



# National Survey of Student Engagement

## Inside

- 1 Introduction
- 2 NSSE and Regional Accreditation Timelines
- 4 Mapping NSSE to Your Accreditation Standards
- 8 Institutional Examples
- 13 Recent Trends in Accreditation
- 13 Accreditation Tips

## Accreditation Toolkit: Mapped to 2006 NSSE Survey Questions Western Association

### Introduction and Rationale for Using NSSE in Accreditation

*Accreditation organizations have responded to the growing salience of learning outcomes in a variety of ways. Virtually all now include explicit references to student learning in their standards for accreditation. Most also require institutions or programs to examine student achievement or “institutional effectiveness” as part of their self-study and review process – usually in the form of some kind of “assessment.”*

—Ewell, P. (2001). *Accreditation and student learning outcomes: A proposed point of departure*. CHEA Occasional Paper. Washington, DC: CHEA

*The single most powerful contributor to assessment’s staying power has been its championing by regional and professional accreditors.*

—Wright, B. (2002). Accreditation and the scholarship of assessment. In T. W. Banta & Associates, *Building a scholarship of assessment*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

One of the most common institutional uses of NSSE data is for accreditation. In fact, NSSE schools report that accrediting agencies are the primary external group with which they share NSSE results. There are two major reasons for this.

First, accreditation agencies are giving less weight to indicators that represent institutional resources such as library holdings and inputs such as student characteristics. More emphasis is being given to evidence of student learning. Indeed, regional associations and various specialized accrediting organizations are urging colleges and universities to more thoroughly measure student learning and to demonstrate that processes are in place to assess and enhance learning outcomes and institutional effectiveness on an ongoing basis. Student engagement

results from NSSE are a direct indicator of what students put into their education and an indirect indicator of what they get out of it. That is, NSSE data show how engaged various types of students are in effective educational practices during the first and last years of college.

Second, regional and discipline- or program-specific accreditation standards encourage institutions to focus on self-evaluation and formative reviews that guide improvement efforts. So, rather than fashion self-studies as a stand-alone document for one-time use, they have begun to feature more elements of strategic planning and program evaluations that can be used to identify areas where institutions wish to improve. NSSE data are especially valuable for this purpose. The results are actionable; that is, they point to aspects of student and institutional performance that institutions can do something about related to the curriculum, pedagogy, instructional emphases, and campus climate. In addition, because NSSE benchmarks allow a school to compare itself to others, the results often point to areas where improvement may be desired. NSSE results help answer key questions related to institutional policies and programs associated with high levels of student engagement and learning.

Specific applications of student engagement information for accreditation vary. They range from minimal use such as including the results in a self-study appendix to systematic incorporation of NSSE results over a several-year period to demonstrate the impact of improvement initiatives on student behavior and the efficacy of modifications of policies and practices.

An effective accreditation plan is context specific. No one approach or template can do justice to the wide variety of institutional missions, curricula, and campus environments the plan is designed to address. However, two

common early steps to developing an accreditation plan are to identify the assessment practices already in place and the data that are available and then to augment this evidence with the self-study process (*ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*. “*Why does accreditation matter?*”).

## NSSE as a Tool for Documenting Student Learning Outcomes

Here are several examples of how student engagement information can respond to accreditation goals related to documenting student learning processes and outcomes:

- NSSE is a national survey that can help institutions measure their effectiveness in key areas of interest.
- Used systematically over time, NSSE provides data that illustrate (1) a college or university is using assessment to determine the extent to which it is meeting its educational objectives, (2) whether current institutional goals remain appropriate, and (3) various areas of teaching and learning in need of improvement.
- Institutions can benchmark their performance against select peer comparison groups, Carnegie classification, and NSSE national norms.
- Information about student engagement and institutional effectiveness is evidence of efforts to meet accrediting standards and continuously improve.
- NSSE results can yield insights into widely held assumptions about the nature of students and how they use the institution’s resources for learning.
- Student engagement results are intuitively accessible and understandable by different groups of stakeholders, on and off the campus.

This toolkit provides suggestions for incorporating NSSE into regional accreditation processes and products with an emphasis on mapping student engagement results to regional accreditation standards. In addition, we offer examples of how to use NSSE data in your regular accreditation processes.

## NSSE and Regional Accreditation Timelines

NSSE results can be used in all components of the institutional accreditation process. These include but are not limited to (a) the self-study that responds to evaluation criteria established by the accrediting body; (b) the visit by the team of peer evaluators who gather additional evidence; and (c) the response to a decision by an accreditation body requesting an improvement plan or additional evidence of student learning and related areas.

