), and culminating senior experiences (22% vs. 40%).

Experiential Differences

Important aspects of students’ time use, programs of study, or co-curricular activities may impact their ability to be engaged, for example:

- Participation in high-impact practices varied considerably by major (Figure 3). For instance, astronomy, biochemistry, and physics majors were most likely to do research with faculty; nursing and education majors participated in more service-learning.

- Senior student-athletes were more likely to participate in community service, with 78% of athletes doing so compared to 62% of non-athletes.

- Social fraternity and sorority members were more likely to participate in high-impact practices, showed higher levels of academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, and student-faculty interaction, and experienced a more supportive campus environment.

- Online learners were more challenged in their coursework but engaged less often in active and collaborative learning activities.

Figure 3: Percentage of Seniors Who Participated in High-Impact Practices by Selected Majors

Study Time by Student and Institutional Characteristics

Over the years, NSSE has examined the amount of time students spent preparing for class, finding meaningful differences by student and institutional characteristics. We have replicated many of these findings using 2012 data.

For example, in Spring 2012, full-time, first-year students averaged about 15 hours per week preparing for class, and seniors averaged 15½ hours (Table 2). Women typically spent more time studying than men—an hour more among first-year students and about 40 minutes more among seniors. Almost a third of seniors age 24 or older spent more than 20 hours per week on class preparation compared to a quarter of younger seniors. First-year first-generation students devoted about an hour less per week in class preparation. Both first-year and senior distance education
students spent about an hour more per week preparing for class than their on-campus counterparts.

Self-reported grades provided the starkest differences in time spent studying, especially among first-year students. Of first-year students who earned mostly C’s, only 15% spent more than 20 hours per week preparing for class while twice as many did so among those who earned A’s. Finally, institutional type made a difference. Full-time students attending Baccalaureate Arts and Sciences colleges averaged one to three more hours per week than students at other types of institutions.

Comparing NSSE and FSSE Results by Disciplinary Area

From previous findings, we know class preparation time varies considerably by disciplinary area. We also know from FSSE results that faculty expectations and perceptions of students’ weekly study time are closely tied to discipline.

Using data from 31 institutions that participated in both NSSE 2012 and the Typical-Student version of FSSE 2012, we compared the time full-time seniors spent preparing for class with faculty expectations and perceptions across eight disciplinary categories (Figure 4). Consistent with past results, engineering students spent the most time preparing for class while business students spent the least. Compared to faculty expectations, students in most fields studied one to two hours less per week than what most faculty expected. In only two instances, engineering and other professional, did students exceed faculty expectations. The greatest differences were with faculty beliefs about how much time students actually spend studying. On average, full-time seniors spent five to eight more hours per week preparing for class than what faculty believed they spent. This may be because students had insufficient opportunities to demonstrate what they learned or because their performance fell short of expectations, but more investigation is needed.

### Table 2: Study Time\(^a\) by Selected Characteristics for Full-Time Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avg. Hours Per Week</td>
<td>More Than 20 Hours (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 24 years of age</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 years of age and older</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-generation(^b)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not first-generation</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance education(^c)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not distance education</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Reported Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A- to A</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B- to B+</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+ or lower</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie 2010 Basic Classification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRU</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s L</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s M</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s S</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC/AIDS</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC/Diverse</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Hours per week were estimated using the midpoint of the categorical response options: 0, 1-5, 6-10, 21-25, 26-30, and More than 30 hours per week. For “More than 30,” a value of 33 was assigned.

\(^b\) Neither parent holds a bachelor’s degree.

\(^c\) Taking all classes entirely online.
Positive Trends in Student Engagement: Updated Findings

In *Annual Results 2009*, we reported on the prevalence of positive institution-level trends on several key measures of student engagement. This section updates the analysis through the 2012 NSSE administration. We limited the study to institutions that administered NSSE at least four times from 2004 to 2012 (years in which key survey questions did not change) and excluded administrations in which data quality considerations (response rate, sample size, and sampling error) for a given year at a given institution diminished confidence in the results. Using these criteria, we identified 449 colleges and universities with at least four data points for first-year students and 539 for seniors—more than double the number in the previous analysis. Three out of five institutions in the analysis had at least five data points, and about 40% had at least six. These institutions reflect the diversity of U.S. higher education with respect to institutional control, Carnegie 2010 Basic Classification, and size.

We examined multi-year results for four NSSE benchmarks (Level of Academic Challenge, Active and Collaborative Learning, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Supportive Campus Environment) and the proportion of students participating in high-impact practices (for first-year students, a learning community or service-learning; for seniors, service-learning, research with faculty, an internship or field experience, study abroad, or a culminating experience). Criteria for identifying a trend matched those used in 2009: change between the first and last measure that is both statistically significant and of a meaningful size (in technical terms, an effect size of at least .3), and an overall pattern that provides a satisfactory fit to a line or a curve indicating a positive or negative trend.

Positive Findings Reinforced

The updated analysis reinforces the 2009 findings. More than half of institutions examined (55%) demonstrated a positive trend on at least one measure for first-year students, and more than one-third (36%) did so for seniors. Negative trends were rare, observed at only 7%–8% of institutions. Positive trends outnumbered negative ones by 5:1 for seniors and nearly 7:1 for first-year students. Many institutions showed improvement trends on more than one measure, including a small number with positive trends for all five measures. Thirty percent of institutions showed positive trends on at least two measures for first-year students, as did 16% for seniors.

The greater incidence of positive trends among first-year students likely reflects broad concerns about retention and the quality of the first-year experience. However, the first-year experience may also be more amenable to improvement, given the greater commonality of experience among first-year students compared to seniors (e.g., general education programs and large introductory classes common in the first year).

While conventional wisdom might hold that systematic improvement in student engagement is only possible at certain types of institutions (i.e., small liberal arts colleges), our results show otherwise (Table 3). For first-year students, comparable shares of public and private institutions evidenced positive trends on at least one measure, and proportionally more doctorate-granting and master’s universities than baccalaureate colleges showed improvement. Among seniors, positive trends were more common among private institutions, but they were still in evidence at one in four public institutions studied. Positive trends for seniors were equally likely for doctoral, master’s, and baccalaureate institutions. Even at institutions that enroll more than 10,000 undergraduates, half showed at least one positive trend for first-year students, and one-quarter did so for seniors.

A fundamental objective of the NSSE project is to provide college and university faculty, staff, and leadership with actionable information to inform the improvement of undergraduate education. These findings offer compelling evidence that positive change is taking place, and that the possibility of improvement is not confined to a narrow subset of institutional types.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Institutions with Any Improvement Trend, by Selected Characteristics¹</th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>247</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undergraduate enrollment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (fewer than 2,500)</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (2,500–4,999)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (5,000–9,999)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very large (10,000 or more)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Carnegie 2010 Basic Classification (aggregated)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate-granting universities</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s colleges and universities</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate colleges</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others or unclassified</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Cells contain the number and percentage of institutions with the indicated attribute that showed a pattern of improvement on at least one criterion measure.
Revisiting the DEEP Study After Ten Years: Lessons for Enhancing Educational Effectiveness

Improving the conditions to enhance student success remains a steady concern in higher education. Colleges and universities continue to strengthen first-year experience programs, increase high-impact practices such as learning communities, service-learning, and undergraduate research, add early alert systems, and expand applied learning experiences, among others. Efforts like the Documenting Effective Educational Practices (DEEP) project, launched in 2002 with the support of Lumina Foundation and the Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College, have helped illuminate ways to enhance student success.

Project DEEP studied the noteworthy performance of 20 colleges and universities with higher-than-predicted graduation rates and better-than-predicted student engagement scores—exemplars of effective practice. Resulting publications, including *Student Success in College: Creating Conditions That Matter* (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh, Whitt, & Associates, 2005/2010) and a series of topical DEEP Practice Briefs, provide specific context-based descriptions of what educationally effective colleges and universities do to foster student learning and success.

Six overarching features were found to be common to the 20 DEEP colleges and universities:

- A “living” mission and a “lived” educational philosophy
- An unshakeable focus on student learning
- Clearly marked pathways to student success
- Environments adapted for educational enrichment
- An improvement-oriented campus culture
- Shared responsibility for educational quality and student success

The noteworthy level of performance achieved by the DEEP institutions is not only attributable to having effective educational conditions, programs and practices in place. Their success also comes from quality initiatives that touch large numbers of students in meaningful ways. In addition, the synergy and complementarity of these efforts create a success-oriented campus culture and learning environment. What’s more, they are never quite satisfied with their performance, and continually strive to improve the student experience and encourage faculty and staff to experiment with approaches to heighten learning.

**DEEP Institutions Maintain Strong Performance**

In 2010 we revisited the DEEP institutions to determine if they had been able to maintain their strong performance (Kuh, Kinzie, Schuh & Whitt, 2011). By and large, they had. Retention and graduation rates were still good, and several had increased. NSSE scores were also comparable, and the six features remained critical to sustaining a focus on student success. In addition, several practices took on greater importance, including (a) expanded emphasis on data-informed decision-making and an ethic of “positive restlessness,” (b) better collaboration between academic and student affairs, and (c) more campus leaders working diligently to increase faculty and staff understanding of conditions for student success.

Faculty and staff at these high-performing colleges were careful to measure things that reflected institutional mission and values. They focused on data that were actionable, not immutable institutional or student characteristics. They have evolved from simply gathering data to using evidence to guide changes that improve student engagement, learning, and persistence. This shift reflects what Blaich and Wise (2011) identified as important—moving from approaching assessment as a data-gathering process ending in a report to seeing it as a many-step process to strengthen the institution’s teaching and learning environment and culminate in improvements. The practices and policies identified in Project DEEP and the follow-up reinforce the importance of taking action on evidence to enhance student learning and on increasing the number of faculty and staff who understand that promoting student engagement in effective educational practices is essential to deepening student learning and success.

**Selected DEEP Practice Briefs—Promoting Student Success**

- What Campus Leaders Can Do
- Creating Conditions So Every Student Can Learn
- The Importance of Shared Leadership and Collaboration
- What Student Affairs Can Do
- What Faculty Members Can Do
- What Student Leaders Can Do
- What Department Chairs Can Do
- What Advisors Can Do
- What New Faculty Need to Know
- What SHEEOs and System Heads Can Do
- What Accreditation Teams Can Do

Available at: nsse.iub.edu/links/DEEP_project
Introducing the Updated NSSE Survey for 2013

After years of evidence-based and collaborative testing, the updated NSSE survey is complete. While survey changes range from minimal adjustments to entirely new content (Figure 5), the 2013 instrument maintains NSSE’s signature focus on diagnostic and actionable information related to effective educational practice.

From Benchmarks to “Engagement Indicators”

Sets of new and updated items have been rigorously tested and are grouped within several Engagement Indicators (EIs). These fit within five areas of engagement (adapted from the Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice). The area of Academic Challenge includes four EIs—Higher-Order Learning, Reflective and Integrative Learning, Quantitative Reasoning, and Learning Strategies. The area of Learning with Peers includes two EIs—Collaborative Learning and Discussions with Diverse Others. The area Experiences with Faculty includes two EIs—Student-Faculty Interaction and Teaching Practices. The Campus Environment area includes two EIs—Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment. Finally, the High-Impact Practices area includes six EIs—Learning Communities, Service-Learning, Study Abroad, Research with Faculty, Internships, and Capstone Experiences.

New Items

The 2013 survey introduces valuable new content to enrich institutional assessment efforts. For example, new Quantitative Reasoning questions ask students how often they used numerical information in their own analysis, in examining real-world problems, or to evaluate others’ conclusions. New Teaching Practices items gauge the extent instructors explained course goals and provided feedback. The Learning Strategies indicator includes three items about how often students identified key information from readings, reviewed notes after class, and summarized what was learned from class or course materials.

