

## NSSE 2016 STUDENT AFFAIRS SUMMARY

### OVERVIEW, METHODOLOGY, and PRESENTATION of RESULTS

During fall 2016, a subcommittee of the Student Affairs Division Student Learning Outcomes Committee (SAD-SLOC) and the Applied Research Lab (ARL) analyzed benchmarked results from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). NSSE is among the most recognized and utilized survey instruments in higher education. NSSE is designed to obtain data to “provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending college,” doing so by asking first-year and senior students to answer questions regarding a number of metrics of student success, involvement, and development at American colleges and universities (About NSSE webpage). IUP has issued the instrument in 2007, 2009, 2011, 2013, 2014, and 2016. For 2016, a total of 784 (approximately 24%) of all IUP first-year students, and 549 (approximately 28%) of all senior IUP students responded to the survey. The analysis includes internal (IUP) longitudinal comparisons, as well as comparisons to external benchmarks identified below. The subcommittee, as part of its commitment to assess student learning and student development outcomes within the Student Affairs Division, identified longitudinal trends at IUP for 19 variables that were clustered under the following three sections: a) diversity and global citizenship, b) divisional services and practices, and c) student involvement.

First-year and senior benchmarked results are presented in the table below. The first column contains the specific Student Affairs variables identified by the subcommittee. The second column shows the mean response score for each IUP population from 2016. The additional columns show whether the 2016 responses are higher (green) or lower (red) when benchmarked to the following: (a) internal IUP NSSE mean scores from 2014 and 2013, and (b) external mean scores from 13 PASSHE institutions, 69 Carnegie Class institutions, and all 865 institutions that administered NSSE in 2015 and 2016. Statistically significant mean score differences are identified (by asterisks) at the following levels: one asterisk ( $p < .05$ ); two asterisks ( $p < .01$ ); and three asterisks ( $p < .001$ ). No asterisk indicates that no statistical significance could be observed in the difference between the two values. ARL graduate assistants Derek Hanely and Britny Sarver completed significance analyses for all IUP internal benchmarks, utilizing non-weighted two sample t-tests for all but one variable (11B), which utilized a two-proportion z-test. As part of their analyses, NSSE completed all significance tests for external benchmarks using the same tests as the ARL did with internal IUP benchmarks, noting that “all statistics are weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups)” and “unless otherwise noted, statistical comparisons are two-tailed independent tests” (NSSE Endnotes, *Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons*).

NSSE Variables		FIRST YEAR STUDENTS						SENIOR STUDENTS					
		IUP FY 2016 Means	Internal Longitudinal Means		External Benchmark Means			IUP SR 2016 Means	Internal Longitudinal Means		External Benchmark Means		
			IUP FY 2014	IUP FY 2013	PASSHE FY 2016	CARNEGIE FY 2016	NSSE FY 2015-16		IUP SR 2014	IUP SR 2013	PASSHE SR 2016	CARNEGIE SR 2016	NSSE SR 2015-16
Section I: Diversity and Global Citizenship Variables													
2E	Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective <sup>1</sup>	2.88	2.84	2.81	2.88	2.93	2.84	2.94	2.91	2.93	2.97	3.01 **	2.98
8A	Had serious conversations with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own <sup>1</sup>	2.95	3.02	2.90	3.02 *	3.09 ***	3.08 ***	2.98	2.92	2.94	3.03	3.16 ***	3.10 ***
8B	Had serious conversations with people of an economic background other than your own <sup>1</sup>	2.99	3.02	2.94	3.03	3.05	3.07	3.06	2.99	3.06	3.05	3.12	3.10
8C	Had serious conversations with people with religious beliefs other than your own <sup>1</sup>	2.90	2.96	2.95	2.98 *	2.93	2.98 **	2.97	2.91	2.98	3.00	2.98	3.01
8D	Had serious conversations with people with political views other than your own <sup>1</sup>	2.96	2.90	2.96	2.97	2.93	2.97	2.93	2.95	3.01	3.02	3.01	3.02
14D	Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds <sup>2</sup>	2.82	2.69 *	2.62 ***	2.69 **	2.78	2.77	2.58	2.34 ***	2.34 ***	2.52	2.66	2.60
17H	Understanding people of other backgrounds <sup>2</sup>	2.88	2.76 ***	2.71 ***	2.73 ***	2.80 *	2.78 **	2.81	2.85	2.76	2.82	2.88	2.83
Section II: Divisional Service and Practice Variables													
13D	Relationships with student services staff <sup>3</sup>	4.89	4.72	4.59 **	4.91	4.94	5.02	4.56	4.56	4.69	4.86 **	4.92 ***	4.92 ***
14B	Providing support to help students succeed academically <sup>2</sup>	3.06	3.02	2.96	3.06	3.10	3.12	2.95	2.86	2.87	2.91	3.00	2.99
14C	Using learning support services <sup>2</sup>	3.11	2.98 *	2.97 *	3.08	3.15	3.16	2.80	2.81	2.72	2.82	2.94 ***	2.91 *
14F	Providing support for your overall well-being <sup>2</sup>	2.97	2.94	2.83 **	3.00	2.93 **	2.99	2.80	2.79	2.85	2.85	2.70 **	2.77
14G	Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities <sup>2</sup>	2.44	2.22 ***	2.14 ***	2.37	2.39 *	2.41	2.08	1.98	1.93 *	2.11	2.13	2.11