When and how often to collect and integrate student engagement data in the accreditation process are decisions facing all colleges and universities. The answers will vary, depending on several factors. Some schools want to collect student engagement information to establish a baseline. Ideally, this would be done three to five years before preparing the self-study. This way, the institution has enough time to analyze, interpret and vet the results with appropriate audiences, identify areas for improvement, take action in these areas, and administer the survey in subsequent years to demonstrate whether student and institutional performance are moving in the desired direction.

Other institutions will establish different timelines to meet their self-study objectives. For this reason, some schools administer NSSE on an annual or biennial basis. The appropriate NSSE participation cycle for your school depends on how you intend to use your data. Many institutions have found it valuable to have several years of NSSE results to establish a reliable baseline of data. Then, institutions assess their students every few years to allow time for institutional changes to take effect. This planned administration cycle maximizes the use of student engagement data for most accreditation purposes.

A substantial number of schools have gathered student engagement information multiple times. This suggests that they may be comparing the results over time to estimate areas in which student performance is changing. It may also indicate that some of these colleges are carefully monitoring student learning processes to track trends over time and to make certain that institutional performance remains at the desired level.

While the reasons schools use NSSE at different intervals can legitimately vary, the best answer to how frequently an institution should obtain student engagement data depends on the needs of a given college or university.

Listed on the next page are suggestions for determining when and how often to administer NSSE as part of a self-study process, depending on the length of the accreditation cycle.

## Timeline for NSSE Administration on a 3-Year Accreditation Cycle

If your institution is conducting its self-study over a three-year time span, the most useful time to administer NSSE is in year one. The survey is administered each spring between February and May (schools must regis-

ter the preceding summer). Institutional Reports complete with analyzed results are returned to participating schools in August of the year the survey is administered.

In years two and three of the self-study, your institution can review and share results across campus and determine your course of action to improve in specific areas.

### Example of Administering NSSE in Regional Accreditation Timeline

#### Middle States – 3 year cycle

Year 1	(Before start of fall semester) Choose model and approach
Year 1	(fall) Subcommittees begin work <b>(Register for NSSE)</b>
Year 2	(spring) Committee receives subcommittee drafts <b>(Administer NSSE)</b>
Year 2	(fall) Feedback from campus on draft of self-study <b>(Review NSSE data and share with accreditation team)</b>
Year 2	(fall) Accreditation team chair's preliminary visit
Year 3	(early spring) Final report mailed to accreditation team
Year 3	(late spring) Accreditation team visit, report, and institutional response
Year 3	(summer) Commission action

## Timeline for NSSE Administration on a 7 to 10-Year Accreditation Cycle

On a longer accreditation cycle, it may be wise to administer NSSE more than once. In the first year or two of the self-study, NSSE results can assist your institution to determine where to focus attention. After obtaining

your results and implementing campus improvement plans, another NSSE administration three to four years later would help determine the impact of such changes. This would allow ample time for assessment of results and perhaps additional adjustments to priorities in the Progress Report for your accreditation commission.

### Example of Administering NSSE in a Regional Accreditation Timeline

#### WASC – 10 year cycle

Year 1:	Proposal approved
Years 1 & 2:	Preparatory Review (PR) <b>(Analyze NSSE results, incorporate into Preparatory Review, demonstrate use of results to improve practice for inclusion in EER)</b>
Years 2 & 3:	Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) <b>(2nd NSSE administration, use results as support for the EER)</b>
Years 9 & 10:	Prepare for and submit Progress Report/New Proposal <b>(Register for &amp; administer NSSE to demonstrate ongoing review/change based on improvement plan)</b>

## What if Accreditation is around the corner?

For some institutions, a self-study or site visit review may be just a year away. In this case, NSSE can still provide some valuable information to schools during a single year. Keep in mind that schools must register for NSSE by September, the survey is administered during the spring semester, and results are provided to schools in August. This timeline offers institutions baseline data to demonstrate educational strengths and weaknesses and results to corroborate institutional evidence. In addition, subsequent NSSE administrations can be used to evaluate institutional improvement efforts outlined in the self-study.

## Mapping NSSE to WASC Standards

A successful accreditation plan is authentic to each institution. However, an important step to developing an accreditation plan is to determine what evaluation practices are currently in place and the evidence that can be linked to accreditation standards. This document maps specific items from the NSSE instrument to regional accreditation board standards. Individual NSSE items can be used as evidence of specific standards, and overall NSSE findings and benchmark scores can be used to support and document institutional improvement efforts. Finally, NSSE results will be most meaningful when coupled with other measures of student learning outcomes from your campus.

