



HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
Office of Institutional Research and Planning

2013 NSSE Report: Humboldt State University Results



Office of Institutional Research and Planning

One Harpst Street • Arcata, California 95521-8299

707.826.5489 • www.humboldt.edu/irp



Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Method	1
Collaborative Learning, Classroom Engagement, and Preparation	2
Reflective and Integrative Learning	4
Student-Faculty Interactions.....	5
Higher-Order Learning	6
Effective Teaching Practices.....	7
Quantitative Reasoning.....	8
Reading and Writing Frequency.....	9
Discussions with Diverse Others	9
Learning Strategies	10
Challenge.....	11
Educational and Personal Growth	12
Quality of Interactions	13
Campus Emphasis	14
Time Management.....	14
Perceived Gains.....	16
Overall Experience	17
Experiences with Writing	17
Academic Advising	19
NSSE 2008 to 2013 Results Comparison	20

Introduction

Student engagement represents two critical features of collegiate quality. The first is the amount of time and effort students put into their studies and other educationally purposeful activities. The second is how the institution deploys its resources and organizes the curriculum and other learning opportunities to get students to participate in activities that decades of research studies show are linked to student learning. Survey items reflect behaviors by students and institutions that are associated with desired outcomes of college. Though the NSSE doesn't assess student learning directly, survey results point to areas where colleges and universities are performing well and aspects of the undergraduate experience that could be improved.

Method

The survey was deployed February 19th, 2013 via email. After initial deployment students were given four reminders to complete the survey. A total of 4,021 first-year and senior students were asked to participate in the survey. Of those students, 29% percent of first-year students ($n=391$) and 34% of senior students ($n=912$) responded.

Students self-reported their ethnicity/race membership in any of the following categories: White (43%), Hispanic or Latino (35%), Asian/Pacific Islander (6%), Black (4%), American Indian or Alaskan native (1%), two or more ethnicities (6%), and other (5%). About 96% of the students were enrolled full time, and the sample was 65% female. Female students were over represented in the responses. See Table 1.

First-year and senior HSU students were compared to three different cohorts consisting of other institutions. The first comparison group was the Far West Public (FW), which consisted of 18 similar institutions. The second comparison group consisted of institutions with a Carnegie Classification (CC) of "Public Master's Colleges and Universities (medium programs)." This classification is determined by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and matches HSU's own classification. The third group consisted of all schools that participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

This report includes several tables that report both statistical significance and effect size for the mean comparisons between groups. Effect size indicates the practical importance of an observed difference. An effect size of .2 is generally considered small, .5 medium, and .8 large.

Table 1. *Representativeness*

	First-year		Senior	
	Respondent %	Population %	Respondent %	Population %
Female	65	55	58	51
Full-time	96	94	92	89
First-time, first-year	94	90	N/A	N/A
Race/ethnicity^a				
Am. Indian or Alaska Native	1	1	1	2
Asian	5	4	2	2
Black or African American	4	7	2	2
Hispanic or Latino	35	35	16	17
Native Hawaiian/Other Pac. Isl	1	0	0	0
White	43	42	61	57
Other	0	0	0	0
Foreign or nonresident alien	1	0	1	1
Two or more races/ethnicities	6	6	6	5
Unknown	6	4	12	13

a. Based on the IPEDS categories (not available for Canadian institutions) submitted in the population file. Results not reported for institutions without full (at least 90%) race/ethnicity information in the population file.

Collaborative Learning, Classroom Engagement, and Preparation

The first section of the survey focused on how frequently students engage in a number of behaviors related to learning with other students. In addition, the first portion of the NSSE included questions regarding classroom contribution and preparation. Each question was rated on a 4-point Likert scale with available responses of “1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Very often.”

First-year Students

First-year students ($M = 2.6$) reported asking questions or contributing to course discussions at a lower frequency than all three peer groups. First-year students ($M = 2.4$) reported that they did not prepare two or more drafts of papers as often as all three peer groups. First-year students ($M = 2.9$) reported that they did not come to class prepared by completing readings and assignments as often as all three peer groups. First-year students ($M = 2.1$) attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance more often than the CC and NSSE peer groups. First year students ($M = 2.6$) asked another student for help in understanding course material more often than peers in the CC comparison group. First year students did not explain course material to others, prepare for exams through working with other students, or work with other students on assignments or projects at a different rate than students in any of the comparison groups. First year students ($M = 2.1$) reported giving course presentations less often than students in all three peer groups.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 3.1$) reported asking questions or contributing to course discussions at a lower frequency than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.4$) reported that they did not prepare two or more drafts of papers as often as all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.8$) reported that they did not come to class prepared by completing readings and assignments as often as all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.2$) attended an art exhibit, play, or other arts performance more often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.6$) asked another student for help in understanding course material more often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 3.0$) reported explaining course material to one or more students more often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.7$) prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students more often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 3.0$) worked with other students on course projects and assignments more frequently than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.8$) reported giving course presentations more frequently than all three peer groups.

