2020 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)
What is the NSSE?
And why is it important?

- Student Engagement Survey
  - 10 Engagement Indicators
  - 6 High-Impact Practices
- Administered every 3 years
- 16 Other CSU Campuses

Engagement is linked to:
- Satisfaction
- Retention

Graduation Initiative 2025
- Engagement and Well-Being
NSSE Student Sample
First-Year Student Response Rate (n = 1,085)

+22%
Compared with 2017 results

2014: 11%
2017: 13%
2020: 35%

+22% Compared with 2017 results
NSSE Student Sample
Senior Student Response Rate (n = 2,064)

+17% Compared with 2017 results
Response Rate Contributions

- **President Mahoney** – Introduced the NSSE through a campus-wide email
- **Provost Summit & VP Hellwig** – signatories on the welcome & reminder messages
- **Dean Lori Beth Way & DUEAP team** – supported NSSE efforts & funded the 1st incentives offered at SF State
- **AVP Roderick & AT team** – set up individualized survey links via iLearn
- **AVP Beeler & Marketing team** – developed & implemented a comprehensive marking strategy
- **Debjani Roy** – sent out two local email reminder messages
Engagement Indicators
Engagement Indicators

Theme 1 - Academic Challenge:

1. Higher-Order Learning
   (How much has your coursework emphasized evaluating a point of view, decision or information source?)

2. Reflective and Integrative Learning
   (How often have you connected your learning to societal problems or issues?)

3. Learning Strategies
   (How often have you reviewed your notes after class?)

4. Quantitative Reasoning
   (How often have you used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue?)

Theme 2 - Learning With Peers:

5. Collaborative Learning
   (How often have you asked another student to help you understand course material?)

6. Discussions with Diverse Others
   (How often have you had discussions with people from a race or ethnicity other than your own?)
Engagement Indicators

Theme 3 - Experiences with Faculty:

7. Student-Faculty Interaction
   (How often have you talked about career plans with a faculty member?)

8. Effective Teaching Practices
   (To what extent have your instructors clearly explained course goals and requirements?)

Theme 4 - Campus Environment:

9. Quality of Interactions
   (Indicate the quality of your interactions with academic advisors)

10. Supportive Environment
    (How much does your institution emphasize providing support to help students succeed academically?)
### Engagement Indicators

**Theme 1: Academic Challenge**

**Key Finding:**
SF State first-year students showed higher ratings across all academic challenge items compared with our own 2017 results and compared with the CSUs.

#### First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Challenge Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>SF State 2020</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>+1.4</td>
<td>significantly higher</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>+3.0</td>
<td>significantly higher</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>significantly higher</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>+2.1</td>
<td>significantly higher</td>
<td>medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Engagement Indicators

### Theme 1: Academic Challenge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Challenge Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>SF State 2020</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
<td>significantly higher</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>+0.2</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>+0.6</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Finding:**
SF State senior students scored significantly higher than CSU students in reflective and integrative learning.
## Engagement Indicators

### Theme 2: Learning with Peers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning with Peers Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>SF State 2020</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>significantly higher</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Finding:**
SF State students reported significantly higher discussions with diverse others compared with CSU students.
### Theme 2: Learning with Peers

**Key Finding:**
There were no significant differences between SF State senior students and CSU students in either collaborative learning or discussions with diverse others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning with Peers Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>SF State 2020</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Engagement Indicators**

**Theme 3: Experiences with Faculty**

First-Year Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences with Faculty Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>SF State 2020</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>+0.7</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Finding:**

There were no significant differences between SF State students and CSU students in either student-faculty interactions or effective teaching practices.
Engagement Indicators

Theme 3: Experiences with Faculty

Senior Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences with Faculty Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>SF State 2020</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Finding:
There was no significant differences between senior SF State students and CSU students in either student-faculty interactions or effective teaching practices.
### Engagement Indicators

#### Theme 4: Campus Environment

**First-Year Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Environment Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>SF State 2020</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>significantly lower</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>significantly lower</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Finding:**

First-year SF State students reported significantly lower quality of interactions and supportive environments compared with CSU students.
## Engagement Indicators