## 2006 NSSE Survey Items

### WASC Standards

1	Academic and Intellectual Experiences	WASC Standards
a.	Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions	
b.	Made a class presentation	
c.	Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in	2.5
d.	Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources	2.5
e.	Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	1.5; 2.10; 3
f.	Come to class without completing readings or assignments	2.5
g.	Worked with other students on projects during class	2.2
h.	Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments	2.2
i.	Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions	2.2; 2.5
j.	Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)	2.2
k.	Participated in a community-based project (e.g. service learning) as part of a regular course	2.11
l.	Used an electronic medium (Listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment	2.3
m.	Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor	2.3; 2.5; 2.12
n.	Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor	2.5; 2.12
o.	Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor	2.12; 2.13
p.	Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class	2.5; 2.9
q.	Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance	2.5

## 2006 NSSE Survey Items (continued)

## WASC Standards

	r.	Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations	2.5; 2.10
	s.	Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)	2.8; 2.9
	t.	Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, coworkers, etc.)	2.2
	u.	Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own	1.5; 2.2; 2.10; 3
	v.	Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	1.5; 2.2; 2.10; 3
<b>2</b>	<b>Mental Activities</b>		
	a.	Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form	2.10; 2.2
	b.	Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	2.10; 2.2
	c.	Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	2.10; 2.2
	d.	Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	2.10; 2.2
	e.	Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations	2.10; 2.2
<b>3</b>	<b>Reading and Writing</b>		
	a.	Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings	2.5
	b.	Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment	2.2
	c.	Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more	2.2; 2.5
	d.	Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages	2.2; 2.5
	e.	Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages	2.2; 2.5
<b>4</b>	<b>Problem Sets</b>		
	a.	Number of problem sets that take you more than an hour to complete	2.5
	b.	Number of problem sets that take you less than an hour to complete	2.5
<b>5</b>	<b>Exams</b>		
	Mark the box that best represents the extent to which your examinations during the current school year challenged you to do your best work.		2.5

## 2006 NSSE Survey Items (continued)

## WASC Standards

6		Additional Collegiate Experiences	
a.	Attended an art exhibit, gallery, play, dance, or other theater performance		2.11; 2.2
b.	Exercised or participated in physical fitness activities		2.11
c.	Participated in activities to enhance your spirituality (worship, meditation, prayer, etc.)		2.11
d.	Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue		2.2
e.	Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective		2.2
f.	Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept		2.2
7		Enriching Educational Experiences	
a.	Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment		2.2; 2.11
b.	Community service or volunteer work		2.2; 2.11
c.	Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together		2.11
d.	Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements		2.9; 2.11
e.	Foreign language coursework		2.2
f.	Study abroad		2.11
g.	Independent study or self-designed major		2.2
h.	Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)		2.5
8		Quality of Relationships	
a.	Relationships with other students		2.10; 2.2
b.	Relationships with faculty members		2.10; 2.2
c.	Relationships with administrative personnel and offices		2.10; 2.2
9		Time Usage	
a.	Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, doing homework or lab work, analyzing data, rehearsing, and other academic activities )		2.5
b.	Working for pay on campus		
c.	Working for pay off campus		
d.	Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)		2.11
e.	Relaxing & socializing (watching TV, partying, etc.)		2.5

## 2006 NSSE Survey Items (continued)

## WASC Standards

	f.	Providing care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)	
	g.	Commuting to class (driving, walking, etc.)	
<b>10</b>	<b>Institutional Environment</b>		
	a.	Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	2.5
	b.	Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically	2.11; 2.13
	c.	Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds	1.5; 2.2
	d.	Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	2.11
	e.	Providing the support you need to thrive socially	2.11
	f.	Attending campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural performances, athletic events, etc.)	2.11
	g.	Using computers in academic work	2.2
<b>11</b>	<b>Educational and Personal Growth</b>		
	a.	Acquiring a broad general education	2.2
	b.	Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	2.2
	c.	Writing clearly and effectively	2.2
	d.	Speaking clearly and effectively	2.2
	e.	Thinking critically and analytically	2.2
	f.	Analyzing quantitative problems	2.2
	g.	Using computing and information technology	2.20; 2.13
	h.	Working effectively with others	2.2
	i.	Voting in local, state, or national elections	2.2
	j.	Learning effectively on your own	2.2
	k.	Understanding yourself	2.2
	l.	Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	2.2
	m.	Solving complex real-world problems	2.2
	n.	Developing a personal code of values and ethics	2.2
	o.	Contributing to the welfare of your community	2.2
	p.	Developing a deepened sense of spirituality	2.2
<b>12</b>	<b>Academic Advising</b>		
	Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?		2.12



