

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) 2016 University of San Francisco Summary of Results

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) collects information from first-year and senior students about the characteristics and quality of their undergraduate experience by measuring student engagement at participating institutions. Student engagement represents two critical features of collegiate quality. The first, measured by “Engagement Indicators,” is the amount of time and effort students put into their studies and other educationally purposeful activities. The second is how institutional resources, courses, and other learning opportunities facilitate student participation in activities, known as “High Impact Practices,” that matter to student learning. USF student responses are compared to student responses in three comparison groups: 1) participating Jesuit schools, 2) select Carnegie schools, and 3) all other 2015 and 2016 United States NSSE participants. More than 311,000 students from 557 institutions in the US and Canada completed the survey in the 2016 administration.

Overview of 2016 Results

First-year students rated USF lower in the Higher Order Learning and Campus Environment indicators compared to other participating Jesuit schools. However, first-years rated USF higher or with no significant difference in all engagement indicators (Academic Challenge, Learning with Peers, Experiences with Faculty and Campus Environment) when compared to select Carnegie schools and all other NSSE 2015 and 2016 participants.

Seniors rated USF higher in Higher Order Learning indicators as compared to all three comparison groups. Seniors also rated USF higher or with no significant difference compared to all three comparison groups for all other engagement indicators.

USF first-year students report participating in Service-Learning at higher percentages than students at other participating Jesuit schools. USF seniors report participating in at least two High-Impact Practices (participation in a learning community, service-learning, and research with faculty, internship or field experience, study abroad and culminating senior experience) at higher percentages than students from all three comparison groups, with significantly higher participation than students from the select Carnegie schools and all other 2015 and 2016 participating schools.

USF Sample Characteristics:

		First-Years	Seniors
Institution- reported sex	IRsex		
	Female	247	249
	Male	103	124
Total		350	373

Table 1 Institution-Reported Race/Ethnicity (NSSE 2016)

IPEDS 2010 Race/Ethnicity	First-Years	Seniors
African American	13	9
Asian	65	78
Hispanic or Latino	68	86
International	74	58
Multi Race	23	23
Native American	1	0
Pacific Islander	1	2
Unknown	14	11
White	91	106
Total	350	373

Table 2 Institution-Reported Residency (NSSE 2016)

Residency	First-Years	Seniors
International	74	58
US Citizen/Permanent Resident	276	315
Total	350	373

Response Rate:

First-Year Students: 22%

Senior Students: 19%

Summary of Results:

1. Engagement Indicators

- First-years rated USF lower in Higher Order Learning compared to other participating Jesuit schools (p. 3) and this was true across all four of the questions within this indicator. (p. 5)
- Seniors rated USF higher in Higher-Order Learning compared to other participating Jesuit schools, select Carnegie Classification schools and all 2015 and 2016 NSSE participants (p. 3) and this was also true across all four of the questions within this indicator. (p. 7)
- First-years scored USF lower in both aspects of the Campus Environment (Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment) compared to Jesuit peers (p. 3). The largest score differences (p. 12) are seen in: a) interactions with other students, advisors, and faculty; b) providing opportunities to be involved socially; c) providing support for overall well-being; d) attending campus activities and events. Seniors rated USF higher in

interactions with advisors and faculty (although maybe not significantly), but lower in the other areas. (p. 13)

- Seniors rated USF higher in Academically Challenging environment compared to peer institutions and report engaging in learning strategies. (p. 7)
- First-years and seniors reported participating in discussions with others diverse in race, ethnicity, economic background, and religious beliefs, though not in political views other than their own. (p. 8-9).
- In general, USF did well in questions involving issues of diversity as compared to all comparison groups. (p. 8-9)
- In general, USF showed almost no significant difference from the comparison groups in effective teaching practices, with slightly lower results from last year's survey. (p. 6-7 of Multi-Year Report)
- Seniors rated USF as high as the top 50% in almost all categories and as high as the top 10% in Higher-Order Learning environment and Discussions with Diverse Others. (p. 15)
- First-years rated USF as high as the top 10% in Quantitative Reasoning. (p. 15)

2. High-Impact Practices

- First-years report participating in Service-Learning at a higher percentage than other Jesuit schools, though they report lower rates of participation than the other two comparison groups. (p. 3)
- Seniors report participation in Learning Communities and Service-Learning at higher percentages than students in all three comparison groups. (p. 3)
- Seniors report participation at higher percentages in at least one, as well as in two or more, High-Impact Practices than students in all three comparison groups. (p. 3)

Comparison Groups

The NSSE Institutional Report provides core survey results for USF students alongside those of three comparison groups. USF had the opportunity to customize these groups by (a) identifying specific institutions from the list of all 2015 and 2016 NSSE participants, (b) composing the group by selecting institutional characteristics, or (c) a combination of these. Institutions that chose not to customize received default groups that provide relevant comparisons for most institutions.

Comparison Group 1 (Jesuit): USF selected a comparison group that is representative of all Jesuit institutions that participated in the 2016 NSSE survey. Jesuit (N=10) Boston College (Chestnut Hill, MA) Canisius College (Buffalo, NY) Gonzaga University (Spokane, WA) Loyola University Chicago (Chicago, IL) Marquette University (Milwaukee, WI) Regis University (Denver, CO) Rockhurst University (Kansas City, MO)* Saint Peter's University (Jersey City, NJ) Seattle University (Seattle, WA) Spring Hill College (Mobile, AL)

Comparison Group 2 (Carnegie): USF selected a comparison group that represents all institutions that participated in the NSSE 2016 with a Carnegie classification of Doctoral/Moderate, Public and Private Not-for-profit, and with enrollments between 5001-10,000. Select Carnegie Cl. (N=10) Azusa Pacific University (Azusa, CA) Inter American University of Puerto Rico-Metro Campus (San Juan, PR) Lamar University (Beaumont, TX) Louisiana Tech University (Ruston, LA) Pace University (New York, NY) Seton Hall University (South Orange, NJ) Tennessee State University (Nashville, TN) Texas A&M University-Kingsville (Kingsville, TX) University of Arkansas at Little Rock (Little Rock, AR) University of Louisiana Monroe (Monroe, LA)

Comparison Group 3 (NSSE 2015 & 2016): USF retained the default comparison group of all 2015 and 2016 U.S. NSSE participating institutions (N=865).

Ideas for Possible Follow-Up:

- First-year students may not be challenged enough because the more skilled/rigorous instructors are teaching in the 300 and 400 level curriculum.
- A group of first-years are not challenged enough, some leave, and the remaining students feel challenged enough.
- A group of first-years really wanted the busy campus atmosphere and are disappointed when most students leave during the weekend.
- USF should revisit the selection of the second comparison group for the 2017 administration.
- Response rates have remained at or near 20% for the last 3 years. We should find ways to increase these rates.

Deborah Panter
Director of Educational Effectiveness and Assessment
Office of the Provost