New items were tested in a 2012 pilot study that collected responses from more than 50,000 students attending 56 diverse colleges and universities. For example, the new indicator Quantitative Reasoning was designed to better capture engagement with numerical information across disciplines. While seniors in engineering, physical sciences, and biological sciences were most likely to use numbers, graphs, or statistics in their coursework, it is noteworthy that students in all major categories were involved in at least some quantitative reasoning activities (Figure 6). The Learning Strategies indicator measures the effectiveness of students’ study habits: the more first-year students used these strategies, the higher were their self-reported grades (Figure 7).

Modules

In 2013 institutions may append topical modules, short sets of questions that focus on additional content areas or expand upon existing areas. Some modules were written in collaboration with external experts from AAC&U, AASCU, the Council of Writing Program Administrators, and EDUCAUSE. Topical modules for NSSE 2013 include explorations of academic advising, civic engagement, development of transferable skills, experiences with diverse perspectives, experiences with writing, and learning with technology.

More information about the 2013 instrument and modules can be found on the NSSE Web site.
nsse.iub.edu/nsse2013
Factors Influencing Choice of Academic Major

In past Annual Results (2011, 2010), we have demonstrated that student engagement varies considerably among academic majors. In 2012, interested to learn more about factors that influence a student’s choice of major, we administered an additional set of items to more than 21,000 students at 42 U.S. institutions. We learned that while nearly nine in ten seniors said “passion for the topic” and “a fit of talents and strengths” substantially influenced their decisions (Table 4), only about a third of them attributed “encouragement from a faculty member or advisor” as a key influence.

Table 4: Percentage of Seniors Who Said the Following Factors Substantially influenced Their Choice of Academic Major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic interest or passion for topic</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit for my talents and strengths</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career mobility or advancement</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to find a job</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential salary or earnings</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for graduate or professional school</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reputation of the major at your institution</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having influence over people or managing others</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement from a faculty member or advisor</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental or family influence</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Percentage responding “Quite a bit” or “Very much.”*

Concerns for Job Opportunities

Job opportunities were among the top factors that influenced students’ choice of major. For example, a majority of seniors (55%–59%) said “ability to find a job” or “career mobility or advancement” had a substantial influence on choosing their major. However, these choices varied by racial or ethnic background (see Figure 8). A sizeable share of Asian (68%), African American (63%), and Latino (63%) students were influenced by the ability to find a job, while fewer White students (53%) had such concerns.

When students’ actual choices were taken into consideration, we found that those majoring in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) were more influenced by their concerns for finding a job after graduation. Of all the racial groups, Asian seniors (74%) majoring in STEM fields were the most likely to cite job security as a key influence. A similar percentage of African American (73%) and Latino (69%) STEM majors shared the same concern. Even among non-STEM majors, a sizable percentage of minority students (61%) agreed the ability to find a job was a substantial influence on their decision. Interestingly, the largest disparity between STEM and non-STEM seniors was among Whites. About two-thirds of White students majoring in a STEM field agreed securing a job was a key factor while less than half of their non-STEM counterparts agreed. Compared to minority students, White non-STEM majors appeared to be the least affected by the concern for finding a job.

Figure 8: Percentage of Seniors Who Said Ability to Find a Job Had a Substantial Influence on Choice of Major by Race or Ethnicity and STEM

*Overall, STEM, Non-STEM*
Financial Stress and Its Consequences

The 2008 recession has reduced family incomes and public universities have increased tuition to offset diminished state support, thus decreasing many students’ ability to afford college. According to the American College Health Association (2011), finances are the second-largest stressor for students after academics—more than a third of students described finances as “traumatic” or “very difficult” to handle.

In response to these realities, NSSE appended a set of questions about the impact of finances on academic activities for about 15,000 first-year and senior students at a diverse group of 43 institutions. Results show that finances were a significant concern for the majority of students. For example, about three in five first-year students frequently worried about paying for college and having enough money for regular expenses (Table 5). Seniors were similar, although about half frequently worried about paying for college.

Concern for finances appears to affect many students’ academic performance. About one in four first-year students and one in three seniors frequently did not purchase required academic materials due to their cost, and a third of students believed that financial concerns interfered with their academic performance. Yet despite their financial concerns, three out of four students agreed that college is a good investment.

Financial stress varied according to how much students worked on- or off-campus. Full-time seniors were classified into three groups—those working 0 to 5 hours, 6 to 20 hours, and 21 or more hours per week—with about a third in each group. Students who worked more faced more financial stress (Figure 9). Approximately two out of three students who worked six or more hours per week frequently worried about having enough money for regular expenses, and those who worked more hours worried more often about paying for college. About two in five students working at least six hours per week frequently did not buy required academic materials. Perhaps most troubling, while about 60% of students working more than 20 hours per week believed that their work interfered with their academic performance, an equivalent percentage indicated that they frequently investigated working more hours. Moreover, despite the perceived negative impact of work on academic performance, those with heavy work commitments were more likely to consider increasing their work hours. These findings indicate that financial concerns may trump academic ones for a large number of students. Yet regardless of the number of hours worked, three out of four full-time seniors agreed that college is worth the cost.

---

Table 5: Percentage of First-Year Students and Seniors Who Evidenced Financial Stress in 2011–12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worried about having enough money for regular expenses(^a)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried about paying for college(^a)</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chose not to participate in an activity due to lack of money(^a)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chose not to purchase required academic materials due to their cost(^a)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigated working more hours to pay for costs(^a)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigated increasing your borrowing to pay for costs(^a)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed: Financial concerns have interfered with my academic performance(^a)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed: College is a good investment(^b)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Percentage responding “Very often” or “Often”.
\(^b\) Percentage selecting 4, 5, or 6 on a 6-point scale ranging from “Not at all” to “Very much”.

---

Figure 9: Percentage of Full-Time Seniors Who Evidenced Financial Stress by Hours Worked Per Week

- Worried about having enough money for regular expenses\(^a\)
- Worried about paying for college\(^a\)
- Chose not to purchase required academic materials due to cost\(^a\)
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\(^a\) Estimate of total hours worked combining on- and off-campus paid employment.
\(^b\) Percentage responding “Very often” or “Often”.
\(^c\) Percentage selecting 4, 5, or 6 on a 6-point scale ranging from “Not at all” to “Very much”.
Social Networking

Social networking via Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Google+, etc., is an ever-present aspect of college life. To explore its impact, more than 19,000 students from 42 colleges and universities were asked additional questions about their use of social networking technology.

We found that the vast majority of students (89%) used social media, and the most common connections made were with friends and family. Yet, many students also used this technology in educationally purposeful ways. For example, 28% used social media to plan study groups or tutoring sessions, 33% completed assignments and class projects, 17% learned about internships, and 15% communicated with faculty or advisors. Interestingly, first-year students used social media more than seniors across the board, especially in learning about campus organizations, activities, and making new friends in college (Figure 10).

Social Media—A Mixed Blessing

The connections students made and the information they received through social networking were positively associated with other forms of engagement, as represented by the NSSE benchmarks (Table 6). First-year students who frequently used social media to interact with peers, learn about campus events and opportunities, and interact with faculty and advisors were more engaged in Active and Collaborative Learning and Student-Faculty Interaction, and believed the campus environment to be more supportive. However, no association was found with Academic Challenge, suggesting that use of social media relates more to social learning activities such as collaborative learning and interactions with campus figures.

On the down side, more than two-thirds of students used social media at least sometimes during class, and approximately a third (39% first-year students and 31% seniors) frequently did so. Students who spent more time on social media during class perceived their campus environment to be less supportive and reported lower grades and satisfaction. Colleges and universities will have to balance the distraction of social media during class with the potential to engage students through this new avenue of connections to peers and institutional agents.
High School Engagement and Campus Support

Traditional indicators of college readiness mainly focus on subject-specific high school academic preparation (Conley, 2007). However, these indicators by themselves may not be sufficient to understand student success in college. They do not reflect the students’ readiness to be meaningfully engaged. Thus, prior high school engagement can be considered the foundation for successful student engagement during the first year of college. Years of research have demonstrated the connection between meaningful academic engagement and student persistence and academic performance (e.g., Reason, Terenzini, & Domingo, 2006). With data from the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE) and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), we investigated the extent to which high school engagement helps to explain first-year student engagement. Realizing the role that supportive campus environments can play in increasing student engagement, we then looked at how prior high school engagement and campus support interact to impact first-year student engagement.

BCSSE data reveal that the high school academic engagement of entering first-year students is linked with the subsequent first-year engagement several months later. The general pattern is that with each increasing level of high school engagement, the percentage of students who score above the mean increases for each of three NSSE Benchmarks (Academic Challenge, Active and Collaborative Learning, and Student-Faculty Interaction) (Table 7).

Table 7: Percentage Scoring Above the Benchmark Mean for Each Level of High School Academic Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School Engagement</th>
<th>Academic Challenge</th>
<th>Active and Collaborative Learning</th>
<th>Student-Faculty Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Very low) 0–2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Very high) 9–10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the human tendency toward behavioral consistency (Funder & Colvin, 1991), is it realistic to expect that colleges and universities can influence student behaviors? Consistent with past research, Figure 11 shows that students at all entering levels of high school engagement benefit from a supportive campus environment. For instance, students entering with a higher high school engagement but reporting “low” campus support interact much less with their faculty, whereas students with the same entering high school engagement but reporting higher levels of campus support interact with their faculty much more (results for Academic Challenge and Active and Collaborative Learning are very similar and not shown here). Overall, these results emphasize the link between high school engagement, first-year engagement, and the role of the campus environment in mediating changes in engagement.

Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE)

The Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE, pronounced “bessie”) measures entering first-year students’ high school academic and co-curricular experiences as well as their expectations for participating in educationally purposeful activities during the first year of college. BCSSE administration takes place prior to the start of fall classes so responses can be paired with NSSE in the spring. BCSSE results can aid the design of orientation programs, student service initiatives, and other programmatic efforts aimed at improving the learning experiences of first-year students. Since its launch in 2007, nearly 360,000 first-year students at 348 higher education institutions across the US and Canada have completed the BCSSE survey.

BCSSE 2011–NSSE 2012 Facts

- More than 72,000 first-year students enrolled at 132 institutions participated in BCSSE in the summer and fall of 2011.
- Of these 132 institutions, 87 also participated in NSSE 2012 and received the BCSSE-NSSE Combined Report.
- Of the BCSSE-NSSE institutions, 30% were public institutions. Approximately 45% were bachelor’s-granting colleges, 44% master’s level, and 11% doctorate-granting.

BCSSE Update in 2013!

Subsequent to the launch of an updated NSSE in 2013, the BCSSE instrument will also be updated to enhance overall data quality and the linkages between BCSSE and NSSE. This will allow more comprehensive analysis of the first-year experience. An updated version of BCSSE will launch in 2013, corresponding to the NSSE 2014 administration. Find out more about BCSSE online.

bcsse.iub.edu
One-quarter or less of all faculty across the four fields discussed ideas from readings or classes with the majority of their students outside of class. Similarly, a third of the faculty in three of the four fields believed the majority of their students worked harder than usual to meet their standards, whereas 44% of education faculty reported this sentiment. Overall, education faculty reported higher levels of interaction with students than their peers in other disciplines.

Faculty Survey Results by Major Field

Contact between faculty members and students is an important form of student engagement, associated with the development of key relationships as well as improved outcomes. Increased student-faculty interaction is connected with more positive perceptions of student relationships with others on campus overall, and classrooms with more student-faculty interactions promote better relationships with peers, faculty, and administrative personnel. Yet, consistent with NSSE and FSSE findings over the years, student-faculty interaction varies by field of study.

Using data from FSSE 2012, selected learning activities were examined for faculty members from engineering, nursing, education, and English (Figure 12). The majority of education faculty (68%) reported that at least half of their students frequently asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions, compared with 41% of nursing and only 15% of engineering faculty. About half of nursing faculty discussed grades or assignments with more than half of their students, while 42% of English and only 23% of engineering faculty did so. Similarly, almost half of education faculty discussed career plans with at least half of their students, compared with only 15% of engineering faculty.