## 2006 NSSE Survey Items (continued)

WASC  
Standards

13	Satisfaction	
	How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	1.1; 2.10
14	Satisfaction	
	If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?	1.1; 2.10

### WASC Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

2.6: The institution demonstrates that its graduates consistently achieve its stated levels of attainment and ensures that its expectations for student learning are embedded in the standards faculty use to evaluate student work.

#### UC Santa Cruz

To respond to Standard 2.6, University of California Santa Cruz (UCSC) has employed a series of surveys to measure students' attainment and satisfaction relative to other national research universities and to its sister UC campuses. NSSE demonstrates that UCSC students are substantially more engaged than those in the national cohort on such measures as hours of reading and studying and personal acquaintance with instructors.

### Institutional Examples

Interest in using NSSE in accreditation is growing across all sectors and types of institutions. Because NSSE focuses on student behavior and effective educational practices, colleges and universities have found productive ways to incorporate survey results in their institutional self-studies. In this section, we describe how selected institutions are using NSSE in accreditation.

#### HLC-North Central Association (HLC-NCA)

##### Lawrence Technological University: Improvement of Student Writing

The university assessment committee at Lawrence Technological University (LTU) in Southfield, Michigan began assessing oral and written communication at the university level in 2001 and later incorporated department level assessment. LTU participated in NSSE in 2002 and used their writing item results as additional data in their assessment efforts. NSSE data indicated that students at LTU write less than their counterparts at other universities. Although these results were not unexpected for a technical school, LTU wanted their students to get more practice in writing.

LTU's NSSE results encouraged the institution to conduct a more in-depth study of the type and amount of writing required of students. This led to the development of a university-wide writing matrix which documented the type and amount of writing assignments for each undergraduate major offered at the university. This examination of writing assignments and expectations resulted in changes across departments. Several programs identified upper-level courses in which writing requirements should be enhanced or modified. The university developed an action plan to improve student writing, including initiatives such as stating clearer expectations about the quality of writing required in courses, a junior writing portfolio required for graduation, and a junior writing course for students needing improvement. Finally, the institution incorporated their NSSE results, data from their inquiries into the quality of writing, and their improvement plan into their *HLC-NCA* self-study. The effectiveness of these initiatives will be assessed with future administrations of NSSE, a two-year cycle of writing assessment, and a follow-up with students and departments regarding intended changes in required writing.

##### University of Missouri-St. Louis: Linking NSSE and FSSE to Engage Faculty

The University of Missouri-St. Louis administered NSSE annually between 2000 and 2004 and planned to incorporate its results into its *HLC-NCA* self-study. In preparation for its self-study, the institution orchestrated a multi-year strategy for building enthusiasm for using student engagement and related data for decision-making and improvement. For example, in fall 2001, discussions were held with a select group of early career faculty. In winter 2002, institutional research staff members made several presentations to senior administrators to discuss how to incorporate student engagement results into the University's strategic indicator reporting scheme. The institution also examined its NSSE data in relation to its 2003 FSSE results and began discussions among faculty concerning the quality of student-faculty interactions and creating learner-centered classrooms. These activities resulted in greater understanding and appreciation of student engagement among faculty and staff. NSSE data are being reported by each University of Missouri campus as part of the annual report to the Board of Curators on



progress toward strategic goals and will be used to demonstrate compliance with *HLC-NCA* standards related to cultivating an institutional culture that values life-long learning, enacting activities that value and support effective teaching, and nurturing a challenging yet supportive learning environment.

### **The University of Charleston: Using NSSE to Identify Areas for Improvement**

The University of Charleston (WV) administered NSSE 2002-2004, and incorporated their results into their *HLC-NCA* self-study. They emphasized their plans to address low levels of student engagement and how these changes may have had an impact upon subsequent NSSE scores. Trend data for NSSE 2002 and 2003 plus FSSE data for 2003 were also used to demonstrate compliance with standards. They also examined patterns of evidence around key issues given other data, including Noel-Levitz satisfaction data, and direct outcomes-based indicators of student learning.