Table 2. Significance and effect sizes for Collaborative Learning and Engagement

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. ask questions	.000	.000	.000	.23	.40	.32	.014	.000	.001	.08	.23	.11
b. prepared drafts	.000	.000	.023	.21	.18	.12	.000	.000	.041	.18	.16	.07
c. unprepared	.000	.000	.001	.21	.25	.18	.000	.000	.000	.34	.40	.29
d. attend art show	ns	.032	.044	.07	.11	.10	.000	.000	.000	.40	.39	.37
e. ask for help	ns	.005	ns	.06	.13	.09	.000	.000	.000	.25	.31	.30
f. explain to others	ns	ns	ns	.04	.05	.02	.000	.000	.000	.25	.33	.30
g. study group	ns	ns	ns	.05	.10	.05	.000	.000	.000	.25	.33	.32
h. group projects	ns	ns	ns	.04	.02	.02	.000	.000	.000	.17	.24	.17
i. presentations	.038	.002	.021	.10	.15	.11	.001	.015	.000	.11	.08	.14

Discrepancies between Freshmen and Seniors, and Related Questions

Unlike freshmen, seniors report more instances of collaborative learning than their peers in all categories examined. Also unlike freshmen, seniors report giving more class presentations than their peers. While both groups report coming to class unprepared more frequently, seniors ($M = 16.7$, $d = .20$ to .25) actually report more overall hours spent preparing for class relative to their peers. Freshmen ($M = 13.1$, $d = -.13$ to $-.14$) report less overall hours spent preparing for class relative to their CC and NSSE peers (see Table 13).

Reflective and Integrative Learning

Questions in this area addressed how often first-year students piece together information from different sources and experiences into their current coursework. Each question was rated on a 4-point Likert scale with available responses of "1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Very often."

First-year Students

First year students ($M = 2.8$) reported combining ideas from different courses when completing assignments more frequently than all three peer groups. First year students ($M = 2.8$) connected their learning to societal problems or issues more often than all three comparison groups. First year ($M = 2.7$) students included diverse perspectives into course discussions or assignments more often than all three peer groups. First year students ($M = 2.9$) examined the strengths and weaknesses of their own views on a topic or issue more frequently than all three peer groups). First year students ($M = 3.0$) reported trying to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective more frequently than all three peer groups. First year students ($M = 2.9$) reported learning something that changed the way they understand an issue or concept more often than their peers in the CC comparison group. First year students ($M = 3.2$) reported connected ideas from courses to previous experiences and knowledge more often than all three peer groups.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 3.2$) reported combining ideas from different courses when completing assignments more frequently than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 3.0$) connected their learning to societal problems or issues more often than all three comparison groups. Senior ($M = 2.8$) students included diverse perspectives into course discussions or assignments more often than their peers in the FW and NSSE groups. Senior students ($M = 3.0$) examined the strengths and weaknesses of their own views on a topic or issue more frequently than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 3.1$) reported trying to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective more frequently than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 3.1$) reported learning something that changed the way they understand an issue or concept more often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 3.4$) reported connected ideas from courses to previous experiences and knowledge more often than all three peer groups.

Table 3. Significance and effect sizes for Reflective and Interactive Learning behaviors

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. combine ideas	.001	.003	.041	.15	.15	.10	.000	.000	.000	.21	.23	.21
b. connect to society	.000	.000	.001	.25	.19	.17	.000	.000	.000	.20	.17	.18
c. diverse views	.000	.002	.003	.22	.16	.16	.000	<i>ns</i>	.002	.12	.05	.10
d. criticize own view	.000	.000	.000	.19	.21	.17	.005	.023	.004	.10	.08	.10
e. perspective	.000	.000	.000	.19	.22	.19	.000	.000	.000	.20	.17	.18
f. learned new	<i>ns</i>	.047	<i>ns</i>	.10	.10	.08	.000	.000	.000	.21	.22	.20
g. connect ideas	.001	.003	.012	.18	.16	.13	.000	.000	.000	.19	.22	.20

Student-Faculty Interactions

Students were asked to rate the frequency of their interactions with faculty members. Each question was rated on a 4-point Likert scale with available responses of “1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Very often.”

First-year Students

First year students ($M = 1.6$) report working with a faculty member on activities other than coursework less often than all three peer groups. First year students did not differ from their peer groups on talking with faculty about career plans, discussing course topics or ideas outside of class, or discussing academic performance.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 2.0$) worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework more often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.4$) discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class more often than all three peer groups. Senior students did not differ from their peer groups on talking about career plans with faculty, or discussing their academic performance with a faculty member.