Figure 12: Percentage of Faculty* with 50% or More of Students Participating in Selected Activities

Frequently ask questions in class or contribute to class discussion
Occasionally discuss grades or assignments with you
Talk about career plans with you
Discuss ideas from readings or classes with you outside of class
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Education faculty members at the 75 U.S. institutions that administered the Course-Based option of FSSE in 2012.

Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)
The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE, pronounced “fessie”) measures faculty members’ expectations and practices related to student engagement in educational activities that are empirically linked with high levels of learning and development. The survey also collects information about how faculty members spend their time on professorial activities and allows for comparisons by disciplinary area as well as other faculty or course characteristics. FSSE results, especially when used in combination with NSSE findings, can identify areas of institutional strength as well as aspects of the undergraduate experience that may warrant attention. The information is intended to be a catalyst for productive discussions related to teaching, learning, and the quality of students’ educational experiences.

FSSE 2012 Facts
• This was the 10th administration of this online survey.
• The average institutional response rate was 46%.
• 15,148 faculty from 117 institutions participated.
• 108 (92%) of the institutions administered NSSE and FSSE concurrently.
• Since 2003, 196,000 faculty from 710 different institutions have responded to FSSE.
Find out more about FSSE online.
fsse.iub.edu

Madonna University
Because of their positive effects on student learning and retention, special undergraduate opportunities such as learning communities, service-learning, research with a faculty member, study abroad, internships, and culminating senior experiences are called high-impact practices (Kuh, 2008) (Table 8). High-impact practices share several traits: They demand considerable time and effort, provide learning opportunities outside of the classroom, require meaningful interactions with faculty members and students, encourage interaction with diverse others, and provide frequent and meaningful feedback. Participation in these activities can be life-changing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Characteristics</th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Community</td>
<td>Service-Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie 2010 Basic Classification</td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DRU</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s L</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s M</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master’s S</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bac/A&amp;S</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bac/Diverse</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Characteristics</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Status</td>
<td>Less than full-time</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Generation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>Started here</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Started elsewhere</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 24 years</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 years &amp; older</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Category</td>
<td>Arts &amp; humanities</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical sciences</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional (other)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Students reported having “done” the activity before graduating for all high-impact practices except service-learning, where they reported participating at least “sometimes” during the current school year.

b. For details on the Carnegie Classification, visit classifications.carnegiefoundation.org/descriptions/basic.php.

c. Neither parent holds a bachelor’s degree.
A Closer Look at Service-Learning

Service-learning, a NSSE high-impact practice, is associated with a wide range of positive educational outcomes, including increased academic engagement and learning (Jacoby and Associates, 2009). Though it exists in many forms, common to most is the connection between in- and out-of-class learning environments. Service-learning is often infused across the curriculum or in programs such as learning communities, senior capstone courses, study abroad, and mentoring programs.

In 2012, about 41% of first-year students and 48% of seniors participated in a service-learning project during the year. An additional set of items appended to the 2012 survey followed up with students who said they participated in service-learning, asking them about connections with coursework, faculty involvement, and hours per week on site. Data were collected from 1,856 first-year students and 2,930 seniors enrolled at 42 institutions.

Of all participants, 61% of first-years and 58% of seniors indicated that one of their classes had a service-learning component, with the remaining percentage indicating that two or more classes had a service-learning component. For first-year students, the three most common service-learning locations included colleges or universities (32%), non-profit or community-based organizations (31%), and K-12 schools (20%). For seniors, the three most common service-learning locations included non-profit or community-based organizations (37%), K-12 schools (28%), and colleges or universities (23%). Service-learning experiences helped most students, particularly seniors, to understand the connections between their service experience and their studies, and to better understand their course material—both important goals of service-learning (Figure 13).

First-year students and seniors who participated in service-learning perceived more gains in several areas of learning and development related to their experiences engaging with the community (Figure 14). For both class levels, those who participated in service-learning reported larger gains than their peers in their ability to contribute to the welfare of the community, develop a personal code of ethics, and understand people of different racial and ethnic backgrounds.

Finally, adjusting for student and institutional characteristics, students who participated in service-learning were more engaged in Academic Challenge, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Enriching Educational Experiences, and they perceived higher levels of Supportive Campus Environment (Table 9). These results support claims for the educational benefits of service-learning.

Table 9: Adjusted Mean Difference\(^a\) in Engagement Between Service-Learning Participants and Their Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M(_{diff})</td>
<td>Sig.(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Challenge</td>
<td>4.7 *** .03</td>
<td>6.0 *** .04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>11.3 *** .09</td>
<td>11.9 *** .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching Educational Experiences</td>
<td>7.6 *** .08</td>
<td>10.0 *** .08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Campus Environment</td>
<td>5.4 *** .02</td>
<td>6.7 *** .03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Mean differences (M\(_{diff}\)) were calculated from adjusted means. Controls included gender, enrollment, race/ethnicity, age, first-generation, self-reported grades, transfer, living on campus, major, working, international, distance education, Carnegie Basic Classification, and institutional control.
b. ***p<.001
c. Partial eta squared. Small effects range from .0 to .04; medium effects from .05 to .13; and large effects .14 or higher.

Figure 13: The Service-Learning Experience

Figure 14: Substantial\(^a\) Perceived Gains by Service-Learning Participation

a. Percentage responding “Very much” or “Quite a bit.”
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Over the past 10 years, hundreds of rich examples of what it means to put student engagement results to use have been featured in the “Using NSSE Data” section of Annual Results. These examples illustrate how NSSE’s diagnostic, actionable information can help catalyze vital, sometimes challenging, conversations about the quality of undergraduate education on a given campus.

Campuses that truly “use” NSSE demonstrate that receipt of detailed reports and data is only the start of a process to share and interpret results, identify priorities for action, formulate and implement plans for improvement, and circle back to assess impact. Each of these steps is arguably more challenging than the one before, but all are necessary for an institution to take full advantage of what NSSE provides.

Examining how institutions use results highlights proven steps for converting data to action in ways that promote student success. Important lessons for maximizing the use and impact of NSSE results are presented in the Lessons from the Field series. Collectively, the institutional examples illustrate (a) the value of sharing results widely, (b) the utility of linking data to other sources, and (c) the validity of using data to address real campus problems and issues. The institutional examples represented in this year’s report reflect the growing sophistication of NSSE users to conduct more complex analysis, greater integration of results in strategic planning and the assessment of programs and activities, and tighter links between results and improvements to teaching and learning.

Fostering Student-Faculty Interaction

Winona State University

Winona State University (WSU) in Minnesota has a long history of assessment and evaluation of student engagement and learning outcomes. Most notably, since 1998 they have conducted an institution-wide Assessment Day to gather feedback from students, faculty, and staff and to evaluate student learning outcomes. WSU administered NSSE for the first time in 2009. Results comparing NSSE data to data from a WSU preenrollment survey were analyzed and presented to all Student Life and Development (SLD) staff and to the campus committee preparing for WSU’s upcoming accreditation visit. NSSE results showed that WSU students were very likely to engage in collaborative learning, volunteerism, and service-learning—recent areas of focus at WSU—but were not experiencing as much student-faculty interaction as they had anticipated, especially in the first year. These findings persuaded SLD staff to focus on programming efforts that would involve faculty and promote student-faculty interaction both in and out of the classroom. Additionally, some sections of the first-year orientation course were linked to other courses taught by the same faculty member, serving to increase the amount of contact students had with that instructor.

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

Developing a Model to Foster Student Engagement Goals

Ramapo College of New Jersey

The Committee on Student Engagement at Ramapo College of New Jersey was charged to develop a comprehensive plan to more fully engage students in their undergraduate college experience, motivated in large part by a thorough examination of NSSE results relating to high-impact practices and comparisons to institutions with similar missions. The committee held a series of retreats and meetings that reviewed results, created an inventory
of campus experiences that meet student engagement outcomes, placed these activities on a four-year continuum, and identified what students get out of the experiences. The committee then created a four-year development model that included four student learning goals for academic, social, personal, and campus/civic engagement. They also identified Key Points of Student Engagement (KPEs)—high-impact activities that contribute to student learning and achieve the four goals. For example, existing first-year KPEs are the summer reading program, Convocation, Orientation, and Welcome Week activities. KPEs provide an explicit indicator about factors important to achieving student learning goals, and they represent institutional commitments to supporting and strengthening student engagement. Currently, the model is available for first-year and sophomore students. Future plans include creating a model for juniors and seniors, determining the best way to incorporate transfer students, and offering a co-curricular transcript that records student progress throughout the collegiate journey. Long-term assessment of the model will include a triangulation of NSSE data with other institutional data sources, such as retention data and student satisfaction surveys, to determine the validity and effectiveness of the overall model.

Assessing Program Outcomes

Grinnell College

Grinnell College incorporated NSSE data in program assessments for two projects. NSSE results contributed to an exploration of the long-term impact of the Grinnell Science Project (GSP). The GSP, implemented in 1992 to increase the number of students from underrepresented groups earning degrees in the sciences, involves new students in a preorientation, week-long program and then employs a range of activities rooted in intensive mentoring, engaged pedagogy, and community-building that support persistence in science. An analysis using 2005 and 2008 NSSE data showed that GSP students were more engaged over time in, for example, conversations with faculty and collaboration with classmates in group settings. Grinnell also incorporated NSSE data in a broad assessment of peer mentoring and tutoring programs. Another analysis revealed that participating as a tutor was associated with higher levels of engagement overall, supplementing extensive qualitative data demonstrating similar benefits for tutors.

Examining Transfer Student Success

Western Michigan University

As part of Western Michigan University’s (WMU) planning priorities for 2011–12, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) presented findings to the Provost’s Council about how engagement for transfer students (growing in number at WMU) differed from students who began their undergraduate careers at WMU. Staff examined NSSE data from 2008–2010 because it was the first time WMU participated in consecutive years. Selected findings showed that transfer students were less likely to work with faculty outside of class, complete a field-based experience, carry out community service, or complete a culminating senior project—important goals of WMU’s strategic plan. Furthermore, transfer students were less likely to participate in co-curricular activities due to family responsibilities and time spent commuting to campus. These were important considerations for University programs and practices that support the nonacademic responsibilities of students. Recommendations included a range of initiatives to support transfer student transition, including more evening course offerings and expansion of WMU offerings at local community colleges to ensure smooth transfer.

In addition, WMU implemented a plan to facilitate NSSE data use at the college level to examine other high-priority planning outcomes. WMU developed long-term trend workbooks that display comparison results for individual survey items—over seven years for NSSE and six years for FSSE. The workbooks are posted to the WMU institutional effectiveness Web site.

Using Program-Level Results to Improve Teaching and Learning

Dalhousie University

Dalhousie University’s 2008 NSSE results indicated a need to help first-year students become more engaged academically and
form stronger connections to the Dalhousie community. A new position was established in the Centre for Learning & Teaching through the Office of the Vice-President Academic and Provost specifically to nurture and develop high-impact student engagement initiatives. Dalhousie values its overall NSSE results, but breaking results down by program and department helped the faculty review strengths and areas that need improvement. For example, NSSE results revealed a need for more active and collaborative learning in computer science, so more hands-on, project-driven, first-year classes were implemented to help students link theory with everyday applications. Student response to these classes was so enthusiastic that additional sections were added. The department also saw improvement in second-year retention rates.

**Increasing and Reinforcing Diversity Efforts**

**State University of New York at Geneseo**

NSSE results at the State University of New York at Geneseo (SUNY Geneseo) revealed that student engagement in diversity experiences—including diverse perspectives in writings and assignments, having serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity, and encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds—were lower than comparison groups and what the institution desired. Results also reinforced student feedback to the coordinator of multicultural programs about their interest in more opportunities to interact across cultures. These combined findings helped make the case for a number of initiatives to increase diversity and expand diverse learning experiences on campus. These include the Campus Diversity Plan, Real World Geneseo, Deliberative Dialogues, and The Multi-Cultural Organization Space for Activities, Inclusion, and Collaboration (MOSAIC). MOSAIC provides a dedicated meeting space where activities such as the Deliberative Dialogues sessions led by faculty, staff, and student moderators provide an opportunity to discuss diversity issues and suggest solutions. “Real World Geneseo,” modeled on MTV’s “Real World,” is a four-day intensive workshop held in a Rochester hotel where students explore their differing perspectives on such issues as race, gender, sexual identity, and class differences.