### **Middle States Commission on Higher Education**

#### **Saint Francis University Uses NSSE and Catholic College Consortium Data in Accreditation**

Saint Francis University (SFU) in Loretto, Pennsylvania incorporated NSSE as part of its ongoing assessment and institutional improvement initiatives. Using a combination of NSSE 2003 comparison results and data from the consortium of Catholic colleges and universities, SFU presented a comprehensive picture of the quality of general education in its 2003 General Education Ninth Year Implementation Assessment Report.

NSSE items and consortia questions were mapped to specific general education outcomes to evaluate general education goals. SFU featured several items from NSSE as indicators: rewriting papers, working with faculty on research, number of papers written, time spent studying, number of class presentations, and number of assigned readings. These measures provided faculty clear assessments of essential skills. NSSE data were similarly used in creating meaningful and actionable outcome measures for the connections among different majors, disciplines, and ideas, promoting familiarity with primary resources, and fostering creative, critical, and mathematical thinking skills.

These findings present evidence of college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills indicated in the *Middle States Commission's Standard 12 (general education)*, and provide SFU ample support for its re-accreditation. In addition, by joining a In addition, by joining the Catholic Colleges and Universities consortium, SFU was able to ask additional questions that measured

students' understanding of the school's Franciscan heritage. Results from consortium questions offer evidence for *Standard 1: Mission, Goals, and Objectives*.

### **Shippensburg University: Identifying Institutional Strengths and Weaknesses**

Shippensburg University administered NSSE in 2003 and 2004 to add student behavior data to its assessment efforts. The institution was interested in replacing their longstanding assessment tools that focused primarily on student attitudes rather than experiences and behaviors and did not allow for comparisons with a broader national student sample. NSSE provided the institution an opportunity to focus on student behaviors and to compare its students' experiences with those of students at similar institutions across the country.

The university's use of NSSE reflects its growing commitment to using assessment as a means of adjusting programs and services in keeping with larger goals and proposed outcomes. The data identified a number of institutional strengths. For example, first-year students were significantly "above average" in terms of the frequency with which they made classroom presentations, worked with other students on class work, communicated with professors via e-mail, developed communication skills, and reported receiving a broad general education. In addition, the survey pointed to areas of concern. In comparison to the national sample, students at all levels were less likely to undertake an independent study or have a capstone experience; they also wrote fewer papers. Seniors reported making less progress in writing clearly and effectively. Seniors were less likely to have classes that emphasized synthesizing ideas and information. Students also reported that their college experience contributed less to areas related to civic engagement, such as participating in elections, contributing to the community, and interacting with and understanding those from different backgrounds.

Targeting these areas of concern, the administration initiated an action plan that began with focus group sessions and surveys in departments and programs across the university. The university-wide Planning and Budget Committee then analyzed these findings and the NSSE results and sent their recommendations to the University Forum, the institution's major representative governing body. The Forum will in return review these suggestions and establish an action plan aimed at addressing these potential weaknesses. The institution featured NSSE data in their accreditation report to demonstrate compliance with the *Middle States Commission's* emphasis on continuous planning and utilization of assessment activities for institutional renewal (*Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation and Institutional Renewal*), highlighting how

they used their data to improve institutional programs and to shape their institutional improvement plan.

## **New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC)**

### **Gordon College: Using NSSE Results to Document Selected General Education Outcomes**

Gordon College, a faith-based undergraduate institution of 1,600 students in Wenham, Massachusetts, used NSSE results as evidence of learning outcomes and general education achievements in their *NEASC* self-study. After developing cross-campus outcome measures entitled ‘Goals for Learners’ and ‘Core Purpose Objectives’ to evaluate general education courses, the College used NSSE results from 2000 and 2001 a locally administered assessment of graduating seniors and new alumni, and other national normative studies of first-year students and seniors to document curricular and co-curricular student learning.

Gordon used NSSE results to demonstrate evidence of *NEASC Standard 4.19* “Graduates successfully completing an undergraduate program demonstrate competence in written and oral communication in English; the ability for scientific and quantitative reasoning, for critical analysis and logical thinking; and the capability for continuing learning. They also demonstrate knowledge and understanding of ...ethical dimensions of humankind.... and an in-depth understanding of an area of knowledge or practice and of its interrelatedness with other areas.”