Table 4. Significance and effect sizes for Student-Faculty Interactions

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. discuss career	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.06	.08	.06	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.03	.00	.04
b. discuss non-course	.004	.021	.018	.14	.11	.11	.007	.009	.003	.09	.09	.10
c. discuss outside	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.00	.01	.00	.000	.000	.000	.24	.21	.24
d. discuss performance	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.09	.08	.06	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.01	.00	.05

Higher-Order Learning

Students were asked to determine how often they engage in instances of higher-order learning. This type of learning relates to critical thinking and using knowledge to form new ideas and solve complex problems. Each question was rated on a 4-point Likert scale with available responses of "1 = Very little, 2 = Some, 3 = Quite a bit, 4 = Very much."

First-year students

First-year students did not differ from their peers in emphasis on memorizing course material. First-year students did not differ from their peers in emphasis on applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations. First-year students did not differ from their peers in emphasis on analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts. First-year students did not differ from their peers in emphasis on evaluating a point of view, decision, or information course. First year students did not differ from their peers in emphasis on forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 2.8$) reported having coursework that emphasized memorization of course materials more so than their peers in the CC and overall NSSE groups. Senior students did not differ from their peers in emphasis on applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations. Senior students did not differ from their peers in emphasis on analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts. Senior students did not differ from their peers in emphasis on evaluating a point of view, decision, or information course. Senior students did not differ from their peers in emphasis on forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information.

Table 5. Significance and effect sizes for Higher-Order Learning behaviors

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. memorize	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.03	.03	.02	<i>ns</i>	.000	.000	.07	.16	.14
b. apply fact, etc.	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.02	.06	.10	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.02	.01	.00
c. analyze idea, etc.	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.05	.03	.03	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.04	.05	.05
d. evaluate POV, etc.	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.01	.01	.02	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.01	.02	.01
e. form new idea	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.00	.02	.03	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	<i>ns</i>	.01	.01	.02

Effective Teaching Practices

Students were asked to rate how often their instructors engage in behaviors related to effective teaching. Each question was rated on a 4-point Likert scale with available responses of “1 = Very little, 2 = Some, 3 = Quite a bit, 4 = Very much.”

First-year Students

First-year students ($M = 3.3$) report a higher frequency of instructors clearly explaining course goals and requirements than all three peer groups. First-year students ($M = 3.2$) report their instructors used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points more often than their peers in the overall NSSE group. First-year students ($M = 2.8$) rate frequency of feedback from instructors on drafts is less than that of their peers in the FW and CC comparison groups. First-year students ($M = 2.7$) report receiving feedback on tests or completed assignments less often than all three peer groups. First-year students did not differ from their peers in reporting instructor frequency of teaching courses in an organized way.

Senior Students

Senior Students ($M = 3.1$) report that their instructors teach course sessions in an organized way less frequently than students in the CC comparison group. Senior students ($M = 3.2$) report their instructors used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points more often than their peers in the CC and overall NSSE groups. Senior students ($M = 2.8$) report receiving feedback on tests or completed assignments less often than all three peer groups. Senior students did not differ from their peers in reporting of how often their instructors clearly explaining course goals and requirements, or providing feedback on drafts.

Table 6. Significance and effect sizes for Perceptions of Effective Teaching

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. clear goals	.030	.009	.014	.10	.14	.13	ns	ns	ns	.03	.04	.00
b. organized classes	ns	ns	ns	.06	.04	.03	ns	.006	ns	.04	.10	.05
c. use examples	ns	ns	.049	.07	.10	.10	ns	.037	.004	.07	.07	.10
d. draft feedback	.004	.020	ns	.15	.12	.08	ns	ns	ns	.02	.05	.04
e. completed feedback	.005	.001	.031	.15	.18	.11	.001	.000	.002	.11	.17	.11

Quantitative Reasoning

Students were asked to report how often they engage in quantitative reasoning during the school year. Each question was rated on a 3-point Likert scale with available responses of “1= Never, 2= Sometimes, 3 = Often.”

First-year students

First-year students overall did not differ from their peers in the frequency of using different quantitative methods.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 2.7$) reported reaching conclusions based on their own analysis of numerical information more often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.6$) reported using numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue more often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.7$) reported evaluating what others have concluded from numerical information more often than all three peer groups.

Table 7. Significance and effect sizes for Quantitative Reasoning experience

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. quant conclude	ns	ns	ns	.01	.04	.00	.001	.005	.003	.12	.10	.10
b. quant real-world	ns	ns	ns	.02	.01	.03	.000	.000	.000	.17	.14	.16
c. quant evaluate	ns	ns	ns	.03	.08	.02	.000	.000	.000	.28	.28	.26

Reading and Writing Frequency

Students were asked to estimate how many short, medium, and long papers they have written during the school year. They were also asked to estimate how much time they have spent on assigned reading.

