EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the winter of 2000 UCSC, along with 275 other four-year colleges and universities, participated in the inaugural launch of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The purpose of this large-scale data collection initiative was to measure institutional educational effectiveness by directly surveying students about the extent of their engagement in a variety of educationally important activities. Major findings from the study include:

- Compared to their peers at other doctoral granting research universities UCSC students appear to be more academically challenged and engaged. For example:
  - Both UCSC freshpersons and seniors reported being assigned a greater number of books and readings in their courses, and first year students were assigned to write a greater number of papers than students at other research universities.
  - The UCSC sample was far more likely than the comparison group to take open-ended essay type exams and less likely to take multiple choice type exams.
  - UCSC students were more likely to report that their coursework emphasized analyzing ideas in depth, synthesizing and organizing information into new and more complex interpretations, and making judgments about the value of information for drawing sound conclusions, and less likely to emphasize rote memorization of facts.
  - Both freshpersons and seniors at UCSC were more likely to have discussed ideas from their readings and classes with faculty members and others outside of class.

- In addition to being highly engaged in their academic programs, UCSC freshpersons were considerably more likely than their counterparts at other institutions to have had serious conversations with students of a different race/ethnicity or of differing beliefs, values, or religions. They also reported that the campus environment was more encouraging of such interactions.

- On-the-other-hand freshpersons at UCSC were significantly less likely to have discussed career plans with faculty or advisors than their peers at similar institutions. Although the differences were not statistically significant, they were also somewhat less likely to have discussed grades or assignments with an instructor, or to have worked with a faculty member on research projects or activities other than coursework.

- Relative to their peers at other research universities, both first year and senior UCSC students felt they had gained fewer computing and information technology skills, and seniors felt they had obtained fewer job or career skills.

- Eighty-two percent of UCSC freshpersons and eighty-six percent of seniors rated their entire educational experience as good or excellent.
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INTRODUCTION

Excellence in undergraduate education is explicit to the mission of UCSC. Indeed, quality undergraduate education historically has been, and remains a distinguishing hallmark of this campus. But how exactly is “quality” defined? Typically, quality ratings, such as those used by the media, focus on student selectivity, resources, and reputation. While these are clearly important measures of an institution, they provide very little useful information to potential students, the public, or the institution itself about the quality of the actual undergraduate educational experience.

Perhaps a better indicator of educational quality is the extent to which institutions contribute to student learning and personal development. Research within the field of education clearly indicates that the best predictor of positive student outcomes in such areas as critical thinking, problem solving, effective communication, and responsible citizenship, is the time and energy that students devote to educationally purposeful activities. Those institutions that provide quality undergraduate education then, are those that most fully engage students in appropriate activities and provide them with meaningful learning experiences. Institutional practices associated with high levels of student engagement include those that encourage high student effort, faculty-student interaction, active learning, and peer cooperation. Also important to student learning are institutional environments where performance expectations are high and clearly articulated, where students receive prompt feedback, and that students perceive as supportive, inclusive, and respectful of diversity.¹

In 1998 The Pew Charitable Trusts convened a group of leaders in higher education to discuss issues of educational quality and assessment. The result was a large-scale data collection initiative, now known as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE was a joint undertaking of the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning and the National Center for Higher Education. It was supported by a 3.3 million dollar grant from the Trusts, and co-sponsored by the Pew Forum on Undergraduate Learning and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Its purpose is to provide information about the extent to which colleges and universities exhibit characteristics and commitments that are empirically associated with good educational practice. To that end the College Student Report (CSR) was designed to directly survey undergraduates about those behaviors and educational experiences that are highly correlated with important learning and developmental outcomes of college.

During the winter of 2000 UC Santa Cruz participated in the first widespread administration of the CSR. Results provided by NSSE allow item-by-item comparisons between UCSC students and their peers at other research universities. Using the aggregated results from the 2000 study, NSSE also established a set of national benchmarks of good educational practice against which UCSC can be compared. The findings from this study are intended for institutional self-assessment and quality improvement. NSSE will not share UCSC specific findings with the media.