Gordon specifically used their NSSE results to document an intentional focus on writing across the curriculum. In its self-study, the College reported that 2001 NSSE findings demonstrated first-year students scored considerably higher than comparative institutions on questions about engagement in writing and revision. This finding documented the additional emphasis given to preparing multiple drafts of papers in the College’s First Year Seminars and the effects of faculty attending workshops to enhance writing across the curriculum. These outcomes, in turn, demonstrated how Gordon’s curriculum promoted students’ advanced levels of reflection and analysis.

### **Plymouth State University: Using NSSE as Evidence of Planning and Evaluation**

Plymouth State University (New Hampshire) used their NSSE participation as evidence for *NEASC Standard Two*, which is focused on documenting planning and evaluation efforts within colleges and universities. Plymouth State’s NSSE 2001-2004 results were used as evidence of institutional assessment activities along with their institutional fact book and a consultant review of enrollment management. Further, a University Assessment Task Force inventoried their NSSE results and combined the results with an investigation of assessment best

practices, a review of comparable institutions’ assessment programs, and faculty and staff input on student learning outcomes to develop an administrative structure for Plymouth State’s assessment program.

## **Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)**

### **Self-Study Report Highlights What Southern Utah University Learned from NSSE**

Southern Utah University (SUU) participated in NSSE in 2001 and 2002 and then used the results extensively in their 2003 accreditation self-study. SUU used NSSE to document how students viewed the learning environment. This information informed the development of a new general education curriculum in 2002 and also the planning of a first-year success program for new students in 2003. In assessing their own goals for improvement to present in the self-study report, SUU noticed that on NSSE their students rated themselves lower on measures such as writing clearly and effectively and thinking critically and analytically. As a result, SUU revised its learning objectives for the general education component of its curriculum. In the future, SUU intends to use NSSE results to get more information about the student experience at the departmental level in addition to the institutional level to guide other improvements that will enhance the quality of the undergraduate experience.

Incorporating these directives into efforts to improve student learning mirror the types of human, financial, and physical resources that *NWCCU* considers important in facilitating and enhancing student achievement of program objectives (*Standard 2.A.1*).

## **Portland State University Creates Portfolio for Accreditation**

Administrators at Portland State University (PSU) took a creative route to preparing for an upcoming accreditation self-study. Through use of an online portfolio, PSU was able to create an easily accessible tool for all members of the accreditation committee to track the progress and show how various pieces of the puzzle were fitting together. One important piece used bar graphs to depict how PSU stacks up against its peer institutions in areas measured by NSSE, such as supportive campus environment and the amount of reading and writing reported by first-year students.

## **Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)**

### **Texas A&M International University: NSSE Helps Identify Writing Goals**

Texas A & M International University has been concerned about assessing student writing. The university

developed a local instrument, the University Writing Assessment, that students must pass before graduating. Annual data from this instrument and specific NSSE items related to writing suggested that many students were not developing writing skills the university expected of its college graduates, were not getting the necessary practice in writing, and did not have enough variety in length of writing assignments. The institution determined that the improvement of student writing would be the focus of their Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) in 2005. The institution plans to incorporate its 2001-2004 NSSE data in their self study to demonstrate institutional strengths and organize their QEP and will use NSSE 2004 data as a baseline measure for student writing.

### **Radford University: NSSE and the SACS Quality Enhancement Project**

Radford University (RU) used NSSE as its key assessment tool for the SACS' pilot of the new Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). In 2000, the RU SACS leadership team identified student engagement as the main focus for improvement and decided to use their 2001-2003 NSSE results toward this end. The University organized its QEP around the concept of student engagement using the rationale that engaging students at higher levels will lead to enhanced expectations for student academic performance and learning, which would result in a stronger academic reputation for the institution and an intellectually vibrant learning climate on campus.

### **Agnes Scott College: Use of NSSE in the QEP**

Agnes Scott College's SACS Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) outlined a comprehensive approach to increase intellectual vibrancy on campus by focusing on key aspects in each year of the undergraduate program. These included enriched First Year Seminars, a new Sophomore Year Experience, an expanded Junior Year experience, and the creation of a departmentally based culminating experience for seniors.

NSSE data were used to help identify the focus and features of the QEP and will serve as a baseline from which to measure the success of the interventions once fully implemented. In addition, a variety of measures, including direct and indirect quantitative and qualitative indicators as well as a mix of institutionally administered instruments and nationally normed surveys, will be used to assess the overall effectiveness of the plan. The College is considering different ways to use NSSE over the next few years to further assess the quality of the undergraduate experience and to identify other areas for further improvement. The next administration will be timed to assess the impact of initiatives in the QEP. For example, the 2006 administration of NSSE is intended to examine the experiences of senior students after the capstone courses are fully implemented across the curriculum.