First-year Students

First-year students ($M = 6.0$) reported writing more short assigned papers (up to 5 pages) than their peers in the FW group, but less than their peers in the CC and overall NSSE groups. First-year students did not differ from their peers in number of medium (between 6 and 10 pages) and long (11 or more pages) papers written. First-year students also did not differ in overall estimated pages of assigned writing. They also did not differ in overall time spent completing assigned reading.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 7.7$) reported writing more short assigned papers than their peers in the FW group. Senior students ($M = 3.3$) reported writing more medium length assigned papers than their peers in the FW group, but less than their peers in the overall NSSE group. Senior students ($M = 1.7$) reported writing less long assigned papers than their peers in the CC and overall NSSE groups. Seniors ($M = 74$) reported writing less overall estimated pages than their peers in the NSSE group. Senior students ($M = 8.1$) reported spending more time on assigned reading than all three peer groups.

Table 8. Significance and effect sizes for Reading and Writing frequency

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. short paper	.037	.000	.005	.12	.18	.14	.000	ns	ns	.18	.02	.03
b. medium paper	ns	ns	ns	.01	.04	.07	.023	ns	.018	.08	.06	.07
c. long paper	ns	ns	ns	.04	.08	.08	ns	.007	.003	.05	.08	.09
— total pages	ns	ns	ns	.09	.03	.02	ns	ns	.034	.06	.06	.07
— hours reading	ns	ns	ns	.04	.02	.01	.000	.000	.000	.15	.18	.20

Discussions with Diverse Others

Students were asked how often they engage in conversation with others different from themselves. Each question was rated on a 4-point Likert scale with available responses of “1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Very often.”

First-year Students

First-year students ($M = 3.3$) reported having discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than their own more often than all three peer groups. First-year students ($M = 3.3$) reported having

discussions with people from an economic background other than their own more often than all three peer groups. First-year students ($M = 3.2$) reported having discussion with people with different religious beliefs than their own more often than all three peer groups. First-year students did not differ from their peers in how often they have discussions with people with political views other than their own.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 3.2$) reported having discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than their own more often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 3.3$) reported having discussions with people from an economic background other than their own more often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 3.0$) reported having discussions with people with political views other than their own less often than all three peer groups. Senior students did not differ from their peers in how often they have discussions with people with different religious beliefs than their own.

Table 9. Significance and effect sizes for Discussions with Diverse Others

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. race	.000	.000	.000	.34	.38	.28	.001	.000	.001	.11	.23	.11
b. economic	.000	.000	.000	.29	.29	.22	.000	.000	.000	.15	.24	.15
c. religion	.000	.000	.002	.21	.19	.17	ns	ns	ns	.02	.03	.01
d. political	ns	ns	ns	.03	.01	.03	.001	.002	.000	-.13	-.12	-.13

Learning Strategies

Students were asked how often they engaged in behavior known to enhance learning. Each question was rated on a 3-point Likert scale with available responses of “1= Never, 2= Sometimes, 3 = Often.”

First-year Students

First-year students ($M = 2.8$) reported reviewing their notes after class less often than all three peer groups. First-year students ($M = 2.7$) reported summarizing what they learned in class or from course materials less often than all three peer groups. First-year students did not differ from their peers in how often they identified key information from reading assignments.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 3.4$) reported identifying key information from reading assignments more often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.8$) reported reviewing their notes after class less often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.8$) reported summarizing what they learned in class or from course materials less often than all three peer groups.

Table 10. Significance and effect sizes for Use of Learning Strategies

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. key reading	ns	ns	ns	.00	.04	.05	.000	.000	.000	.14	.14	.16
b. review notes	.000	.001	.014	.22	.19	.13	.000	.000	.028	.19	.15	.08
c. summarize course	.005	.001	.005	.16	.18	.15	.000	.000	.004	.17	.16	.10

Challenge

Students were asked how much they feel HSU has challenged them to do their best work. The question was rated on a 7-point scale ranging from “1 = Not at all” to “7= Very much.”

First-year Students

First-year students ($M = 5.4$) do not feel as challenged as students in all three peer groups. First-year students do not rate their entire educational experience as better as or worse than their peers. First-year students are not more or less likely than their peers to go to a different institution if they had the opportunity to start over.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 5.5$) do not feel as challenged as students in all three peer groups. Senior students do not rate their entire educational experience as better as or worse than their peers. Senior students are not more or less likely than their peers to go to a different institution if they had the opportunity to start over.

Differences by College

Within HSU, perception of challenge differs by college, $F(2,1053) = 3.328, p = .036, partial \eta^2 = .006$. Students in the college of Natural Resources & Sciences ($M = 5.58$) feel more challenged than students in the college of Arts or Humanities ($M = 5.37$). Students in the college of professional studies did not differ from either group.

Table 11. Significance and effect sizes for Challenge

Variable Name	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
10. challenge	.000	.000	.001	.20	.20	.18	.000	.000	.000	.24	.21	.16

Educational and Personal Growth

Students were asked whether or not they have participated in or intend to participate in a number of extracurricular activities related to academic and professional development. Each question allowed respondents to choose one of the following four responses: “1 = Have not decided, 2 = Do not plan to do, 3 = Plan to do, 4 = Done or in progress.”

