



PROJECT
RENAISSANCE

Student Engagement: QEP Cohort Ratings on the 2004 CCSSE Survey

Comparison of Mean Scores on CCSSE
Benchmark Composite Indicators
FCCJ QEP Cohorts I, II, and III
Spring 2004



CCSSE Overview

The Community College Survey of Student Engagement provides information about effective educational practice in community colleges. The survey instrument is designed to measure student engagement based on students rating of their college experiences. Benchmark indicators reflect the most important aspects of the student experience.



FCCJ Survey Administration, 2004

FCCJ administered the survey during the Spring 2004 term in a random sample of courses selected across all campuses. A total of 982 students participated, and 82 students (9%) could be matched to the QEP Cohort files.



CCSSE Benchmarks

- The five Benchmark indicators of Student Engagement are:
 - Active and Collaborative Learning
 - Student Effort
 - Academic Challenge
 - Student-Faculty Interaction
 - Support for Learners
- Each of these Benchmarks includes 6-10 survey items that reflect institutional practices and student behaviors that contribute to effective teaching, learning, retention, and success.



Active and Collaborative Learning

Benchmark Indicators:	Survey Said...	QEP Student Mean	All Other Student Mean	Nat'l CCSSE
Asked questions in class	☹️	2.64	2.97	2.87
Made a class presentation	😊	1.90	2.06	2.02
Worked with other students in class	😊	2.25	2.49	2.43
Worked with other students outside class	😊	1.87	1.91	1.84
Tutored other students	😊	1.35	1.38	1.37
Participated in community project	😊	1.25	1.25	1.28
Discussed ideas outside of class	😊	2.57	2.56	2.56
<i>1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often</i>				
😊=No significant difference between mean rating of QEP Students and All Other Students; 😄=QEP significantly BETTER ($p \leq .05$); ☹️=QEP significantly WORSE ($p \leq .05$)				



PROJECT
RENAISSANCE

Student Effort

Benchmark Indicators:	Survey Said...	QEP Student Mean	All Other Student Mean	Nat'l CCSSE
Prepared 2+ drafts of a paper ^a	☺	2.50	2.55	2.48
Integrated ideas from various sources ^a	☺	2.46	2.64	2.68
Came to class without assignments ^a	☺	1.92	1.90	1.92
Number of books read on own ^b	☹	1.82	2.12	2.08
Hours preparing for class ^c	☺	1.64	1.91	1.84
Frequency: Use peer or other tutoring ^d	☺	1.20	1.08	1.45
Frequency: Use skill lab ^d	☺	1.63	1.25	1.72
Frequency: Use computer lab ^d	☺	2.04	1.89	2.06
^a 1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often; ^b 1=None, 2=1-4, 3=5-10, 4=11-20, 5=>20; ^c 0=None, 1=1-5, 2=6-10, 3=11-20, 4=21-30, 5=>30; ^d 1=Rarely/Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often				
☺=No significant difference between mean rating of QEP Students and All Other Students; ☺=QEP significantly BETTER (p<_.05); ☹=QEP significantly WORSE (p<_.05)				



PROJECT
RENAISSANCE

Academic Challenge

Benchmark Indicators:	Survey Said...	QEP Students	All Other Students	Nat'l CCSSE
Worked harder than you thought you could ^a	☺	2.31	2.49	2.49
Analyzing basic elements of an idea ^b	☹	2.54	2.85	2.79
Synthesizing and organizing ideas ^b	☹	2.36	2.69	2.66
Making judgments about value ^b	☺	2.26	2.49	2.51
Applying theories to problems ^b	☹	2.28	2.60	2.58
Use info to perform new skill ^b	☺	2.36	2.64	2.68
Number of assigned text read ^c	☺	2.75	2.68	2.82
Number of written papers ^c	☺	2.84	2.86	2.79
Challenging examinations ^d	☺	4.66	4.94	5.00
School encourages you to study ^b	☺	2.87	2.90	2.90
<p>^a1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often; ^b1=Very little, 2=Some, 3=Quite a bit 4=Very often/much; ^c1=None, 2=1-4, 3=5-10, 4=11-20, 5=>20; ^d0=None, 1=1-5, 2=6-10, 3=11-20, 4=21-30, 5=>30; ^d 1=Extremely easy to 7=Extremely challenging</p> <p>☺=No significant difference between mean rating of QEP Students and All Other Students; ☺=QEP significantly BETTER (p<_.05); ☹=QEP significantly WORSE (p<_.05)</p>				