Section III: Student Involvement Variables													
11B	Hold a formal leadership role in a student organization or group <sup>4</sup>	11.7	12.3	9.6	10.4	10.5	12.0	46.0	42.6	50.8	43.0	29.8 ***	38.0 ***
14E	Providing opportunities to be involved socially <sup>2</sup>	2.94	3.00	2.91	3.05 **	2.97	3.03	2.91	2.86	2.82	2.95	2.80 **	2.87
14H	Attending campus activities and events <sup>2</sup>	2.88	2.85	2.84	2.87	2.81 ***	2.91	2.69	2.68	2.69	2.68	2.51 ***	2.66
14I	Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues <sup>2</sup>	2.57	2.52	2.47	2.53	2.52 ***	2.61	2.44	2.39	2.35	2.43	2.33 ***	2.43
15B	Participating in co-curricular activities <sup>5</sup>	5.59	5.20	4.67 *	5.66	4.87 ***	5.71	5.98	5.83	5.58	5.86	3.96 ***	4.94 ***
15E	Doing community service or volunteer work <sup>5</sup>	2.38	2.15	2.25	2.11	2.83 *	2.46	3.28	2.72	3.01	3.15	3.58	3.25
17J	Being an informed and active citizen <sup>2</sup>	2.67	2.59	2.68	2.60	2.64	2.64	2.62	2.68	2.63	2.69	2.72 *	2.70

#### KEY

- \* Mean score comparison is marginally significant (p<.05).
- \*\* Mean score comparison is significant (p<.01).
- \*\*\* Mean score comparison is very significant (p<.001).

- IUP 2016 NSSE mean score benchmarked higher (with statistical significance) than comparative group.
- IUP 2016 NSSE mean score benchmarked higher (but with no significance) than comparative group.
- IUP 2016 NSSE mean score benchmarked the same as comparative group.
- IUP 2016 NSSE mean score benchmarked lower (but with no significance) than comparative group.
- IUP 2016 NSSE mean score benchmarked lower (with statistical significance) than comparative group.