¹ References are available from the Office of Planning and Budget, Kerr Hall, University of California Santa Cruz, 95064 (831) 459-2446.
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METHOD

The Instrument
Designed by a team of educational leaders and researchers during 1998, the College Student Report was pilot tested and revised in 1999. The final instrument contains 67 items directly related to student engagement and institutional quality. Specifically the instrument assesses the frequency of respondents’ engagement in a variety of academically relevant activities, the nature of coursework, exams, and assignments, perceptions of institutional support, participation in opportunities such as internships and study abroad, self-evaluations of educational and personal growth, and overall satisfaction.

Procedure
The NSSE was administered by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning. In order to participate, UCSC submitted demographic data for all freshpersons and seniors enrolled during the fall of 1999 and a cover letter to prospective respondents on UCSC stationery from the office of Student Affairs. A random drawing for five $100 gift certificates was offered as an incentive. In February 2000, surveys were sent to 151,910 freshpersons and seniors at 276 participating four-year colleges and universities. Included in the national sample were 350 freshpersons and 350 seniors who were randomly selected from among UCSC’s fall 1999 enrollees. Additional surveys, postcard and e-mail reminders were sent to non-respondents. Respondents had the option of completing the survey on paper or electronically via the World Wide Web.

RESULTS

Respondents
UCSC’s response rate of 48% compared favorably to a 39% rate at other research universities and a 42% rate at all participating universities. Eighty percent of those (90% of seniors and 70% of freshpersons) completed the paper version rather than the electronic version of the survey. Among UCSC respondents, 97% were full-time students, and 57% lived on-campus. Typical of college student surveys, men tended to under respond, comprising only 35% of the UCSC sample. Sixty-six percent of UCSC respondents were White, 16% were Asian American, 13% were Hispanic, 3% were Native American and 2% African American.

The racial/ethnic composition of the UCSC sample closely reflects the racial/ethnic composition of the overall student body. Compared to the national sample, UCSC respondents were considerably more likely to be Asian American or Hispanic and to live on-campus, and less likely to be White or African American.

Comparison to other Research I or Research II Institutions
The 276 institutions that participated in NSSE 2000 are a broad cross-section of public and private four-year colleges and universities that mirror the national profile in terms of region of the country and type of location (i.e., large city, small city, rural). In addition to sector, region, and location, participating institutions were also categorized according to the 1994 Carnegie

---

2 See Appendix A for a list of the National Advisory Board members and Technical Advisory Panel Members.
3 A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix B.
4 Race/ethnicity categories are those used in the 1997 IPEDS data file.
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Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. As a Research University II, UCSC was one of forty-one participating institutions classified as either a Research University I or Research University II. Respondents from the 40 other research universities then, comprised UCSC’s comparison group, while respondents from all of the other 275 colleges and universities comprised the national sample.5

The Means Summary Report is an item-by-item comparison of the UCSC sample both to the comparison group and to the overall national sample.6 Items on which the UCSC mean response differed significantly (at the .001 level) from the mean responses of either the comparison group or the national sample are indicated with an asterisk. The magnitude of each of the significant differences is indicated by the associated effect size. Effect sizes of less than .5 are typically considered small, while those between .5 and .8 are considered moderate, and those greater than .8 indicate large differences.

Results of the comparisons between UCSC and the research universities comparison group are summarized below. Because research universities share important features such as educational mission, student characteristics, and size, among others, they provide the most useful information about the relative quality of UCSC. Therefore, although the data allow comparisons between UCSC and the national sample, only comparisons to the other research universities are discussed.

Unless otherwise noted, differences in patterns of engagement between UCSC students and their peers at other research universities are based on statistically significant differences with relatively small effect sizes. In essence small effect sizes mean that there was considerable variability between individual students in how they responded to the survey, and only a relatively small amount of that variability is attributable to where they attended school. It should be noted that small effect sizes are normative in social scientific survey research of this kind. They should not be interpreted to mean that “average” differences between UCSC students and their peers at other institutions are negligible, but rather that despite the fact that many factors contribute to an individual student’s engagement, there are some real dimensions of engagement that distinguish UCSC students from their peers. This is especially true when statistically significant differences in individual items create meaningful patterns.

A myriad of ways that students use the time and opportunities afforded by college attendance can reasonably be considered important indicators of student engagement. In order to identify meaningful patterns of engagement, differences and similarities between UCSC students and their peers in the comparison group are organized according to dimensions underlying clusters of related items.