## **Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC)**

### **California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB): Building a Comprehensive Picture of Student Outcomes**

CSUMB had existed only six years before undergoing its first accreditation review. NSSE findings played a critical role in planning for accreditation, as data were used to inform enrollment management, student retention, academic program review, strategic planning, and other initiatives. CSUMB administered NSSE twice prior to their WASC accreditation site visit. As part of the institution's commitment to accountability and to be more transparent to the public, NSSE results were posted to the Office of Institutional Assessment and Research Web site along with the institutional self-study.

NSSE results were used as evidence for several WASC standards and were also included as an electronic appendix to the supportive essay submitted for the institution's Educational Effectiveness Review. For example, NSSE data were used to demonstrate effectiveness for *Standard 2.5: Teaching and Learning*. Individual NSSE items, such as levels of active participation in class and frequency of prompt feedback, were used to show that academic programs actively involve students in learning, challenge them to achieve high expectations, and provide students with appropriate and ongoing feedback about their performance and how it can be improved. Use of NSSE results in institutional planning also provided evidence that responds to *Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement*, which focuses on sustained institutional planning and systematic evaluation.

Finally, NSSE data were used to address specific questions raised by the accreditation review team regarding outcomes data. More specifically, NSSE results were used to corroborate the findings of a CSUMB alumni survey about the influence of the university's core values. Statistically significant, moderate-to-large mean differences between CSUMB NSSE scores and national or system scores were found on the following items:

- Applied, active, and project-based learning
- Multicultural and global perspectives
- Technological sophistication
- Service learning
- Collaboration

These NSSE findings provided additional evidence that CSUMB graduates rated themselves better prepared in selected areas related to personal and professional development than alumni in a national sample. When combined with additional alumni survey results, these

findings provided a more comprehensive response to the Extension of Candidacy WASC team question regarding CSUMB's unique student outcomes. The team found that the CSUMB educational model "does yield unique intended outcomes for students."

### Chapman University: Using NSSE as Evidence of Student Outcomes

Chapman University (CA) featured its NSSE 2003 results in its Institutional Proposal for Self-Study submitted to WASC in preparation for their 2004-05 accreditation visit. The first two goals that grew out of the Self-Study were:

1. conceptions and practices of personalized education, linking the curriculum and class room to the co-curriculum and campus community;
2. conceptions and practices of student writing as an essential skill linking liberal arts, professional education, and general education and the academic major, and institutional capacity for assessment as well as linking learning outcomes assessment, program review, and institutional planning through a shared focus on student learning and educational effectiveness.

To this end, Chapman matched NSSE survey items with identified student outcomes and educational experiences. For example, Chapman's outcome goal of "Psychological-Cognitive" relates to one's ability to reason, write, and speak clearly and effectively.

Matching NSSE items include the extent to which experiences at Chapman contributed to:

- writing clearly and effectively,
- speaking clearly and effectively, and
- thinking critically and analytically.

Other matching items used were the number of:

- assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings
- written papers or reports of 20 pages or more
- written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages, and
- written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages.

Chapman's first two Self-Study goals are a direct response to *Standard 2.2* to address the issue of providing academic programs that ensure development of "core learning abilities and competencies," particularly as they relate to students' verbal and written communication skills, critical thinking, and quantitative skills. The importance of assessment is addressed in many of the stan-

dards, assigning accountability and assessment at many levels, whether it includes institutional resources (*Standard 1.3*), student needs (*Standard 2.10*), or program (*Standard 2.7*) and faculty effectiveness (*Standard 3.3*).

### University of California, Santa Cruz: Using a Series of Surveys to Demonstrate Educational Objectives

UC Santa Cruz (UCSC) used a variety of indicators to demonstrate evidence of WASC *Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions*. By using multiple data points and comparison data, the institution had corroborating evidence for its educational outcomes. UCSC administered a series of surveys the two years prior to creating its Institutional Proposal to measure students' attainment and satisfaction relative to other national research universities and to sister UC campuses.