#### SCALE (AND MAXIMUM RESPONSE)

- <sup>1</sup> 1-Never, 2-Sometimes, 3-Often, 4-Very Often (4.00)
- <sup>2</sup> 1-Very Little, 2-Some, 3-Quite a Bit, 4-Very Much (4.00)
- <sup>3</sup> 1-Poor through 7-Excellent (7.00)
- <sup>4</sup> Percentage Responding Done or In Progress (100%)
- <sup>5</sup> 0-0 Hours through 33-More than 30 Hours (33 Hours)

## LIMITATIONS

There are several limitations with regard to the longitudinal analysis of the 2016 NSSE results. First, original data files were not readily accessible by SAD-SLOC or the ARL, and some slight variances between weighted and unweighted mean scores occurred. Second, SAD-SLOC presents all data in the chart above, not just statistically significant data, as the purpose of this analysis is to better inform work within Student Affairs. Third, information presented above does not draw causal relationships, and can only serve to inform correlational relationships between university interventions and student outcomes. Finally, NSSE continues to serve as a single instrument for evaluation, and a comprehensive assessment plan, involving multiple data sources, is needed to fully understand impacts on student development.

## SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS, PLANNED OUTCOMES, and SCOPE of ANALYSIS

IUP's 2016 NSSE scores, when compared internally to 2013 and 2014 IUP NSSE scores, have statistically significant higher mean scores on seven variables for first-year students, and two variables for seniors. Of major note, none of the variables had a statistically lower mean score when compared to IUP NSSE 2013 and 2014. Although internal NSSE scores have improved over time for various variables, this upward trend is most noticeable for first-year students. IUP's 2016 NSSE scores were mixed when compared statistically to external benchmarks. IUP mean scores were most similar to other PASSHE institutions, with only one statistically lower variable for seniors, while first-year scores were statistically higher on two variables, and statistically lower on three variables. In contrast, IUP 2016 NSSE scores were least similar to other Carnegie Class institutions, with six statistically higher and two statistically lower variables for first-year students, and six statistically higher and five statistically lower on four variables for seniors. Five IUP 2016 NSSE variables had both statistically significant higher scores when compared to 2013 and 2014 IUP scores, as well as one or more of the external benchmarks, including encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (14D), understanding people of other backgrounds (17H), providing support for your overall well-being (14F), helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (14G), and participating in co-curricular activities (15B). None of the variables had both internal and external statistically lower mean scores. However, two variables - had serious conversations with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own (8A), and relationships with student services staff (13D) - were statistically lower when compared to each of the three external benchmarks. Additionally, variables under Section I: Diversity and Global Citizenship had, collectively, the largest number of statistically lower scores when compared externally.

Overall, an analysis of IUP's internal NSSE measures shows an upward trend, as scores on multiple variables have improved over time. This may reflect to some degree the intentional planning, focus, and allocation of limited resources by Student Affairs, which may have impacted student engagement, especially around diversity and engagement-focused initiatives. Nonetheless, 2016 IUP scores are noticeably mixed on external benchmarks, serving to reinforce the need for the continued divisional planning and prioritization around these areas.

This report focuses on 2016 NSSE results through the identification of NSSE variables that relate meaningfully to IUP's work in Student Affairs, which contributes to student engagement and success at IUP. However, this report is limited in that it focuses upon only 19 specific NSSE variables that were selected by the subcommittee. Since each area within the Division contributes to student success in unique ways, the remaining NSSE variables not included in this summary may contain meaningful data for individual Student Affairs departments. The reader is encouraged to review the full range of 2016 IUP NSSE results, as well as institutional results from previous years, available through the IUP Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment webpage ([www.iup.edu/planningandassessment](http://www.iup.edu/planningandassessment)).

The scope of the analysis is dedicated to identifying broad trends in IUP NSSE scores when benchmarked internally and externally. Additionally, it is not within the scope of this analysis to offer an explanation as to the multiple influences that may have shaped the experiences of IUP students, and as a result, specific NSSE scores. Rather, the analysis focuses on specific areas where IUP has scored higher or lower to specific comparison groups. As a result, the information can serve as a data source to inform the introduction of needs-based resources or initiatives, or to revise existing dialogue related to departmental and divisional outcome planning and assessment. Additional comments or questions can be directed to departmental SAD-SLOC representatives.