Academic Engagement. Academic engagement refers to the degree to which students are involved in mastery of course material and development of academic competencies. Institutional practices that encourage academic engagement are those that emphasize a high level of academic rigor. Compared to their peers, UCSC students appear to be more academically engaged. For example, both UCSC freshpersons and seniors reported being assigned a greater number of books and readings in their courses, and first year students were assigned to write a greater

---

5 A list of participating institutions categorized by the 1994 classifications is presented in Appendix C.
6 The Means Summary Report was prepared by NSSE and is attached in Appendix D.
number of papers than students at other research universities. In addition to greater amounts of reading and writing, the UCSC sample was far more likely than the comparison group to take open-ended essay type exams and less likely to take multiple choice type exams. Furthermore, they were more likely to report that their coursework emphasized analyzing ideas in depth, synthesizing and organizing information into new and more complex interpretations, and making judgments about the value of information for drawing sound conclusions, and less likely to emphasize rote memorization of facts.

**Intellectual Engagement.** The extent to which students participate in the world of ideas outside of the formal curriculum is another measure of the quality of students’ educational experiences. Again, compared to students at other research institutions UCSC students appear to be more involved. Both freshpersons and seniors at UCSC were more likely to have discussed ideas from their readings and classes with faculty members outside of class. They also reported more discussion of ideas with others outside of their classes (i.e., students, family members, co-workers.) Seventy-five percent of first year students at UCSC engaged “often” or “very often” in discussion of class ideas with others, compared to only 56% of their peers. UCSC freshpersons were also significantly more likely to have had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity, and with students of differing religious, political, and personal beliefs.

**Academic Effort.** Academic effort has been strongly linked to first-year persistence. In this survey, effort was gauged by how often students had rewritten papers, worked harder than they believed possible, or come to class unprepared. On these items, UCSC students were similar to their peer group. UCSC seniors did however, report spending more time studying, reading, writing, or preparing for class than did seniors at other research universities. The most common response among UCSC seniors (23%) was that they spent 11-15 hours per week, whereas the most common response among the comparison group (24%) was that they spent 6-10 hours.

**Faculty-Student Interaction.** With the exception that they were more likely to have discussed ideas with faculty outside of class, UCSC seniors interacted with faculty similarly to their peers at other research institutions. They were also equally likely to have received prompt feedback. Fifty percent indicated that faculty feedback on their work was prompt “often” or “very often,” while only eight percent reported that it “never” was.

Like seniors, UCSC freshpersons had discussed ideas with faculty outside of class more often than freshpersons at other research universities, but they had talked with faculty or advisors about career plans significantly less often. Forty-seven percent of UCSC first year students had never done so, and 37% only occasionally had. And although the differences were not statistically significant, they were also somewhat less likely to have discussed grades or assignments with an instructor, or to have worked with a faculty member on research or other activities besides coursework. For example, 88% had never worked with faculty on a research project, and 9% had done so only occasionally.

**Peer Interactions.** These survey questions centered on cooperative learning activities among students. In general, UCSC students were similar to their peers at other research universities. However, UCSC seniors were a little less likely to work with other students on projects during class, or to make class presentations than seniors at other research universities.
Involvement in Extra-Curricular Activities. The extent to which students are engaged in recreational activities (i.e., relaxing, sports, informal socializing, fraternities/sororities, etc.), as well as the extent of their engagement in activities from outside the student role (i.e., caring for dependents, working for pay on or off campus, etc.) are also related to student outcomes. In terms of extra-curricular involvements, UCSC students were similar to their research university peers. They spent the same amount of time, relaxing, socializing, working off campus, and caring for dependents. Two exceptions were that UCSC seniors were less likely to work off campus than the comparison group seniors, and first year UCSC students were less likely to be engaged in co-curricular activities than their peers. The latter finding may be an artifact of the fact that UCSC has relatively few intercollegiate sports teams and almost no fraternal organizations.

Engagement with Information Technology. Although the relationship between information technology and educational outcomes has not been empirically established, it is difficult to imagine that knowledge of information technologies is not associated with important outcomes. Comparison of UCSC students to students at other Universities suggests that UCSC may not compare favorably. Although the frequency of e-mail use was similar, UCSC seniors were less likely to have used an electronic medium such as e-mail or list-serves to discuss or complete an assignment than their counterparts. Both UCSC seniors and freshpersons perceived that their education had contributed less to their ability to use information and computing technologies than did students at other research universities.