The institution used its NSSE 2001 data, the University of California Undergraduate Education Survey (SERU21), and a local survey of graduating seniors to demonstrate several educational outcomes. NSSE results showed that UCSC students are substantially more engaged than those in the national cohort on such measures as hours of reading and studying and personal acquaintance with instructors. The University of California Undergraduate Education Survey was used to show that UCSC students report similar aspirations and progress towards those aspirations as students at other UC campuses, but UCSC students give higher assessments than at other campuses on such factors as: active solicitation of feedback, political engagement, advising, social and cultural environment, and overall academic satisfaction. The institution used a local survey of graduating seniors, administered for the first time in spring 2003, to demonstrate remarkably high levels of satisfaction with most aspects of the Santa Cruz experience. Finally, to illustrate the success of UCSC graduates, the institution pointed to a national study demonstrating that a higher percentage of UCSC graduates attend graduate school than any other public research university except UC Berkeley.

NSSE results were also used to identify the programs and practices related to success in graduate school, such as the quality of the senior experience, including the proportion of students who have a culminating experience (which is a UCSC capstone requirement), course work that encourages seniors to demonstrate high-level mastery and synthesis of undergraduate work, and participation in independent research.



## Recent Trends in Accreditation

The following trends in accreditation support the use of student engagement results in assessment and institutional improvement initiatives:

- Campuses and accrediting bodies are moving toward self-studies that systematically over time review existing processes (like strategic planning, program evaluation or student services and enrollment management), as contrasted with one-point-in-time reports that have limited utility.
- Accrediting bodies have shifted away from setting and holding institutions to rigid quantitative standards that feature inputs and resources toward empirically-based indicators of institutional effectiveness and student learning.
- Regional and program accreditors are emphasizing the importance of cultivating “cultures of evidence” that nurture and sustain continuous improvement. Progressive campus leaders increasingly are harnessing the regional re-accreditation process as a “chariot for change.” Rather than viewing the process as a burden or hurdle to be overcome, presidents, provosts, and deans are using the self-study and team visit as an opportunity to stimulate productive dialogue and to guide constructive change.

## Accreditation Tips

### Tip #1:

Student engagement results provided by NSSE are one direct indicator of what students put into their education and an indirect indicator of what they get out of it.

### Tip # 2

NSSE items can be used to analyze the resources and appraise the effectiveness of the institution in fulfilling its mission. Two such measures included in the educational gains items are the extent to which students’ experiences at the institution have: 1) contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in acquiring a broad general education, and 2) helped them develop a personal code of values and ethics. The measurement of these experiences could be used to demonstrate achievement of the institution’s mission and goals.

### Tip #3:

NSSE data are actionable; that is, they point to aspects of student and institutional performance that institutions can address related to the curriculum, pedagogy, instructional emphases, and campus climate. In addition, because NSSE benchmarks allow a school to compare itself to others, the results often point to areas where improvement may be desired.

### Tip #4:

Share NSSE results widely to expand the audience’s view of the accreditation data. Spend time thinking about with whom you will share specific results from your data. For example, Oregon State University has disseminated its NSSE results to relevant student affairs departments, like housing and academic advising, who in turn can use the data to better understand how their students interact with available services.

### Tip #5

The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) measures faculty expectations of student engagement in educational practices that are empirically linked with high levels of learning and development. Taken together, the combination of NSSE and FSSE results can be used to identify areas of strength as well as aspects of the undergraduate experience that may warrant attention and stimulate discussions related to improving teaching, learning, and the quality of students’ educational experience.

### Tip #6:

Share NSSE results with appropriate campus community members to help sharpen their reports to the accreditation team. For example, distribute NSSE results regarding the experience of first-generation and commuter students to academic support services and commuter student offices. Data regarding the degree to which students report the institution helps them cope with non-academic responsibilities and helps them succeed academically and report their satisfaction with advising can be used to demonstrate adequate provision of services to meet students’ learning and personal development needs.


**Tip #7:**

NSSE results regarding the degree to which the institution encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds and the extent to which students report that their experiences at the institution have contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds can be used to demonstrate institutional effectiveness in responding to the increasing diversity in society through educational and co-curricular programs.

Standards in effect as of 1/1/06

NSSE update 5/11/06

Additional copies of this document and Accreditation Toolkits from previous years are available on the NSSE Institute Web Site: [www.nsse.iub.edu/institute](http://www.nsse.iub.edu/institute).

**NSSE Institute for Effective Educational Practice**

Center for Postsecondary Research  
Indiana University Bloomington  
School of Education  
1900 East Tenth Street  
Eigenmann Hall, suite 419  
Bloomington, IN 47406-7512

Phone: 812-856-5824

Fax: 812-856-5150

E-mail: [nsse@indiana.edu](mailto:nsse@indiana.edu)

[www.nsse.iub.edu/institute](http://www.nsse.iub.edu/institute)