First-year Students

Seven percent of first-year respondents have completed or are in the process of completing an internship, co-op, field experience, students teaching, or clinical placement. Seven percent of first-year students have completed or are in the process of completing a formal leadership role in a student organization or group. Seven percent of first-year respondents have completed or are in the process of completing participation in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take or more classes together. Only one first-year respondent has completed or is in the process of completing a study abroad program. Three percent of first-year respondents have completed or are in the process of completing work with a faculty member on a research project. Two percent of first-year respondents report having completed or are in the process of completing culminating senior experience.

Senior Students

Fifty percent of senior respondents have completed or are in the process of completing an internship, co-op, field experience, students teaching, or clinical placement. Thirty-four percent of senior students have completed or are in the process of completing a formal leadership role in a student organization or group. Twenty-six percent of senior respondents have completed or are in the process of completing participation in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take or more classes together. Twelve of senior respondents have completed or is in the process of completing a study abroad program. Thirty percent of senior respondents have completed or are in the process of completing work with a faculty member on a research project. Fifty-nine percent of senior respondents report having completed or are in the process of completing culminating senior experience.

Table 12. Significance and effect sizes for Educational and Personal Growth

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. intern	ns	ns	ns	.08	.09	.06	.000	.013	ns	.18	.09	.06
b. leader	.009	.041	.011	.16	.12	.15	.006	ns	ns	.10	.04	.01
c. learncom	.000	.001	.000	.33	.20	.26	ns	ns	ns	.03	.06	.05
d. abroad	.001	.003	.003	.29	.24	.24	.000	ns	ns	.19	.02	.01
e. research	.029	ns	ns	.14	.09	.11	.000	.000	.000	.21	.18	.17
f. capstone	ns	ns	ns	.13	.01	.03	.000	.000	.000	.43	.26	.29

Quality of Interactions

Students were asked to rate the quality of the interactions they have with different members of the campus. Each question was rated from “1 = Poor” to “7 = Excellent.”

First-year Students

First-year students did not differ from their peers in ratings of other students, academic advisors, faculty, student service staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.), or other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 5.7$) reported having less quality interaction with students compared to their peers in the CC group. Senior students ($M = 5.2$) reported having less quality interaction with academic advisors compared to their peers in the CC group. Senior students ($M = 4.8$) reported having less quality interaction with other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.) compared to their peers in the FW and CC groups. Seniors did not differ from their peers in ratings of faculty or student service staff.

Table 13. Significance and effect sizes for Quality of Interactions

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. student interaction	ns	ns	ns	.01	.06	.04	ns	.002	ns	.07	.12	.06
b. advisor interaction	ns	ns	ns	.09	.01	.03	ns	.000	ns	.07	.14	.03
c. faculty interaction	ns	ns	ns	.01	.09	.04	ns	ns	ns	.01	.02	.06
d. staff interaction	ns	ns	ns	.02	.05	.02	ns	ns	ns	.01	.02	.02
e. admin interaction	ns	ns	ns	.05	.01	.05	.022	.006	ns	.08	.10	.02

Campus Emphasis

Students were asked how much they believe their campus emphasizes several aspects related to academic and social success. Each question was rated on a 4-point Likert scale with available responses of "1 = Very little, 2 = Some, 3 = Quite a bit, 4 = Very much."

First-year Students

First-year students rated HSU higher than peers rated their own institutions in a number of categories. According to first-year students, HSU has a greater emphasis on encouraging contact with diverse students ($M = 2.9$), providing support for overall wellbeing ($M = 3.2$), and attending events that address importance social, economic, or political issues ($M = 2.7$).

Senior Students

Senior students rated HSU higher than peers rated their own institutions in a number of categories. According to senior students, HSU has a greater emphasis on providing support for overall wellbeing ($M = 2.9$), attending campus activities and events ($M = 2.8$), and attending events that address importance social, economic, or political issues ($M = 2.7$).

Table 14. Significance and effect sizes for Campus Emphasis

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. study emphasis	ns	ns	ns	.09	.10	.10	ns	ns	ns	.03	.07	.07
b. academic support	ns	.018	.034	.11	.14	.12	ns	ns	ns	.02	.04	.03
c. learning support	ns	.011	.031	.06	.13	.11	ns	ns	ns	.04	.01	.05
d. diversity	.000	.000	.000	.23	.24	.21	.049	ns	ns	.07	.06	.04
e. social opportunities	.037	ns	ns	.11	.11	.06	.000	.001	.025	.14	.11	.07
f. overall well-being	.000	.000	.001	.23	.25	.19	.000	.000	.000	.27	.25	.19
g. nonacademic supp.	ns	ns	ns	.09	.10	.07	ns	.000	.001	.06	.13	.12
h. campus activities	ns	.039	ns	.07	.11	.06	.000	.000	.000	.19	.19	.13
i. soc, econ, poli event	.008	.005	.019	.16	.16	.14	.000	.000	.000	.40	.34	.33

Time Management

Questions dealing with time management asked students how many hours they spend doing certain activities during a 7-day week.