Practical Career Preparation. For many students and parents career preparation is an important function of a college education. As mentioned above, UCSC freshpersons were less likely to talk to a faculty member or an advisor about their career plans than were freshpersons in the comparison group. Relative to their peers, seniors at UCSC were less likely to report that their educations had contributed to the acquisition of job skills, and that they had learned to work well with others. Based on these results alone it is impossible to know if these patterns of engagement reflect the institutional practices and culture of UCSC, or if they are related to the types of students that choose to attend UCSC.

Satisfaction. Overall UCSC students were satisfied with their educational experience. Most UCSC freshpersons (82%) and seniors (86%) rated their educational experience as either "good" or “excellent.” Seniors, however, were more likely to rate their experience as “excellent” than were first year students (44% vs. 23% respectively). About 42% of seniors, and 35% of freshpersons said they “definitely” would come to UCSC if they could start over again. There is no way to determine from this data whether seniors’ greater satisfaction than freshpersons’ is attributable to greater rates of persistence among the satisfied, or to a growth of satisfaction among the persistent. There were no significant differences in satisfaction between UCSC and other research university students.

Comparison to National Benchmarks

In addition to reporting item-by-item comparisons, NSSE also established a set of national benchmarks corresponding to five broad domains of effective educational practice. They are: (a) level of academic challenge, (b) active and collaborative learning, (c) student interactions with faculty members, (d) enriching educational experiences, and (e) supportive campus environment.
Forty of the 67 items from the CSR that directly measured student engagement in educationally important activities were grouped into clusters of similar items to create the benchmarks.\(^7\)

UCSCs’ benchmark scores were derived by aggregating students’ responses to the questions comprising each of the benchmarks and transforming them into scores on 100-point scales. Scores were calculated separately for freshmen and seniors. The relative performance of UCSC on the benchmarks can be gauged by comparing them to the aggregated scores of either the overall NSSE 2000 sample or the comparison group. Subsequent to the release of the initial item-by-item analyses but prior to the establishment of the national benchmarks, the Carnegie Classification system was revised. According to the 2000 classifications UCSC is a Doctoral/ Research University-Extensive (Doctoral-Extensive), thus the appropriate comparison group is comprised of the 46 universities likewise classified.\(^8\)

Table 1 presents UCSC’s scores for first-year students in bold font and for seniors in regular font, along with the overall NSSE 2000 and Doctoral-Extensive scores. Standard scores indicate the distance of UCSC scores above or below the Doctoral-Extensive mean in standard deviation units, while percentile ranks indicate the percentage of Doctoral-Extensive institutions that scored at or below UCSC.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>Doctoral-Extensive</th>
<th>NSSE 2000</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Percentile Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of Academic Challenge</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active and Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Interactions with Faculty</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enriching Educational Experiences</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>+1.2</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Campus Environment</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>+0.4</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^7\) The specific items from the CSR comprising each of the benchmarks are listed in Appendix E. 
\(^8\) The 46 Doctoral-Extensive institutions are listed in Appendix F.
Overall UCSC’s highest benchmark scores were in the area of academic challenge, which represents the nature and amount of coursework, the complexity of cognitive tasks, and the standards faculty use to evaluate students. Freshpersons and seniors scored at the 88th and 90th percentiles respectively, suggesting that across the college career UCSC provides a substantially more challenging undergraduate experience than the majority of its Doctoral-Extensive peer institutions. Indeed, UCSC scores on this benchmark were above the means for all other types of institutions except for Liberal Arts Colleges, which overall evidenced the highest level of academic challenge, particularly with respect to writing. Analysis of the items contributing to this benchmark indicate that, particularly for first year students, high scores were strongly related to the challenging nature of coursework.

First year students also scored notably high (at the 88th percentile) on the enriching educational experiences benchmark, which measured involvement in a variety of learning opportunities both inside and outside the classroom that complement the goals of the academic program. A large component of this benchmark had to do with exposure to diversity (i.e., interacting with students of a different race/ethnicity or with differing political opinions, values, and beliefs, and a campus environment that encourages such contact). The relatively high frequency with which freshpersons interacted with students different than themselves accounted for their high score on this benchmark. Seniors on the other hand appear to have a more typical exposure (scoring at the 51st percentile) to such experiences.