**Loyola Marymount University**

Loyola Marymount University (LMU) uses NSSE results as direct and indirect evidence in the assessment of almost all of its four broad Undergraduate Learning Goals and Outcomes that focus on (a) critical thinking and integration of knowledge from multiple disciplines, (b) in-depth understanding of at least one academic discipline, (c) demonstration of transformative personal growth, and (d) application of acquired knowledge and reason to potential leadership roles in a socially just world. NSSE results on a number of survey items, such as preparing two or more drafts of a paper, making presentations in class, and the number and length of papers or reports written, provide evidence for fulfilling the written and oral communication outcome under LMU’s Goal 1: “Written and oral communication: Students will effectively express information both in writing and orally using conventions and forms appropriate to the intended audience.” For example, LMU’s NSSE 2010 results on writing practices showed that first-year students were completing drafts of a paper before submitting a final version more often than seniors. Because writing multiple drafts is considered an effective practice, faculty wanted to encourage first-year students to continue doing so and to heighten awareness of this best practice for all students. NSSE results helped faculty address the written and oral communication outcome and communicate the value of requiring students to complete drafts before submitting a final paper or assignment.

**Assessing Sustainability Education through Consortium Participation**

**Sustainability Education Consortium 2011**

Eight institutions formed a consortium in NSSE 2011 to assess engagement in sustainability education across the curriculum. The consortium added 20 questions to the core survey in order to develop a user-friendly assessment system for sustainability education. With these results, institutions could (a) acquire a cross-institution data set on students’ engagement with aspects of sustainability, (b) assess institutional strengths and weaknesses with respect to sustainability education compared to peers, and (c) provide one source of assessment data for the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education’s (AASHE) education initiative. Consortium results showed high proportions of students involved in sustainability education, with the highest scores on integrating knowledge from multiple disciplines, understanding the consequences of one’s actions, and perceptions of institutional emphasis on learning about sustainability. Lower than expected scores on a few items suggested a need to increase,
for example, student participation in sustainability projects and field trips in the bioregion. Results also revealed that students were more likely to focus on their own behavior than to engage in group sustainability-related activities. In the future, the consortium plans to revise the survey to include items that assess the understanding of issues of social justice and economic dimensions of sustainability.

Examining Subgroup Variation in Learning Communities

Wagner College

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

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

Connecting Institutional Mission to Learning Outcomes Assessment

McKendree University

In Fall 2010, the Student Learning, Assessment, and Teaching Effectiveness (SLATE) committee at McKendree University renewed focus on its assessment plans. The SLATE team developed seven learning outcomes derived from the four principles of McKendree’s institutional mission: Responsible Citizenship, Engagement, Academic Excellence, and Lifelong Learning. The seven learning outcomes are (1) Appreciation of Diversity, (2) Personal, Social, Ethical, and Civic Responsibility, (3) Engagement, (4) Effective Communication, (5) Inquiry and Problem Solving, (6) Discipline-Specific Competence, and (7) Lifelong Learning.

This new phase of McKendree’s assessment activity emphasizes the systematic assessment of programs, services, and student learning by selecting an individual learning outcome to focus on annually. This focused work is conducted by subcommittees of faculty, administrators, and student affairs professionals using a three-year cycle of planning, development, and implementation. The learning outcome of “Engagement” was developed during the 2010–11 academic year and implemented the following year. The “Year of Engagement” as an institutional theme quickly became a catalyst for many changes across the McKendree campus. All major divisions, including the president and provost, incorporated the theme of Engagement into programming efforts.

NSSE results were an obvious data source to assess the Engagement outcome. Though McKendree first-year students scored at or above the mean for many items in the Enriching Educational Experiences Benchmark, the SLATE committee wanted to improve areas where seniors scored below the mean. NSSE 2011 results were used in conjunction with results from their Fall Student Survey to demonstrate the need for increased service-learning opportunities and improvements in teaching resources for faculty. Specifically, the Provost’s Office dedicated its Teaching for Excellence fall and spring workshops to the institutional theme. McKendree plans to administer NSSE every three years to continuously measure student engagement scores.
The NSSE Institute for Effective Educational Practice develops user resources and responds to requests for assistance with using student engagement results to improve student learning and institutional effectiveness. Institute staff and project associates have completed a major national study of high-performing colleges and universities, made dozens of presentations at national and regional meetings, and worked with many campuses to enhance student success.

Institute associates have:

- Presented a workshop at a state university system conference for faculty members interested in using NSSE data in their scholarship of teaching and learning projects
- Facilitated a fall faculty workshop at a private liberal arts college to examine student engagement in high-impact educational practices
- Designed a day-long retreat with administrators and faculty at an urban research university to review their NSSE and FSSE data and identify institutional policies and practices that promote and inhibit student persistence and academic success
- Advised teams at a national summer institute on learning communities about using NSSE results to develop and assess the effectiveness of learning communities

**Outreach Services**

**NSSE Users Workshops**

Since 2003, nearly 700 representatives from participating NSSE institutions have attended at least one workshop. A spring 2013 workshop is planned to help users transition to NSSE 2013 results and work with prior years’ data. Customized institution-based, regional, systems, and consortium workshops can also be developed. Topics may include using NSSE data for assessment and improvement, strategies for data dissemination and sharing, and using NSSE for accreditation and system-wide quality improvement plans. If you have questions about NSSE User Workshops or are interested in hosting an event at your institution, please contact Jillian Kinzie at 812-856-1430 (toll-free: 866-435-6773) or jikinzie@indiana.edu.

**NSSE Webinars**

Free, live, and prerecorded Webinars are available to faculty, administrators, institutional researchers, and student affairs professionals who want to better use and understand their NSSE, BCSSE, and FSSE data. Each hour-long Webinar includes a PowerPoint presentation and question-and-answer period. All Webinars are recorded and available on the NSSE Web site for later or repeated viewing at your convenience.

**Enhanced Resources**

*The Guide to Online Resources* helps users connect to an array of resources that are available for download from the NSSE Web site. It is included in the Web version of the *Institutional Report 2012* and includes descriptions and active links to:

- Regional and specialized NSSE Accreditation Toolkits that help users incorporate NSSE results into accreditation reports and suggest ways to align survey items with regional and specialized accreditation standards
- NSSE’s Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP) Toolkit that explores the overlap between student engagement in educationally effective practices and the learning outcomes expected of all students earning a bachelor’s degree outlined in Lumina Foundation’s DQP
- The NSSE Report Builder generates reports drawn from a secure database of responses from the two most recent years of NSSE and can be queried using any combination of student and institutional characteristics
- User guides on (a) interpreting effects sizes in NSSE reports, (b) conducting cognitive interviews and focus groups, (c) analyzing multiple years of NSSE data, (d) facilitating presentation of NSSE and FSSE data to campus stakeholders, and (e) developing institutional Web displays of NSSE results
- A *Pocket Guide to Choosing a College* in English and Spanish languages and *The Student Experience in Brief*

**Institutional Web Site Review and Web Site Display Guide**

NSSE has created *Guidelines for Display of NSSE Results on Institution Web Sites* and a gallery of institutional Web site examples to aid institutions in the display of NSSE results that are accurate, accessible to a general audience, and consistent with NSSE’s advice and policy in support of responsible public reporting.

**Encouraging Student Participation in NSSE and Increasing Survey Response Rates**

A new prerecorded Webinar titled *Encouraging Student Participation in NSSE* is available to assist institutional users in promoting survey participation. An accompanying Web page highlights tips to consider during the NSSE administration and includes institutional examples for maximizing the number of respondents effectively and ethically.
A Pocket Guide to Choosing a College and The Student Experience in Brief

NSSE’s guide to exploring colleges, A Pocket Guide to Choosing a College: Questions to Ask on Your College Visits, helps prospective college students and their parents in the college decision-making process and is a useful resource for college admissions staff. A Spanish version, Una Guía de Bolsillo Para Escoger una Universidad, is also available.

Questions drawn from the pocket guide, with responses from students on individual campuses, are provided in The Student Experience in Brief report.

New this year is a mobile version of the pocket guide. A QR code to access the mobile site is available on the NSSE Web site so institutions can include it in their recruitment, college fair, and campus tour materials. Scan the QR code to access the mobile NSSE pocket guide.

To obtain free copies of the pocket guide, high schools, colleges, and non-profit education organizations can contact NSSE.

Searchable Database for Using NSSE Data

Examples of how campuses use NSSE, FSSE, and BCSSE results can be searched by keyword, institution name, Carnegie Classification, and topics such as accreditation, general education assessment, retention, diversity, advising, and service learning in an online database.

NSSE and the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA)

The NSSE Web site contains resource pages that describe how NSSE results can be featured in the Student Experiences and Perceptions section of the VSA College Portrait, including syntax to populate the College Portrait template.

Research Initiatives

NSSE Learning to Improve Project—Spencer Foundation Grant Update

In Annual Results 2009, we reported encouraging findings about institutions that are realizing gains in student engagement over time. Substantial numbers of institutions across a wide range of institution types showed positive trends in NSSE results. (For a comparable analysis using more recent data, see p. 13.) These promising findings led to a Spencer Foundation-funded project, Learning to Improve: A Study of Evidence-Based Improvement in Higher Education, to explore what institutions had done to achieve significant positive improvement in a variety of NSSE measures. The Learning to Improve section of the NSSE Web site provides access to project documents, including a sample institutional questionnaire, detailed description of NSSE measures used for analysis, and results shared at annual meetings of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) and the American Educational Research Association (AERA).

Collaboration with the Linking Institutional Policies to Student Success (LIPSS) Project

The LIPSS research project, coordinated by the Center for Higher Education Research, Teaching and Innovation at Florida State University, seeks to identify institution-wide policies that influence college student engagement. About 100 institutions participating in NSSE 2012 were invited to join the project, involving surveys of administrators to illuminate the relationship between institutional policies and practices and student success.

Moving from Data to Action and Using NSSE to Assess and Improve Undergraduate Education: Lessons from the Field—Volumes 1 and 2

The Lessons from the Field series provides practical ideas for NSSE institutions to improve evidence-based assessment and improvement initiatives. Lessons from the Field—Volume 1 (2009) captured the growing body of collective wisdom and emerging lessons about the use of student engagement results to improve educational quality. Moving from Data to Action: Lessons from the Field—Volume 2, released on June 1, 2012, features new examples of how institutions are using NSSE data to assess and improve the quality of undergraduate education. The institutions represent a range of sizes, Carnegie types, regions, locales, and private or public control. The accounts illustrate various ways that assessment can be a worthwhile undertaking when results inform efforts to improve educational effectiveness.

Moving from Data to Action: Lessons from the Field—Volume 2

nsse.iub.edu/links/lessons_home

www.cherti.fsu.edu/LIPSS
Updated NSSE Survey Launches in 2013

Those who have followed NSSE over the past several years know that change is in the works. Most surveys, including NSSE, must be periodically revised to maintain their utility and relevance. To balance the preference for continuity with the need to keep the survey fresh and relevant, we have borrowed an idea from evolutionary biology: “punctuated equilibrium.” We will minimize survey changes for extended periods, punctuated by infrequent updates as needed. The first such update will occur in 2013.

Beginning in 2008, we initiated a deliberate and concerted effort to investigate possible enhancements to the NSSE survey. In updating the survey, we adhered to two key imperatives: New content had to bear on student engagement, and respondent burden must not increase, given our reliance on voluntary participation by students already besieged by a variety of surveys and assessments.