First-year Students

First-year students ($M = 13.1$) report spending less time preparing for class than their peers in the CC and NSSE comparison groups. First-year students ($M = 1.4$) work for pay on campus less often than all

three peer groups. First-year students ($M = 1.6$) work for pay off campus less often than all three peer groups. In general, first-year students ($M = 2.9$) work far less often for pay than their peers. First-year students ($M = 1.8$) do less community service than their peers in the FW and NSSE comparison groups. First-year students ($M = 15.1$) spend far more time relaxing and socializing than all three peer groups. First-year students ($M = 1.0$) spend less time caring for dependents than all three peer groups. First-year students ($M = 2.7$) spend less time commuting to campus than all three peer groups. First-year students did not differ from their peers in time spent participating in co-curricular activities.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 16.7$) report spending more time preparing for class than all three comparison groups. Senior students ($M = 4.9$) report more time spent participating in co-curricular activities than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 4.3$) work for pay on campus less often than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 7.6$) work for pay off campus less often than all three peer groups. In general, senior students ($M = 11.8$) work for pay far less often than their peers. Senior students ($M = 2.7$) spend less time doing community service than their peers in the FW and CC groups. Senior students ($M = 12.6$) spend far more time relaxing and socializing than all three peer groups. Senior students ($M = 2.3$) spend less time caring for dependents than all three peer groups. Senior students spend less time commuting to campus than the FW group, but more time than the CC group.

Table 15. Significance and effect sizes for Time Management

Variable	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. hours class prep	ns	.016	.010	.06	.13	.14	.000	.000	.000	.25	.25	.20
b. co-curriculars	ns	ns	ns	.04	.04	.08	.000	.000	.010	.23	.14	.10
c. work on campus	.002	.000	.000	.13	.18	.17	.030	.000	.004	.08	.14	.10
d. work off campus	.000	.000	.000	.52	.49	.40	.000	.000	.000	.49	.52	.38
e. community service	.000	ns	.022	.21	.11	.13	.000	.005	ns	.14	.10	.07
f. relax and socialize	.000	.000	.000	.43	.35	.31	.000	.000	.000	.50	.32	.26
g. dependent care	.000	.000	.000	.41	.37	.31	.000	.000	.000	.61	.52	.42
h. commute	.000	.015	.001	.36	.14	.18	.030	.021	ns	.07	.08	.06
— total hours worked	.000	.000	.000	.52	.54	.44	.000	.000	.000	.44	.46	.32

Time, Challenge, and Preparedness: Interesting Considerations

The NSSE provided interesting information on how HSU students are spending their time and how they feel HSU has prepared them. As previously discussed, HSU students do not feel as challenged as their peers at other institutions.

Questions on the NSSE lead us to believe that HSU students have far more free time than their peers. HSU students are not working for pay nearly as often, and they spend much more time relaxing and

socializing. HSU students are not engaging in behaviors that aid academic success (e.g. reviewing notes after class) as often as their peers. HSU students are also coming to class unprepared more often and as less likely to complete drafts of work before turning in assignments. These results support the idea that HSU students are not as challenged as their peers. They may be putting in less work because they feel no need to push themselves further to achieve their academic goals. In addition, HSU students do not feel as though HSU is preparing them as much as their peers in terms of acquiring job skills or affective writing techniques.

Perceived Gains

Students were asked to rate how much HSU has prepared them for real-world interactions and issues. Each question was rated on a 4-point Likert scale with available responses of “1 = Very little, 2 = Some, 3 = Quite a bit, 4 = Very much.”

First-year Students

First-year students feel less confident in their writing skills ($M = 2.7$) and their job-related knowledge ($M = 2.4$) than all three peer groups.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 3.0$) feel less confident in their writing skills than their peers in the CC and NSSE comparison groups. Senior students ($M = 2.9$) feel less confident in their job-related knowledge than all three peer groups. However, senior students ($M = 2.9$) report greater preparation in problem solving skills. Senior students also reported greater feelings of being an informed citizen thanks to their experiences at HSU.