UCSC earned its lowest benchmark scores in the area of student-faculty interactions, with seniors scoring right at the 50th percentile and first year students scoring well below the mean at just the 21st percentile. Item-by-item analysis of the questions contributing to this benchmark suggest that the especially low score for freshpersons was largely the result of how infrequently they had discussed career plans with a faculty member or an advisor. Forty-seven percent of UCSC freshpersons reported having never talked about their career plans with faculty or advisors, compared to only twenty-seven percent of freshpersons at other research universities. They were also slightly less likely to have discussed grades or assignments with an instructor, to have worked with a faculty member on a research project, or to have worked with faculty on activities other than coursework, however these differences were not statistically significant. It should be noted that across all types of institutions this benchmark score was the lowest of the five, and student-faculty contact was least frequent at doctorate-granting institutions.

In the domain of active and collaborative learning, UCSC students were fairly similar to students at other Doctoral-Extensive universities, scoring at or slightly above the mean. Overall however, doctorate-granting institutions scored the lowest on this benchmark, despite the fact that these larger schools may be the very institutions where active and collaborative learning approaches are most needed to compensate for the anonymity and passivity that can characterize large and impersonal learning environments.

Across all types of institutions the highest of the five benchmark scores was for supportive campus environment. Most students, including those at UCSC, rated their schools as supportive and responsive. While slightly above the mean, UCSC’s scores at the 66th percentile were within the typical range of Doctoral-Extensive scores.
DISCUSSION

The most encouraging finding of this survey is that in comparison to similar institutions UCSC provides an academically challenging undergraduate education. UCSC students were assigned more reading, and first year students did more writing than is typical at other research universities. Coursework emphasized critical thinking and in-depth analysis, and students here were more likely to discuss ideas from their courses with faculty and others outside of class. The University of California Santa Cruz was founded on a mission to provide a liberal arts type education at a public university. That legacy is apparent in the results of this survey. As the campus begins a period of mandated growth, particularly in graduate education, it is imperative that undergraduate students continue to be engaged in an academically challenging curriculum if UCSC is to sustain its “uncommon commitment to undergraduate education.”

In addition to being highly engaged in their academic programs, UCSC freshpersons also reported that the climate on campus encourages frequent contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds. They were considerably more likely than their counterparts at other institutions to have had serious conversations with students of a different race/ethnicity or of differing beliefs, values, or religions. It appears that there is something about the first year experience at UCSC that encourages the kind of exposure to diversity that enriches the educational experience. It seems likely that the difference between freshpersons and seniors in this area is related to the first year college core courses. It may also be that living on-campus contributed to first year students’ exposure to diversity.

Perhaps the most disappointing finding of this study is that during their first year at UCSC students engaged with faculty less than they might. This is particularly true with respect to discussing career plans, but is somewhat true of other types of interactions as well. It appears that career preparation may not be a strong feature of a UCSC education. Both first year students and seniors felt that they gained fewer computing and information technology skills, and seniors felt they had obtained fewer job or career skills than students at other research universities. These differences may reflect the inclinations of UCSC students, or they may indicate an institutional tendency to place less priority on these areas.

UCSC is participating in the NSSE again in 2001. The CSR was distributed to new classes of freshpersons and seniors in February of this year. If similar patterns of student engagement emerge we can have greater confidence that the results provide meaningful information about the nature of the undergraduate educational experience at UCSC. It is hoped that these findings will be used to inform campus-wide discussions of educational effectiveness, to identify strengths and weaknesses of the UCSC undergraduate curriculum, and to develop strategic plans for addressing weaknesses and enhancing strengths.
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**APPENDIX B**

## The College Student Report

Who knows more than you do about the quality of your education? But it's usually administrators, faculty members, and others that make the big decisions about your college. Missing is the student voice -- information from people like you about what actually happens inside and outside the classroom and what you think about it. The College Student Report takes only about 15 minutes to complete. It's part of a national effort to improve college quality. What you and other students say will also be used to help your school get better.

After completing The Report, please put it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope and deposit in any U.S. Postal Service mailbox. If you have any questions about the survey, please e-mail help@collegereport.org or call 1-800-676-0390. Thank you!