To provide additional coverage of important topics without significantly expanding the survey, we developed a set of optional topical modules, short in length and narrowly focused on areas of interest such as advising, civic engagement, and experiences with diversity. NSSE has always provided (and will continue to provide) the opportunity for institutions sharing a common interest or emphasis to form a consortium and append a common set of questions. But whereas consortia typically serve institutional identity or affinity groups (e.g., Association of American Universities members, Catholic colleges and universities, women’s colleges), the new modules are designed to address concerns and interests that span institutional types, identities, and affiliations. Over the coming years, we expect to expand the menu of available modules, based in large measure on recommendations from the field.

The result of this careful work is the 2013 version of the NSSE survey briefly summarized on page 15. As shown in Figure 5, about half of the items on the updated survey are either unchanged from the current version or only slightly modified. The other half is roughly split between more substantial rewording and entirely new items, offset by strategic cuts for length considerations. To maintain their close parallels to NSSE, FSSE and BCSSE will also launch updated versions in 2013. The updated NSSE and FSSE surveys can be viewed on the projects’ Web sites. (The BCSSE update is under development.)

The updated NSSE survey will offer new insights into the undergraduate experience, facilitated by new content (e.g., learning with peers, quantitative reasoning, learning strategies, and teaching practices) and the new Engagement Indicators (see p. 15), which will replace the NSSE Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice. These enhancements will equip our users with a more comprehensive analytical toolbox for understanding the quality of the undergraduate experience. Over the next several months, we will revamp our reporting to take full advantage of the updated survey.

Other Developments

In other news, we are putting the finishing touches on an interactive reporting tool for use by authorized institutional users. Based on the Report Builder currently available on the NSSE Web site, this tool will be accessible through our secure Institution Interface and will offer interactive, customized reporting capabilities for participating institutions.

We are concluding work on our Spencer Foundation-funded investigation of institutions showing positive trends on NSSE results, with the results to be reported in a range of outlets and venues. This work promises to enhance our understanding not just of what colleges and universities can do to improve student engagement, but more generally of how intentional change succeeds in institutions of higher education.

NSSE and its companion projects are dedicated to providing diagnostic, actionable information that colleges and universities can use to understand, document, and enhance quality in undergraduate education. We look forward to ongoing collaborations with participating institutions and others in service to this vitally important mission.


For a list of research articles, conference presentations, and other works, see nsse.iub.edu/html/pubs.cfm

Online Resources

Summary Tables
Access basic tables of annual survey responses and benchmarks by student and institution characteristics.

NSSE Report Builder
Interactive tool that allows institutions to generate individualized reports using any combination of student and institutional characteristics from the two most recent years of NSSE results.

Psychometric Portfolio
Studies of validity, reliability, and other indicators of quality of NSSE’s data are detailed, including breakdowns by a variety of student and institutional characteristics.

Participating Institutions Search
Search tool to generate lists of institution participation for selected years and surveys (NSSE, FSSE, BCSSE, LSSSE), or to identify the participation history of a specific institution.

Webinars
Live and recorded Webinars for faculty, administrators, institutional researchers, and student affairs professionals who want to better use and understand their results.
To represent the multi-dimensional nature of student engagement at the national, sector, and institutional levels, NSSE developed five indicators, or Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice:

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

Each benchmark summarizes students’ responses on a set of related survey questions. They were created as a way to concisely distill important aspects of the student experience inside and outside of the classroom. To facilitate comparisons over time, as well as between individual institutions or groups of institutions, each benchmark is expressed on a 100-point scale. Benchmarks were computed by rescaling responses to each component question from 0 to 100, then taking the average of the items. Thus a benchmark score of 0 would mean that every student chose the lowest response option for every item in the benchmark, while 100 would mean that every student chose the highest response to every item. Although benchmarks are reported on a 0 to 100 scale, they are not percentages.

Pages 33 through 42 show percentile distributions of student benchmark scores as well as frequency distributions of the survey items that make up each benchmark. These statistics are presented separately by class level for each of the Carnegie 2010 Basic Classification groups and for the entire U.S. NSSE 2012 cohort of colleges and universities. Also included are aggregated results for institutions that scored in the top 10% of all U.S. NSSE 2012 institutions on the benchmark. The pattern of responses among these “Top 10%” institutions sets a high bar for colleges and universities aspiring to be among the top performers on a particular benchmark. However, the distributions show that even at these high-performing institutions, about one-quarter of students are no more engaged than the typical student at all U.S. NSSE 2012 institutions.

**Sample**

These results are based on responses from 122,368 first-year and 163,609 senior students who were randomly sampled or census-administered from 546 bachelor’s-granting colleges and universities in the US.

**Weighting**

Students in the percentile distributions and frequency tables are weighted within their institution by gender and enrollment status (full-time or less than full-time). In addition, to compensate for different sampling and response rates across institutions of varying size, cases are weighted so that the number of respondents at an institution represents that institution’s share of total enrollment across all participating U.S. institutions.

**Interpreting Scores**

When interpreting benchmark scores, keep in mind that individual student performance typically varies much more within institutions than average performance does between institutions. Many students at lower-scoring institutions are more engaged than the typical student at top-scoring institutions. An average benchmark score for an institution might say little about the engagement of any individual student. For these reasons, we recommend that institutions disaggregate results and examine benchmark scores for different groups of students.

As in previous years, students attending smaller undergraduate colleges with a focus on arts and sciences have higher median
scores. However, many institutions are an exception to the general principle that “smaller is better” in terms of student engagement. For this reason, anyone wishing to estimate collegiate quality should examine institution-specific results.

Percentile Distributions

Percentile distributions are shown in a modified “box and whiskers” chart with an accompanying table. For each institutional type, the charts and tables show students’ scores within the distribution at the 95th, 75th, 50th, 25th, and 5th percentiles. The dot signifies the median—the middle score that divides all students’ scores into two equal halves. The rectangular box shows the 25th to 75th percentile range, the middle 50% of all scores. The “whiskers” on top and bottom extend to the 95th and 5th percentiles, encompassing 90% of all scores while excluding outliers.

This type of information is richer than simple summary measures such as means or medians. One can readily discern the range and variation of student scores in each group as well as where the middle 50% of all scores falls. At the same time, one can see what scores are needed (i.e., 75th or 95th percentile) to be a top performer in the group.

Frequency Tables

Following each set of percentile distributions is a table of frequencies based on 2012 data that shows how students responded to the items that make up the benchmark. The values listed are weighted column percentages.

For more details on the construction of the benchmarks, visit our Web site.
nsse.iub.edu/links/institutional_reporting

Carnegie 2010 Basic Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>Research Universities (very high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RU/H</td>
<td>Research Universities (high research activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRU</td>
<td>Doctoral/Research Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s L</td>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities (larger programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s M</td>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities (medium programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s S</td>
<td>Master’s Colleges and Universities (smaller programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/A&amp;S</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges–Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bac/Diverse</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges–Diverse Fields</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

classifications.carnegiefoundation.org

“Colleges and universities derive enormous internal value from participating in NSSE; of equal importance is the reassurance to their external publics that a commitment to undergraduate education and its improvement is a high priority.”

—Muriel A. Howard, President, American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU)
Level of Academic Challenge

Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. Colleges and universities promote high levels of student achievement by setting high expectations for student performance.

**Benchmark Scores** First-Year Students

**Percentiles** First-Year Students

**Benchmark Scores** Seniors

**Percentiles** Seniors

**Key**
- First-Year Students
- Seniors

**Guide to Benchmark Figures**

Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. Colleges and universities promote high levels of student achievement by setting high expectations for student performance.
### First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and major</th>
<th>RU/VH</th>
<th>RU/H</th>
<th>DRU</th>
<th>Master’s L</th>
<th>Master’s M</th>
<th>Master’s S</th>
<th>Bac/A&amp;S</th>
<th>Bac/Diverse</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
<th>NSSE 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5 and 10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 11 and 20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and major</th>
<th>RU/VH</th>
<th>RU/H</th>
<th>DRU</th>
<th>Master’s L</th>
<th>Master’s M</th>
<th>Master’s S</th>
<th>Bac/A&amp;S</th>
<th>Bac/Diverse</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
<th>NSSE 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1 and 4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 5 and 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 11 and 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and major</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Between 1 and 4</th>
<th>Between 5 and 10</th>
<th>Between 11 and 20</th>
<th>More than 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Students</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of written papers or reports of 20 PAGES OR MORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution and major</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Between 1 and 4</th>
<th>Between 5 and 10</th>
<th>Between 11 and 20</th>
<th>More than 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coursework emphasized:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANALYZING the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNTHESIZING and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAKING JUDGMENTS about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLYING theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Hours per week spent preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Institutional emphasis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a bit</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**National Survey of Student Engagement | Annual Results 2012**
Active and Collaborative Learning

Students learn more when they are intensely involved in their education and are asked to think about and apply what they are learning in different settings. Collaborating with others in solving problems or mastering difficult material prepares students to deal with the messy, unscripted problems they will encounter daily, both during and after college.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>(in percentages)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RU/VH</td>
<td>RU/H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a class presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with other students on projects DURING CLASS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with classmates OUTSIDE OF CLASS to prepare class assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a community-based project (e.g., service-learning) as part of a regular course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“I gained from having engaging peers, kind and encouraging faculty and staff, service-learning activities, and opportunities to exercise my leadership and decision-making skills.”

—Senior, Biology Major, Birmingham-Southern College
Students learn firsthand how experts think about and solve problems by interacting with faculty members inside and outside of the classroom. As a result, their teachers become role models, mentors, and guides for continuous, lifelong learning.

### Key
- **First-Year Students**
- **Seniors**

### Benchmark Scores: First-Year Students

#### Percentiles: First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RU/VH</th>
<th>RU/H</th>
<th>DRU</th>
<th>Master’s L</th>
<th>Master’s M</th>
<th>Master’s S</th>
<th>Bac/A&amp;S</th>
<th>Bac/Div</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
<th>NSSE 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Benchmark Scores: Seniors

#### Percentiles: Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RU/VH</th>
<th>RU/H</th>
<th>DRU</th>
<th>Master’s L</th>
<th>Master’s M</th>
<th>Master’s S</th>
<th>Bac/A&amp;S</th>
<th>Bac/Div</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
<th>NSSE 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95th</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“All of the professors help you develop the networking skills that are necessary for success in the real world. Ideas are challenged showing students that anything is possible if you work very hard and set your mind to it.”

—First-Year Student, Management Major, Columbia College Chicago
Enriching Educational Experiences

Complementary learning opportunities inside and outside of the classroom augment the academic program. Experiencing diversity teaches students valuable things about themselves and other cultures. Used appropriately, technology facilitates learning and promotes collaboration between peers and instructors. Internships, community service, and senior capstone courses provide students with opportunities to synthesize, integrate, and apply their knowledge. Such experiences make learning more meaningful and, ultimately, more useful because what students know becomes a part of who they are.