Table 16. Significance and effect sizes for Perceived Gains

	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
a. writing prep	.000	.001	.004	.24	.21	.17	.073	.000	.001	.07	.15	.12
b. speech prep	.385	.872	.423	.05	.01	.04	.653	.127	.459	.02	.06	.03
c. critical thinking	.195	.089	.057	.07	.10	.11	.062	.193	.360	.07	.05	.03
d. quant methods	.025	.219	.177	.13	.07	.08	.054	.010	.026	.07	.10	.08
e. job skills	.001	.000	.000	.20	.25	.25	.046	.010	.042	.07	.10	.07
f. working w/ others	.153	.059	.082	.08	.11	.10	.025	.103	.086	.08	.06	.06
g. personal values	.006	.027	.059	.15	.13	.11	.253	.796	.707	.04	.01	.01
h. diversity sensitivity	.002	.001	.004	.17	.19	.17	.331	.392	.459	.04	.03	.03
i. problem solving	.944	.961	.501	.00	.00	.04	.003	.005	.018	.11	.10	.09
j. informed citizen	.812	.676	.831	.01	.02	.01	.000	.000	.000	.18	.14	.15

Overall Experience

The last questions covered on the general NSSE consider students’ overall experience at HSU and whether or not they would attend HSU if given the option to start over. Students were asked to rate their entire educational experience at HSU on a 4-point scale with available responses “1= Poor, 2= Fair, 3=Good, 4= Excellent.” Students were asked to rate their decision to choose HSU if they could start over on a 4-point scale with available responses of “1= Definitely no, 2= Probably no, 3= Probably yes, 4= Definitely yes.”

First-year Students

First-year students did not differ from their peers in terms of quality of experience ($M = 3.3$) or decision to choose a new school ($M = 3.3$).

Senior Students

Senior students did not differ from their peers in terms of quality of experience ($M = 3.3$) or decision to choose a new school ($M = 3.2$).

Table 17. Significance and effect sizes for Overall Experience and HSU reselection

Variable Name	First-Year Students						Seniors					
	Significance			Effect size			Significance			Effect size		
	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE	Far West	Carnegie	NSSE
experience	ns	ns	ns	.09	.07	.04	ns	ns	ns	.01	.03	.02
same school	ns	ns	ns	.08	.08	.04	ns	ns	ns	.01	.02	.02

Experiences with Writing

In addition to the default NSSE questionnaire, HSU also participated in a survey of student writing experiences. HSU students were compared to other institutions that completed the Experiences with Writing survey. Students were asked how often they engaged in certain behaviors related to their writing assignments. They were also asked how often their instructors engaged in certain behaviors related to their writing assignments.

Each question was rated on a 5-point scale with available responses “1 = No writing assignments, 2 = Few writing assignments, 3 = Some writing assignments, 4 = Most writing assignments, 5 = All writing assignments.”

First-year Students

First-year students ($M = 3.4$) reported arguing a position using evidence and reasoning in their writing more often than their peers. First-year students ($M = 2.6$) reported writing in the style and format of a specific field less often than their peers. First-year students ($M = 4.2$) reported that their instructors provided clear instructions describing what he or she wanted the student to do more often than their peers.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 2.9$) reported talking with a classmate, friend, or family member to develop their ideas before starting a writing assignment more often than their peers. Senior students ($M = 2.9$) received feedback from a classmate, friend, or family member about a draft before turning in a final assignment more often than their peers. Senior students ($M = 2.8$) gave feedback to a classmate about a draft or outline he or she had written more often than their peers. Senior students ($M = 3.8$) analyzed or evaluated something they read, researched, or observed more often than peers. Senior students ($M = 3.2$) reported describing their methods or findings related to data collected in lab or field work more often than their peers. Senior students ($M = 3.2$) reported arguing a position using evidence and reasoning more often than their peers. Senior students ($M = 2.9$) reported explaining in writing the meaning of numerical or statistical data more often than their peers. Senior students ($M = 3.6$) wrote in the style and format of a specific field more often than their peers. Senior students ($M = 3.0$) reported addressing a real or imagined audience (e.g. classmates or non-experts) more often than their peers. Senior students ($M = 3.7$) reported that their instructors provided clear instructions describing what he or she wanted the student to do more less than their peers.

Table 18. *Significance and effect sizes for Experiences with Writing*

Question Description	First-Year Students				Seniors			
	Mean		Sign. Tests		Mean		Sign. Tests	
	HSU	Peers	Sig.	Effect Size	HSU	Peers	Sig.	Effect Size
Developed ideas before starting assignment	2.93	2.97	ns	-.03	2.94	2.83	.02	.09
Received feedback on a draft before final assignment	3.16	3.25	ns	.07	2.90	2.80	.02	.09
Gave feedback to a classmate about a draft or outline	3.11	3.10	ns	.01	2.75	2.60	.00	.13
Summarized material you read	3.25	3.34	ns	.09	3.41	3.36	ns	.05
Analyzed something read, researched, or observed	3.61	3.53	ns	.01	3.85	3.58	.00	.24
Described methods or findings related to data	2.73	2.85	ns	.10	3.17	3.02	.00	.12
Argued a position using evidence and reasoning	3.40	3.24	.02	.14	3.42	3.06	.00	.29
Explained in writing the meaning of statistical data	2.40	2.43	ns	-.03	2.93	2.64	.00	.22
Wrote in the style and format of a specific field	2.64	2.85	.01	-.15	3.65	3.32	.00	.23
Addressed a real or imagined audience	3.02	2.99	ns	.02	3.00	2.82	.00	.13
Provided clear instructions	4.18	4.08	.05	.10	4.05	4.03	ns	.02
Explained in advance learning objectives	3.80	3.88	ns	.07	3.65	3.82	.00	.15
Explained the criteria he or she would use to grade	4.06	4.04	ns	.01	4.02	4.04	ns	.01