### Theme 4: Campus Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Environment Indicators</th>
<th>SF State 2017</th>
<th>SF State 2020</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>Difference w/ CSU</th>
<th>Significant Difference</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
<td>significantly lower</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>significantly lower</td>
<td>small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Finding:**
Senior SF State students reported significantly lower quality of interactions and supportive environment compared with CSU students.
EI Correlations with Retention

Quality of Interactions (QI)*
Supportive Environment (SE)*
Effective Teaching Practices (ET)*
Student/Faculty Interaction (SF)
Quantitative Reasoning (QR)
Collaborative Learning (CL)
Higher Order Learning (HO)
Reflective/Integrative Learning (RI)
Learning Strategies (LS)
Discussions with Diverse Others (DD)
High Impact Practices
High-Impact Practices

High-Impact Practices (HIPs)
Undergraduate opportunities which have positive associations with student learning, retention, and graduation

1. Service-Learning
2. Learning Communities
3. Research with Faculty
4. Internship or Field Experience
5. Study Abroad
6. Culminating Senior Experience
Key Finding: Participation in both one HIP & two or more HIPs increased from 2017 to 2020.
High-Impact Practices
Senior Students

Key Finding: Participation in one HIP remained the same & participation in two or more HIPs increased from 2017 to 2020.

- **SF State 2020**: 35% participated in one HIP, 49% participated in two or more HIPs (84% total)
- **SF State 2017**: 35% participated in one HIP, 46% participated in two or more HIPs (81% total)
- **CSU**: 30% participated in one HIP, 56% participated in two or more HIPs (86% total)
Strengths
&
Areas of Opportunity
**Item Comparisons**

**Highest Performing Items Relative to CSU Campuses – First-Years**

2c. Included diverse perspectives (…) in course discussions or assignments.

2b. Connected your learning to societal issues or problems.

2d. Examined the strengths and weakness of your own views on a topic or issue.

12. How many courses have included a community-based project (service learning).

6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue.

**Key Finding:** SF State first-year students reported spending significantly more time involved in course discussions or assignments around diverse perspectives compared with other CSU Students.
8d. Discussions with... People with political views others than your own.

14a. Institution emphasis on studying and academic work.

13d. Quality of interactions with student services staff.

13e. Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices.

14h. Institution emphasis on attending campus activities and events.

**Key Finding:** SF State first-years reported having significantly less discussions with people with political views other than their own compared with students at other CSU Campuses.
Item Comparisons

Highest Performing Items Relative to CSU Campuses – Seniors

2c. Included diverse perspectives (…) in course discussions or assignments
2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept
7. Assigned more than 50 pages of writing
2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue
8a. Discussions with… People of a race or ethnicity other than your own

Key Finding: SF State senior students spent more time involved in course discussions or assignments around diverse perspectives compared with other CSU Students. This is also the top scoring item for first-year students.
**Item Comparisons**

**Lowest Performing Items Relative to CSU Campuses - Seniors**

14b. Institution emphasis on providing support to help students succeed academically

13d. Quality of interactions with student services staff

14e. Institution emphasis on providing opportunities to be involved socially

11a. Participated in an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, clinical placement

14h. Institution emphasis on attending campus activities and events

**Key Finding:** SF State seniors reported lower levels of institution emphasis on providing support to help students succeed academically relative to students at other CSU Campuses.
Overall Experience
Satisfaction with SFSU

Overall Experience

Percentage Rating Their Overall Experience as "Excellent" or "Good"

Key Finding: 76% of First-Years and Seniors rated their overall SF State Experience as “Excellent” or “Good”
Satisfaction with SFSU

Likelihood to Attend Again

Key Finding: 75% of Seniors and 74% of First-Year students would attend again.
Summary of NSSE

Positive Growth
• Met our target of 30% response rate
• Improvements from 2017
• Academic Challenge above & beyond the CSU
• Recurrent theme of diverse perspectives
• “Good” or “Excellent”

Areas of Opportunity
• Campus Environment
  • Quality of Interactions
  • Supportive Environment