Key

- First-Year Students
- Seniors

Guide to Benchmark Figures

Benchmark Scores First-Year Students

Benchmark Scores Seniors

Percentiles First-Year Students

Percentiles Seniors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Seniors</th>
<th>(in percentages)</th>
<th>RU/VH</th>
<th>RU/H</th>
<th>DRU</th>
<th>Master’s L</th>
<th>Master’s M</th>
<th>Master’s S</th>
<th>Bac/A&amp;S</th>
<th>Bac/Diverse</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
<th>NSSE 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td>Very little</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours per 7-day week spent participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1–5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6–10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11–15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16–20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21–25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26–30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used an electronic medium (Listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment</td>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community service or volunteer work</td>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Have not decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language coursework</td>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study abroad</td>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent study or self-designed major</td>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do not plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)</td>
<td>Have not decided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

Key
- First-Year Students
- Seniors

Guide to Benchmark Figures

Benchmark Scores First-Year Students

Percentiles First-Year Students

Benchmark Scores Seniors

Percentiles Seniors

Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice (continued)
### First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional emphasis: Providing the support you need to thrive socially</th>
<th>Unhelpful, unsympathetic, sense of alienation</th>
<th>Quality: Your relationships with other students</th>
<th>Quality: Your relationships with faculty members</th>
<th>Available, helpful, sympathetic</th>
<th>Unhelpful, considerate, rigid</th>
<th>Quality: Your relationships with administrative personnel and offices</th>
<th>Helpful, considerate, flexible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional emphasis: Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)</th>
<th>Unhelpful, unsympathetic, sense of alienation</th>
<th>Quality: Your relationships with other students</th>
<th>Quality: Your relationships with faculty members</th>
<th>Available, helpful, sympathetic</th>
<th>Unhelpful, considerate, rigid</th>
<th>Quality: Your relationships with administrative personnel and offices</th>
<th>Helpful, considerate, flexible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite a bit</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### (in percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU/VH</th>
<th>RU/H</th>
<th>DRU</th>
<th>Major's L</th>
<th>Major's M</th>
<th>Major's S</th>
<th>Bac/A&amp;S</th>
<th>Bac/Diverse</th>
<th>Top 10%</th>
<th>NSSE 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Participating Colleges and Universities: 2000–2012

**Alabama**
- Alabama A&M University
- Auburn University
- Auburn University-Montgomery
- Birmingham-Southern College
- Faulkner University
- Huntingdon College
- Jacksonville State University
- Judson College
- Miles College
- Oakwood University
- Samford University
- Southeastern Bible College
- Spring Hill College
- Stillman College
- Troy University
- Troy University-Montgomery Campus

University of Alabama at Birmingham
- University of Alabama in Huntsville
- University of Alabama, The
- University of Mobile
- University of Montevallo
- University of North Alabama
- University of South Alabama

**Alaska**
- Alaska Pacific University
- University of Alaska Anchorage
- University of Alaska Fairbanks
- University of Alaska Southeast

**Arizona**
- Arizona Christian University
- Arizona State University
- Arizona State University at the Polytechnic Campus
- Arizona State University at the West Campus
- Embry Riddle Aeronautical University-Prescott
- Grand Canyon University
- Northern Arizona University
- Prescott College
- University of Advancing Technology
- University of Arizona
- University of Phoenix-Online Campus
- University of Phoenix-Phoenix Campus
- Western International University

**Arkansas**
- Arkansas State University
- Arkansas Tech University
- Central Baptist College
- Ecclesia College
- Henderson State University
- Hendrix College
- John Brown University
- Lyon College
- Ouachita Baptist University
- Philander Smith College
- Southern Arkansas University
- University of Arkansas at Fort Smith
- University of Arkansas at Little Rock
- University of Arkansas at Monticello
- University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff
- University of Central Arkansas
- University of the Ozarks

**California**
- Alliant International University
- American Jewish University
- Art Center College of Design
- Brooks Institute
- California Baptist University
- California College of the Arts
- California Lutheran University
- California Maritime Academy
- California Polytechnic State University
- California State University-Bakersfield
- California State University-Channel Islands
- California State University-Chico
- California State University-Dominguez Hills
- California State University-East Bay
- California State University-Fresno
- California State University-Fullerton
- California State University-Long Beach
- California State University-Los Angeles
- California State University-Monterey Bay
- California State University-Northridge
- California State University-Sacramento
- California State University-San Bernardino
- California State University-San Marcos
- Chapman University
- Claremont McKenna College
- Concordia University
- DeVry University-California
- Fresno Pacific University
- Harvey Mudd College
- Holy Names University
- Hope International University
- Humboldt State University
- Hampburg University
- La Sierra University
- Laguna College of Art and Design
- Life Pacific College
- Loyola Marymount University
- Master’s College and Seminary, The
- Menlo College
- Mills College
- Mount St. Mary’s College
- National University
- Notre Dame de Namur University
- Occidental College
- Pacific Union College
- Pepperdine University
- Point Loma Nazarene University
- Saint Mary’s College of California
- San Diego Christian College
- San Diego State University
- San Francisco State University
- San Jose State University
- Santa Clara University
- Scripps College
- Sierra College
- Simpson University
- Sonoma State University
- Trident University International
- University of California-Berkeley
- University of California-Davis
- University of California-Merced
- University of California-Santa Cruz
- University of La Verne
- University of Phoenix-Southern California Campus
- University of Redlands
- University of San Diego
- University of San Francisco
- University of the Pacific
- Vanguard University of Southern California
- Westmont College
- Whittier College
- Woodbury University

**Colorado**
- Adams State University
- American Sentinel University
- Colorado College
- Colorado Mesa University
- Colorado School of Mines
- Colorado State University
- Colorado State University-Pueblo
- Colorado Technical University-Colorado Springs
- Colorado Technical University-Greenwood Village
- Colorado Technical University-Online
- Fort Lewis College
- Johnson State College
- Metropolitan State University of Denver
- Naropa University
- Nazarene Bible College
- Regis University
- United States Air Force Academy
- University of Colorado at Boulder
- University of Colorado at Colorado Springs
- University of Colorado Denver
- Western State College of Colorado

**Connecticut**
- Central Connecticut State University
- Charter Oak State College
- Connecticut College
- Eastern Connecticut State University
- Fairfield University
- Lyme Academy College of Fine Arts
- Mitchell College
- Post University
- Quinnipiac University
- Sacred Heart University
- Saint Joseph College
- Southern Connecticut State University
- University of Bridgeport
- University of Connecticut
- University of Connecticut-Avery Point
- University of Connecticut-Stamford
- University of Connecticut-Tri-Campus
- University of Hartford
- University of New Haven
- Western Connecticut State University

**Delaware**
- Delaware State University
- Goldey-Beacom College
- University of Delaware
- Wesley College
- Wilmington University

**District of Columbia**
- American University
- Catholic University of America
- Corcoran College of Art and Design
- Gallaudet University
- George Washington University
- Georgetown University
- Howard University
- Strayer University
- Trinity Washington University
- University of the District of Columbia

**Florida**
- American InterContinental University-South Florida
- Ave Maria University
- Barry University
- Beacon College
- Bethune Cookman University
- Eckerd College
- Edward Waters College
- Embry Riddle Aeronautical University-Daytona Beach
- Embry Riddle Aeronautical University- Worldwide
- Flagler College
- Florida A&M University
- Florida Atlantic University
- Florida Gulf Coast University
- Florida Hospital College of Health Sciences
- Florida Institute of Technology
- Florida International University
- Florida Memorial University
- Florida Southern College
- Florida State University
- Jacksonville University
- Johnson & Wales University-Florida Campus
- Lynn University
- New College of Florida
- Northwood University
- Nova Southeastern University
- Palm Beach Atlantic University-West Palm Beach
- Ringling College of Art and Design
- Rollins College
- Saint John Vianney College Seminary
- Saint Leo University
- Saint Thomas University
- Southeastern University

---
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Illinois
Lewis-Clark State College
Idaho State University
College of Idaho, The
Brigham Young University-Idaho
Boise State University
University of Hawai'i-West O'ahu
University of Hawai'i at Manoa
Chaminade University of Honolulu
Hawaii
University of Guam
Guam
Young Harris College
Wesleyan College
University of Phoenix-Atlanta Campus
University of Georgia
Truett-McConnell College
Spelman College
Southern Polytechnic State University
Shorter University
Savannah State University
Savannah College of Art and Design
Paine College
Oxford College of Emory University
Paine College
Savannah College of Art and Design
Savannah State University
Shorter University
Southern Catholic College
Southern Polytechnic State University
Spelman College
Thomson University
Truett-McConnell College
University of Georgia
University of Phoenix-Arizona Campus
University of West Georgia
Valdosta State University
Wesleyan College
Young Harris College
Georgia
Agnes Scott College
Albany State University
American InterContinental University-Atlanta
American InterContinental University-Buckhead
Armstrong Atlantic State University
Augusta State University
Berry College
Brenau University
Clark Atlanta University
Clayton State University
College of Coastal Georgia
Columbus State University
Covenant College
Dalton State College
DeVry University-Georgia
Emory University
Fort Valley State University
Georgia College & State University
Georgia Gwinnett College
Georgia Health Sciences University
Georgia Institute of Technology
Georgia Southern University
Georgia Southwestern State University
Georgia State University
Kennesaw State University
LaGrange College
Life University
Macom State College
Mercer University
Morehouse College
North Georgia College & State University
Oglethorpe University
Oxford College of Emory University
Paine College
Savannah College of Art and Design
Savannah State University
Shorter University
Southern Methodist University
Southern Polytechnic State University
Spelman College
Thomas University
Truett-McConnell College
University of Georgia
University of Phoenix-Arizona Campus
University of West Georgia
Valdosta State University
Wesleyan College
Young Harris College
Guam
University of Guam
Hawaii
Brigham Young University-Hawaii
Chaminade University of Honolulu
Hawaii's Pacific University
University of Hawaii's at Hilo
University of Hawaii's at Manoa
University of Hawaii's-West O'ahu
Idaho
Boise State University
Brigham Young University-Idaho
College of Idaho, The
Idaho State University
Lewis-Clark State College
University of Idaho
Illinois
American InterContinental University-Online
Augustana College
Aurora University
Benedictine University
Blackburn College
Bradley University
Chicago State University
Columbia College Chicago
Concordia University
DePaul University
DeVry University-Illinois
Dominican University
East-West University
Eastern Illinois University
Elmhurst College
Eureka College
Greenville College
Harrington College of Design
Illinois College
Illinois Institute of Art-Chicago, The
Illinois Institute of Technology
Illinois State University
Illinois Wesleyan University
Judson University
Knox College
Lake Forest College
Lewis University
Lincoln Christian University
Loyola University Chicago
MacMurray College
McKendree University
Methodist College
Millikin University
Monmouth College
North Central College
North Park University
Northeastern Illinois University
Northern Illinois University
Northwestern University
Olivet Nazarene University
Quincy University
Robert Morris University-Illinois
Rockford College
Roosevelt University
Saint Xavier University
School of the Art Institute of Chicago
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Trinity Christian College
University of Illinois at Chicago
University of Illinois at Springfield
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
University of St. Francis
Western Illinois University
Wheaton College
Indiana
Anderson University
Ball State University
Butler University
Calumet College of Saint Joseph
DePaul University
Earlham College
Franklin College
Goshen College
Grace College and Theological Seminary
Hampshire College
Harrison College-Indianapolis
Holy Cross College
Huntington University
Indiana Institute of Technology
Indiana State University
Indiana University Bloomington
Indiana University East
Indiana University Kokomo
Indiana University Northwest
Indiana University South Bend
Indiana University Southeast
Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis
Indiana Wesleyan University
Manchester College
Martin University
Purdue University
Purdue University-Calumet Campus
Purdue University-North Central Campus
Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
Saint Joseph's College
Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College
Saint Mary's College
Taylor University
Taylor University Fort Wayne
Trine University
University of Evansville
University of Indianapolis
University of Saint Francis-Ft. Wayne
University of Southern Indiana
Valparaiso University
Wabash College
Iowa
Ashford University
Briar Cliff University
Buena Vista University
Central College
Clarke University
Cornell College
Dordt College
Drake University
Grace University-Lamoni
Grand View University
Grinnell College
Iowa State University
Iowa Wesleyan College
Kaplan University
Loras College
Luther College
Maharishi University of Management
Morningside College
Mount Mercy University
Northwestern College
Saint Ambrose University
Simpson College
University of Dubuque
University of Iowa
University of Northern Iowa
Upper Iowa University
Waldorf College
Warburg College
Kansas
Baker University
Benedictine College
Bethany College
Emporia State University
Fort Hays State University
Friends University
Haskell Indian Nations University
Kansas State University
Kansas Wesleyan University
Kansas Wesleyan University
Kaplan University
McPherson College
Mid-America Nazarene University
Newman University
Ottawa University
Pittsburg State University
Southwestern College
Tabor College
University of Kansas
University of Saint Mary
Washburn University
Wichita State University
Kentucky
Alice Lloyd College
Asbury College
Bellarmine University
Berea College
Brescia University
Campbellsville University
Centre College
Eastern Kentucky University
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Colleges and Universities: 2000–2012 (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland-Eastern Shore 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington College 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Massachusetts</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American International College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amherst College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Maria College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumption College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babson College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bard College at Simon’s Rock 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Path College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay State College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentley University 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Architectural College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgewater State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark University 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Our Lady of the Elms 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Holy Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Nazarene College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel College 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endicott College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitchburg State University 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framingham State University 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin W. Olin College of Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasell College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley University 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts College of Art and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrimack College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Holyoke College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Ida College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newbury College-Brookline 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichols College 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Manor College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regis College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of the Museum of Fine Arts-Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simmons College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springfield College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonehill College 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffolk University 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Amherst 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Boston 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Dartmouth 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts Lowell 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth Institute of Technology 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western New England University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheaton College 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelock College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Polytechnic Institute 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester State University 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albion College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma College 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews University 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquinas College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Michigan University 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleary University 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia University-Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davenport University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Michigan University 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferris State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley State University 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Great Lakes Christian College</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalamazoo College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kettering University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuyper College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Superior State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Technological University 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madonna University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marygrove College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Technological University 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Michigan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saginaw Valley State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Arbor University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Detroit Mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Dearborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan-Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Phoenix-Metro Detroit Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minnesota</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augsburg College 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bemidji State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany Lutheran College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel University 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capella University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Saint Benedict and Saint John’s University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Saint Scholastica, The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia College at Moorhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordia University-Saint Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamline University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macalester College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis College of Art and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State University-Mankato 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota State University-Moorhead 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Catherine University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Cloud State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Mary’s University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Olaf College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Minnesota State University 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Crookston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Duluth 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota-Twin Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of St. Thomas 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mississippi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcorn State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta State University 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millsaps College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississipi State University 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississipi State University-Meridian Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi University for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississipi Valley State University 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tougaloo College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Carey University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missouri</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avila University 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes-Jewish College Goldfarb School of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Methodist University 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Ozarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Technical University-Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia College 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culver-Stockton College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drury University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontbonne University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Georgetown College**