Academic Advising

In addition to the default NSSE questionnaire, HSU students also participated in a survey about their experiences with academic advising. HSU students were compared to students at other institutions that participated in the Academic Advising survey. Students were asked how often their advisors engaged in specific behaviors normally encountered in an advising environment. These questions were rated on a 4-point scale with available options of “1 = Very little, 2 = Some, 3 = Quite a bit, 4 = Very much.” Students also disclosed how often they have discussed academic topics with their advisor during the current school year.

First-year Students

First-year students ($M = 2.5$) discussed their academic interests, course selections, or academic performance with their advisor more often than their peers. First-year students ($M = 2.8$) reported that their advisors informed them of academic support options (e.g. tutoring) more often than their peers at other institutions.

Senior Students

Senior students ($M = 2.6$) discussed their academic interests, course selections, or academic performance with their advisor more often than their peers. Senior students ($M = 2.5$) reported that their advisors informed them of important deadlines less often compared to their peers at other institutions. Senior students ($M = 2.5$) reported that their advisors helped them understand academic rules and policies less often compared to their peers. Senior students ($M = 2.3$) reported that their advisors informed them of academic support options (e.g. tutoring) less often compared to their peers. Senior students ($M = 2.4$) reported that their advisors helped them get information on special opportunities (e.g. internships) less often compared to their peers.

Table 19. *Significance and effect sizes for Academic Advising*

Question Description	First-Year Students				Seniors			
	Mean		Sign. Tests		Mean		Sign. Tests	
	HSU	Peers	Sig.	Effect Size	HSU	Peers	Sig.	Effect Size
Interaction with an academic advisor	2.46	2.04	.00	.30	2.61	2.40	.00	.11
Been available when needed	2.99	2.91	ns	.08	3.00	2.98	ns	.01
Listened closely to your concerns and questions	2.97	2.91	ns	.06	2.98	3.00	ns	-.02
Informed you of important deadlines	2.78	2.72	ns	.06	2.54	2.73	.00	-.17
Helped you understand academic rules and policies	2.76	2.68	ns	.07	2.53	2.68	.00	-.13
Informed you of academic support options	2.78	2.62	.01	.15	2.33	2.46	.00	-.11
Provided useful information about courses	2.90	2.81	ns	.09	2.75	2.78	ns	-.02
Helped you when you had academic difficulties	2.61	2.58	ns	.03	2.59	2.66	ns	-.07
Helped you get information on special opportunities	2.53	2.41	ns	.10	2.40	2.51	.03	-.09
Discussed your career interests and post-grad. plans	2.50	2.45	ns	.04	2.51	2.57	ns	-.05

NSSE 2008 to 2013 Results Comparison

The structure of the NSSE changed dramatically since the last time HSU participated in data collection in 2008, limiting the ability to examine data longitudinally. HSU students from 2008 differed from students in 2013 in a number of ways. Where comparisons between certain peer groups are not mentioned, it should be assumed that there is no difference.

Collaborative Learning, Classroom Engagement, and Preparedness

In 2008, senior students worked with other students on course projects or assignments less often than students at other CSUs, and did not differ from the CC and NSSE comparison groups. In 2013, HSU seniors worked with other students more often than all three peer groups.

In 2008, senior students gave a course presentation less often than all of that year's comparison groups. In 2013, HSU seniors gave presentations more often than all three peer groups. In 2008, both first-year and senior students prepared two or more drafts of an assignment before turning it in more often than the overall NSSE group. In 2013, students prepared drafts less often than all three comparison groups.

Effective Teaching

In 2008, first-year students did not differ in their rating of frequency of instructor feedback on tests or completed assignments, while seniors rated their instructors' frequency of feedback higher than students at other CSUs. In 2013, first-year students and senior students reported the frequency of prompt and detailed feedback lower than all three peer groups.

Campus Emphasis

In 2008, senior students rated HSU's emphasis on providing opportunities to be involved socially lower than peers in the CC and NSSE groups. In 2013, seniors rated this emphasis higher than all three peer groups.

Time Management

In 2008, first-year students did not differ from their peers in the number of hours spent on class preparation peer week. In 2013, first-year students prepared for class less than their CC and NSSE peers. In 2008, first-year students did not differ from their peers in the number of hours spent working for pay on campus. In 2013, first-year students worked for pay on campus less often than all three peer groups.

Perceived Gains

In 2008, senior students rated HSUs contribution to their understanding of analyzing numerical and statistical information lower than their peers across all groups. In 2013, seniors rated HSUs contribution to this skill higher than their CC and NSSE peers.