PROJECT
RENAISSANCE

Student-Faculty Interaction

Benchmark Indicators:	Survey Said...	QEP Student Mean	All Other Student Mean	Nat'l CCSSE
Use email to communicate with faculty	☺	2.16	2.27	2.20
Discussed grades with instructor	☺	2.40	2.45	2.45
Talked about career plans	☺	1.99	1.98	1.95
Discussed ideas w/ faculty outside class	☺	1.46	1.63	1.69
Received prompt feedback	☹	2.19	2.60	2.64
Work with faculty other than coursework	☺	1.34	1.30	1.36
<i>1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often</i>				
<p>☺=No significant difference between mean rating of QEP Students and All Other Students; ☺=QEP significantly BETTER ($p \leq .05$); ☹=QEP significantly WORSE ($p \leq .05$)</p>				



PROJECT
RENAISSANCE

Support for Learners

Benchmark Indicators:	Survey Said...	QEP Student Mean	All Other Student Mean	Nat'l CCSSE
College provides support to succeed ^a	☹️	2.69	2.88	2.89
College encourages contact among students of different backgrounds ^a	☹️	2.45	2.43	2.41
College helps cope with non-academics ^a	☹️	1.64	1.74	1.86
College provides support to thrive socially ^a	☹️	1.93	1.91	2.01
College provides financial support ^a	☹️	2.26	2.21	2.31
Frequency: Use academic advising ^b	☹️	1.62	1.55	1.74
Frequency: Use career counseling ^b	☹️	1.21	1.14	1.45
^a 1=Very little, 2=Some, 3=Quite a bit, 4=Very much; ^b 1=Rarely/Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often				
☹️=No significant difference between mean rating of QEP Students and All Other Students; 😊=QEP significantly BETTER ($p \leq .05$); ☹️=QEP significantly WORSE ($p \leq .05$)				



Summary

Compared to other college students, QEP cohort students:

- Used the skill labs **more** often
- Asked questions in class **less** often
- Read **fewer** books on their own
- Analyzed ideas, synthesized ideas and applied theories **less** often
- Received prompt feedback **less** often
- These differences were all statistically significant.



Summary, cont'd.

QEP Students had higher ratings on these items, too (although not significantly different than other students):

- Discussing ideas outside of class
- Use of tutoring and computer labs
- Use of academic advising and career counseling
- Number of assigned text read
- Discussing ideas with faculty outside class and working with faculty other than on coursework



Summary, cont'd.

QEP Students rated the college higher on:

- Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds
- Providing support to thrive socially
- Providing financial support
- These differences were not statistically significant, but indicate efforts in the right direction in providing student services



Limitations

The differences between the QEP Cohort students and other students are subject to some limitations:

- Small number of QEP students identified (82 QEP compared with 900 other students).
- CCSSE random sample EXCLUDED college prep classes that participated in the Noel Levitz SSI in Spring 2004 (over 100 classes of college prep courses).
- “Other students” includes students that did not give their Student ID on the survey (24%). They can’t be matched with the QEP Cohorts, but might be part of the Cohorts. “Other students” also includes college prep students who are not a First-time-in-college student in Fall 2001, 2002, or 2003.



PROJECT
RENAISSANCE

Conclusions

- The QEP Cohort students are very similar to other college students on various aspects of student engagement.
- This group uses tutoring and lab services more often than other students, and increased access might further improve frequency of use.
- As a group, the QEP cohort had lower ratings on several academic challenge indicators, but this might reflect differences in the coursework of college prep students compared to other students.
- Systems and methods for ensuring prompt feedback should improve student ratings.



Acknowledgements

Without the cooperation and assistance of the FCCJ Faculty and Campus Administration the Spring 2004 CCSSE administration would not have been possible.

Data collection and analysis were supported in part by:

Florida Department of Education

US Department of Education, Title III Grant