Kentucky Christian University

Kentucky State University 2

Kentucky Wesleyan College 1

Lindsey Wilson College

Midway College

Morehead State University 12

Murray State University 7

Northern Kentucky University 12

Sullivan University 7

Thomas More College

Transylvania University 1

Union College

University of Kentucky

University of Louisville 12

University of Pikeville

Western Kentucky University 2

**Louisiana**

Centenary College of Louisiana

Dillard University 2

Grambling State University 2

Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College 2

Louisiana State University-Shreveport

Louisiana Tech University

Loyola University New Orleans 12

McNeese State University

Nicholls State University 1

Northwestern State University of Louisiana 12

Our Lady of the Lake College 12

Saint Joseph Seminary College

Southeastern Louisiana University 1

Southern University and A&M College 2

Southern University at New Orleans

Tulane University of Louisiana 2

University of Louisiana at Lafayette 5

University of Louisiana Monroe

University of New Orleans

Xavier University of Louisiana 12

**Maine**

Colby College 2

College of the Atlantic

Husson University 3

Maine College of Art

Saint Joseph’s College of Maine 12

Thomas College 2

Unity College 2

University of Maine

University of Maine at Augusta

University of Maine at Farmington 12

University of Maine at Fort Kent 2

University of Maine at Machias 1

University of Maine at Presque Isle 12

University of New England

University of Southern Maine 2

**Maryland**

Baltimore International College

Bowie State University

College of Notre Dame of Maryland 2

Coppin State University

Frostburg State University

Goucher College 12

Hood College

Loyola University Maryland 2

Maryland Institute College of Art

McDaniel College 2

Morgan State University 3

Mount St. Mary’s University 2

Saint Mary’s College of Maryland 1

Salisbury University

Sophomore-Douglass College

Stevenson University

Towson University 12

United States Naval Academy 2

University of Baltimore 2

University of Maryland-Baltimore County 5

University of Maryland-Catholic Park

University of Maryland-Eastern Shore 2

Washington College 12
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>University/Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Carroll College 1, Montana State University 1, Montana State University-Billings 1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montana State University-Northern 1, Montana Tech of The University of Montana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rocky Mountain College 1, Salish Kootenai College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Great Falls 12, University of Montana, The 1, University of Montana-Western,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>Bellevue University 2, Chadron State College 2, College of Saint Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concordia University, Creighton University 2, Dana College 2, Doane College 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hastings College, Midland University 1, Nebraska Methodist College 2, Nebraska Wesleyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University 12, Peru State College, Union College 12, University of Nebraska at Kearney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, University of Nebraska at Lincoln 1, University of Nebraska at Omaha 1, Wayne State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>Nevada State College 1, Sierra Nevada College 1, University of Nevada, Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Nevada, Reno 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Colby-Sawyer College 2, Daniel Webster College, Franklin Pierce University 2, Granite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State College 1, Keene State College 1, New England College 2, Plymouth State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2, Rivier College 2, Saint Anselm College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Berkeley College 1, Bloomfield College, Centenary College 1, College of New Jersey,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The 12, College of Saint Elizabeth 2, Drew University 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairleigh Dickinson University-College at Florham 1, Fairleigh Dickinson University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metropolitan Campus 1, Felician College 1, Georgian Court University 1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keen University, Monmouth University 12, Montclair State University 2, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City University, New Jersey Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramapo College of New Jersey, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, The 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rider University, Rowan University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rutgers University-Camden, Rutgers University-New Brunswick, Saint Peter's College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seton Hall University 12, Stevens Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Paterson University of New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>Adelphi University 12, Alfred University 2, Barnard College, Berkeley College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canisius College, Cazenovia College 2, Clarkson University 1, Colgate University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Mount Saint Vincent, College of New Rochelle, The College 1,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Saint Rose, The Concordia College-New York 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CUNY Bernard M. Baruch College 2, CUNY Brooklyn College 12, CUNY 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CUNY The City College 2, CUNY College of Staten Island 12, CUNY 12, CUNY 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Herbert H. Lehman College 1, CUNY Hunter College 1, CUNY John Jay College of Criminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Justice 1, CUNY Medgar Evers College 12, CUNY New York City College of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CUNY Queens College 2, CUNY York College 1, Daemen College 12, Dominican College of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blauevt 3, Dowling College, Elmira College 2, Excelsior College 2, Farmingdale State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of the State University of New York 4, Fashion Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fordham University, Hamilton College, Hartwick College 2, Hilbert College 3, Hobart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and William Smith Colleges, Hofstra University, Houghton College 2, Ithaca College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keuka College, Le Moyne College 1, LIM College 1, Long Island University-Brooklyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campus 1, Long Island University-C.W. Post Campus, Manhattan College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manhattanville College, Marist College 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marymount College of Fordham University, Marymount Manhattan College, Medaille College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercy College, Metropolitan College of New York, Molloy College, Morrisville State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College, Mount Saint Mary College 2, Nazareth College 1, New School, The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York Institute of Technology-Manhattan Campus, New York Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Westbury, Niagara University, Nyack College, Pace University 1, Paul Smith's College 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polytechnic Institute of New York University 2, Pratt Institute, Roberts Wesleyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College, Rochester Institute of Technology, Russell Sage College, Sage College of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albany, Saint Bonaventure University 2, Saint Francis College, Saint John's-University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York 3, Saint Joseph's College 2, Saint Joseph's-College-Suffolk Campus 2, Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lawrence University, Sarah Lawrence College, School of Visual Arts, Seena College 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skidmore College, Stony Brook University 12, SUNY at Albany, SUNY at Binghamton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY at Fredonia, SUNY at Geneseo, SUNY at Purchase College 2, SUNY College at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brockport 2, SUNY College at Buffalo 1, SUNY College at Cortland, SUNY College at New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palz, SUNY College at Old Westbury, SUNY College at Oneonta 1, SUNY College at Oswego 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY College at Plattsburgh 2, SUNY College at Potsdam, SUNY College of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Technology at Cobleskill, SUNY College of Environmental Science and Forestry 3,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUNY College of Technology at Alfred, SUNY College of Technology at Canton, SUNY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Technology at Delhi, SUNY Empire State College, SUNY Institute of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at Utica-Rome, SUNY Maritime College, SUNY Upstate Medical University, Syracuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University 1, Touro College 2, Union College 1, United States Merchant Marine Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1, United States Military Academy University at Buffalo, Vassar College, Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College of Aeronautics and Technology 12, Wagner College 12, Webb Institute, Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College 2, Yoshiva University 1, North Carolina, Appalachian State University, Barton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>College 1, Belmont Abbey College, Bennett College for Women, Brevard College, Campbell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University Inc. 2, Catawba College, Chowan University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participating Colleges and Universities: 2000–2012 (continued)

East Carolina University 2
Elizabeth City State University 2
Elon University 2
Fayetteville State University 2
Gardner-Webb University 2
Greensboro College 2
Guilford College 2
High Point University
Johnson & Wales University-Charlotte
Johnson C. Smith University 2
Lees-McRae College 2
Lenoir-Rhyne University 2
Livingstone College 2
Mars Hill College
Meredith College 2
Methodist University 2
Montreat College
North Carolina A&T State University 2
North Carolina Central University 2
North Carolina State University
Pfeiffer University
Queens University of Charlotte
Saint Andrews Presbyterian College
Saint Augustine’s College 2
Salem College
Shaw University 2
University of North Carolina at Asheville
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of North Carolina at Charlotte
University of North Carolina at Greensboro 1
University of North Carolina at Pembroke 2
University of North Carolina at Wilmington 2
Warren Wilson College 2
Western Carolina University 2
William Peace University 1
Wingate University 2
Winston-Salem State University 2

North Dakota
Dickinson State University 2
Mayville State University 2
Minot State University 2
North Dakota State University 2
University of Mary 1
University of North Dakota 1
Valley City State University 2

Ohio
Antioch College 1
Ashland University
Baldwin Wallace University 1
Bowling Green State University 2
Capital University 1
Case Western Reserve University 1
Cedarville University 2
Central State University
Cleveland State University
College of Mount St. Joseph
College of Wooster, The 12
Columbus College of Art and Design 2
Defiance College 2
Denison University 1
Franciscan University of Steubenville 2
Franklin University
Heidelberg University 1
Hiram College 2
John Carroll University 2
Kent State University Kent Campus 1
Kent State University Stark Campus
Kenyon College
Kettering College of Medical Arts
Lake Erie College
Lourdes University 2
Malone University
Marietta College
Miami University-Oxford 12
Mount Union College 2
Notre Dame College 2
Oberlin College
Ohio Christian University
Ohio Dominican University
Ohio Northern University 2
Ohio State University-Lima Campus
Ohio State University-Mansfield Campus
Ohio State University-Marietta Campus
Ohio State University-Newark Campus
Ohio State University, The
Ohio University
Ohio University-Zanesville Campus
Ohio Wesleyan University 1
Otterbein University 2
Shawnee State University
Tiffin University 1
University of Akron, The 2
University of Cincinnati 2
University of Dayton
University of Findlay, The
University of Rio Grande 2
University of Toledo
Urbana University
Ursuline College 2
Walsh University
Wilmington College
Wittenberg University 1
Wright State University 2
Xavier University 2
Youngstown State University

Oklahoma
Bacon College
Cameron University
East Central University
Northeastern State University
Northwestern Oklahoma State University
Oklahoma Christian University
Oklahoma City University 2
Oklahoma State University 1
Oklahoma State University
Rogers State University
Southeastern Oklahoma State University
Southern Nazarene University 1
Southwestern Oklahoma State University
University of Central Oklahoma
University of Oklahoma
University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma
University of Tulsa 2

Oregon
Concordia University
Eastern Oregon University 1
George Fox University 2
Lewis & Clark College
Linfield College 12
Linfield College-Adult Degree Program 2
Linfield College-Nursing & Health Sciences 2
Northwest Christian University 2
Oregon Institute of Technology
Oregon State University 12
Pacific University 2
Portland State University 2
Southern Oregon University 1
University of Oregon
University of Portland
Warner Pacific College
Western Oregon University
Willamette University 2

Pennsylvania
Albright College
Allegheny College 2
Alvernia University 1
Arcadia University
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania 1
Bryn Mawr College
Bucknell University 1
 Cabrini College
California University of Pennsylvania 2
Carlow University
Carnegie Mellon University 1

Cedar Crest College 2
Central Pennsylvania College
Chatham University 12
Chester Hill College 1
Chesney University of Pennsylvania 2
Clarion University of Pennsylvania
Delaware Valley College 2
Dickinson College
Drexel University 2
Duquesne University
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Eastern University 2
Edinboro University of Pennsylvania
Elizabethtown College 12
Franklin and Marshall College
Gannon University 1
Gettysburg College
Grove City College 12
Gwynedd Mercy College
Harrisburg University of Science and Technology
Holy Family University
Immaculata University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Juniata College 1
Keystone College
Kutztown University of Pennsylvania
La Roche College
La Salle University 2
Lafayette College
Lebanon Valley College
Lehigh University 2
Lincoln University of Pennsylvania 12
Lock Haven University 1
Lycoming College
Mansfield University of Pennsylvania
Marywood University 2
Mercyhurst College
Messiah College
Millersville University of Pennsylvania 12
Misericordia University
Moore College of Art and Design
Moravian College and Moravian Theological Seminary
Mount Aloysius College
Muhlenberg College 1
Neumann University 2
Penn State University Abington 1
Penn State University Altoona
Penn State University Berks 12
Penn State University Brandywine
Penn State University Erie, The Behrend College
Penn State University Fayette, The Eberly Campus
Penn State University Harrisburg
Penn State University Hazleton 5
Penn State University University Park
Penn State University Worthington Scranton
Penn State University York
Pennsylvania College of Technology
Philadelphia University 2
Point Park University
Robert Morris University
Rosemont College
Saint Francis University
Saint Joseph’s University
Saint Vincent College 2
Seton Hill University
Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania
 Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania 1
Susquehanna University 2
Swarthmore College
Temple University
Thiel College 12
University of Pittsburgh-Bradford 1
University of Pittsburgh-Greensburg 2
University of Pittsburgh-Johnstown 2
University of Pittsburgh-Pittsburgh Campus
University of Scranton 12
University of the Arts, The
University of the Sciences
Ursinus College 1 2
Baptist Memorial College of Health Sciences
Austin Peay State University
Tennessee
South Dakota State University
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology
Presentation College
Oglala Lakota College
Mount Marty College
Dakota Wesleyan University
Dakota State University
Colorado Technical University-Sioux Falls
Augustana College
Voorhees College
University of South Carolina-Upstate
University of South Carolina-Aiken
Southern Wesleyan University
Limestone College
Lander University
Converse College
Columbia International University
Converse College
Francis Marion University
Furman University
Lander University
Limestone College
Morris College
Presbyterian College
Southern Wesleyan University
University of South Carolina-Aiken
University of South Carolina-Beaufort
University of South Carolina-Columbia
University of South Carolina-Upstate
Voorhees College
Winthrop University
Wofford College
Augustana College
Black Hills State University
Colorado Technical University-Sioux Falls
Dakota State University
Dakota Wesleyan University
Mount Marty College
Northern State University
Ogala Lakota College
Presentation College
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology
South Dakota State University
University of South Dakota

Tennessee
Austin Peay State University
Baptist Memorial College of Health Sciences
Belmont University
Bethel University
Bryan College
Carson-Newman College
Christian Brothers University
Cumberland University
East Tennessee State University
Fisk University
Johnson University
King College
Lane College
Lee University
LeMoyne-Owen College
Lincoln Memorial University
Lipscomb University
Martin Methodist College
Maryville College
Memphis College of Art
Middle Tennessee State University
Milligan College
Rhodes College
Southern Adventist University
Tennessee State University
Tennessee Technological University
Tennessee Temple University
Trevecca Nazarene University
Tusculum College
Union University
University of Memphis
University of Tennessee, The
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, The
University of Tennessee-Martin, The
University of the South, Sewanee

Texas
A&M International University
American InterContinental University-Houston
Angelo State University
Austin College
Baylor University
Concordia University Texas
DeVry University-Texas
East Texas Baptist University
Hardin-Simmons University
Houston Baptist University
Howard Payne University
Huston-Tillotson University
 Jarvis Christian College
Lamar University
LeTourneau University
Lubbock Christian University
McMurry University
Midwestern State University
Northwood University
Our Lady of the Lake University-San Antonio
Paul Quinn College
Prairie View A&M University
Rice University
Saint Edward's University
Saint Mary's University
Sam Houston State University
Schreiner University
Southern Methodist University
Southwestern Assemblies of God University
Southwestern Christian College
Southwestern University
Stephen F. Austin State University
Sul Ross State University
Tarleton State University
Texas A&M International University
Texas A&M University
Texas A&M University-Commerce
Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
Texas A&M University-Galveston
Texas A&M University-Kingsville
Texas A&M University-Texarkana
Texas Christian University
Texas Lutheran University
Texas Southern University
Texas A&M University-San Marcos
Texas Tech University
Texas Woman's University
University of Dallas
University of Houston
University of Houston-Clear Lake
University of Houston-Downtown
University of Houston-Victoria
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor
University of North Texas
University of Phoenix-Houston Westside Campus
University of St. Thomas
University of Texas at Arlington, The
University of Texas at Austin, The
University of Texas at Brownsville, The
University of Texas at Dallas, The
University of Texas at El Paso, The
University of Texas at San Antonio, The
University of Texas at Tyler, The
University of Texas of the Permian Basin, The
University of the Incarnate Word
Wayland Baptist University
West Texas A&M University
Wiley College

Utah
Brigham Young University
Dixie State College of Utah
Southern Utah University
University of Utah
Utah State University
Utah Valley University
Weber State University
Western Governors University
Westminster College

Vermont
Bennington College
Burlington College
Castleton State College
Champlain College
College of St. Joseph
Green Mountain College
Johnson State College
Lyndon State College
Marlboro College
Middlebury College
Norwich University
Saint Michael's College
Southern Vermont College
St. John's College
Vermont College of Troy
Woodbury Institute at Champlain College

Virgin Islands
University of the Virgin Islands

Virginia
Art Institute of Washington, The
Averett University
Bluefield College
Brandeis College
Christopher Newport University
College of William and Mary
Eastern Mennonite University
Emory and Henry College
Ferrum College
George Mason University
Hampden-Sydney College
Hollins University
James Madison University
Liberty University
Longwood University
Lynchburg College
Mary Baldwin College
Marymount University
Norfolk State University
Old Dominion University
Radford University

National Survey of Student Engagement | Annual Results 2012
Participating Colleges and Universities: 2000–2012 (continued)

Randolph College
Randolph-Macon College 1
Regent University 2
Roanoke College 1 2
Shenandoah University 2
Southern Virginia University 1 2
Sweet Briar College 1 2
University of Mary Washington
University of Richmond 2
University of Virginia
University of Virginia’s College at Wise, The
Virginia Commonwealth University 1 2
Virginia Interim College 1 2
Virginia Military Institute
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Virginia Union University
Virginia Wesleyan College
Washington and Lee University 1 2

Washington
Central Washington University 1
Eastern Washington University 1
Evergreen State College, The 2
 Gonzaga University
Heritage University 1 2
Northwest University
Pacific Lutheran University 1 2
Saint Martin’s University
Seattle Pacific University 1
Seattle University 1
University of Puget Sound
University of Washington-Bothell
University of Washington-Seattle
University of Washington-Tacoma 1 2
Washington State University 1 2
Western Washington University
Whitman College
Whitworth University 2

West Virginia
Alderson-Broaddus College
American Public University System
Bethany College 2
Bluefield State College
Concord University
Davis & Elkins College
Fairmont State University 2
Glennville State College
Marshall University 2
Mountain State University 2
Ohio Valley University
Shepherd University
University of Charleston 2
West Liberty University
West Virginia State University
West Virginia University 1 2
West Virginia University Institute of Technology
West Virginia Wesleyan College 2
Wheeling Jesuit University 2

Wisconsin
Alverno College 2
Beloit College
Cardinal Stritch University 2
Carroll University 1 2
Cathedral College 1 2
Concordia University-Wisconsin 2
Edgewood College 1 2
Lakeland College
Lawrence University
Maranatha Baptist Bible College 2
Marin University 2
Marquette University
Milwaukee Institute of Art & Design 2
Milwaukee School of Engineering
Mount Mary College 2
Northland College 2
Ripon College
Saint Norbert College
University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire 2

University of Wisconsin-Green Bay 1 2
University of Wisconsin-La Crosse 1 2
University of Wisconsin-Madison 1
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee 2
University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh 2
University of Wisconsin-Parkside 1 2
University of Wisconsin-Platteville 1
University of Wisconsin-River Falls 1 2
University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point 4
University of Wisconsin-Stout 1 2
University of Wisconsin-Superior 1 2
University of Wisconsin-Whitewater 2

Wyoming
University of Wyoming 4

Canada
Alberta
Alberta College of Art and Design
Ambrose University College
Athabasca University
Canadian University College
Grant MacEwan University
King’s University College, The
Mount Royal University
University of Alberta
University of Calgary 1 2
University of Lethbridge

British Columbia
Capilano University
Kwantlen Polytechnic University 2
Quest University Canada
Royal Roads University
Simon Fraser University
Thompson Rivers University 2
Trinity Western University
University of British Columbia
University of British Columbia, Okanagan
University of Northern British Columbia
University of the Fraser Valley 1
University of Victoria
Vancouver Island University

Manitoba
Brandon University
University of Manitoba
University of Winnipeg

Newfoundland
Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John’s Campus

New Brunswick
Mount Allison University
St. Thomas University
University of New Brunswick-Fredericton 2
University of New Brunswick-Saint John Campus 2

Nova Scotia
Acadia University
Cape Breton University
Dalhousie University
Mount St. Vincent University
Nova Scotia Agricultural College 1
Saint Mary’s University 5
St. Francis Xavier University
University of King’s College

Ontario
Algoma University
Brescia University College
Brock University
Carleton University 1 2
Humber College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning 1

Huron University College
King’s University College 2
Lakehead University
Laurentian University
McMaster University
Nipissing University
Ontario College of Art and Design University
Queen’s University
Ryerson University
Sheridan College Institute of Technology and Advanced Learning 1
Trent University
Tyndale University College and Seminary
Université d’Ottawa/University of Ottawa
Université de Hearst
University of Guelph 1 2
University of Ontario-Institute of Technology
University of Toronto
University of Waterloo
University of Western Ontario
University of Windsor
Wilfrid Laurier University
York University 1

Prince Edward Island
University of Prince Edward Island 1 2

Quebec
Bishop’s University
Concordia University
École de technologie supérieure
McGill University
Université de Montréal, Montréal Campus
Université de Sherbrooke
Université du Québec à Chicoutimi
Université du Québec à Montréal
Université du Québec à Rimouski
Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières
Université du Québec en Abitibi-Témiscamingue
Université du Québec en Outaouais
Université Laval

Saskatchewan
Bevercrest College and Seminary
University of Regina
University of Saskatchewan

Afghanistan
American University of Afghanistan, The

Egypt
American University in Cairo, The

England
American InterContinental University London

Iraq
American University of Iraq-Sulaimani 2

Lebanon
Lebanese American University 2

Liberia
American University of Sharjah
Petroleum Institute, The

1. Participated in the Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE)
2. Participated in the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)
“This was a great survey and the faculty should push this idea to make us aware of how students engage in this institution.”

—Senior, Agriculture Major, Prairie View A&M University
NSSE
national survey of student engagement
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