### COLLEGE ACTIVITIES

**DIRECTIONS:** In your experience at this institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor or other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a class presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewrote a paper or assignment several times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came to class unprepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with other students on projects <em>during class</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with classmates <em>outside of class</em> to prepare class assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored or taught other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used an electronic medium (e-mail, list serve, chat group, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your reading or classes with faculty members outside of class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with a faculty member on a research project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student-life activities, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your reading or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious conversations with other students whose religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values were very different from yours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX B

**DIRECTIONS:** During this current school year, about how much reading and writing did you do?

- Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings
- Number of books read on your own (not assigned)
- Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more
- Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 20 pages

Mark the oval that best represents the nature of the examinations you have taken this year at this institution:

- Mostly multiple-choice or short-answer
- Mostly essay or open-ended problems

**During the current school year, to what extent has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?**

- Memorizing facts, ideas or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form
- Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience or theory such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components
- Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships
- 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
- Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations

**During the current school year, about how many hours do you spend in a typical week doing each of the following?**

- Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, and other activities related to your academic program)
- Working for pay on campus
- Working for pay off campus
- Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, social fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)
- Relaxing and socializing (watching TV, partying, exercising, playing games, etc.)
- Providing care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)

**In thinking about your undergraduate program as a whole (including your major or expected major), which of the following have you done or plan to do before you graduate from this institution? Fill in the oval that best describes your situation.**

- Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment
- Community service or volunteer work
- Interdisciplinary coursework
- Foreign language coursework
- Study abroad
- Independent study or self-designed major
- Culminating senior experience (comprehensive exam, capstone course, thesis, project, etc.)
### EDUCATIONAL AND PERSONAL GROWTH

To what extent has your college education contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite a Bit</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring a broad general education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing quantitative problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using computing and information technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting in elections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning effectively on your own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being honest and truthful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the welfare of your community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPINIONS ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL

Thinking about your experience at this institution during the current school year, to what extent does your college emphasize each of the following?

- Spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work
- Providing the support you need to help you succeed academically
- Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds
- Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)
- Providing the support you need to thrive socially

Again, thinking about your experience at this institution this year, fill in the oval that best represents the quality of the relationships among people that are typical at this college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationships with other students</th>
<th>Unfriendly, Unsupportive, Sense of Alienation</th>
<th>Friendly, Supportive, Sense of Belonging</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with faculty members</td>
<td>Unavailable, Unhelpful, Unsympathetic</td>
<td>Available, Helpful, Sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with administrative personnel and offices</td>
<td>Unhelpful, Inconsiderate, Rigid</td>
<td>Helpful, Considerate, Flexible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?
- Excellent
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?
- Definitely yes
- Probably yes
- Probably no
- Definitely no
APPENDIX C

NSSE 2000 Participating Institutions Categorized by the 1994 Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education

Carnegie Classification 1994: Research University I
Georgia Institute of Technology
Indiana University, Bloomington
Iowa State University
Michigan State University
New Mexico State University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Oregon State University
Pennsylvania State University
State University of New York at Buffalo
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Temple University
University of Alabama at Birmingham
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Florida
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Iowa
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of Missouri, Columbia
University of New Mexico
University of Pittsburgh
University of Texas at Austin
University of Utah
University of Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth University
West Virginia University

Carnegie Classification 1994: Research University II
Brigham Young University
Kent State University
Ohio University
Oklahoma State University
Rice University
Syracuse University
Tulane University
University of Arkansas
University of California, Santa Cruz
University of Idaho
University of Mississippi
University of Wyoming
Washington State University

University of California, Santa Cruz
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Carnegie Classification 1994: Doctoral Universities I
Adelphi University
American University
Bowling Green State University
Catholic University of America
Drexel University
Loyola University, Chicago
Miami University
Northern Illinois University
Polytechnic University
University of Missouri, Kansas City
University of Texas at Dallas

Carnegie Classification 1994: Doctoral Universities II
Clark University
George Mason University
Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis
North Dakota State University
Pepperdine University
Seton Hall University
State University of New York College of Environmental Science and Forestry
University of Maryland, Baltimore
University of Massachusetts, Lowell
University of Missouri, St. Louis
University of Montana
University of North Dakota
University of South Dakota

Carnegie Classification 1994: Master’s Universities and Colleges I
Abilene Christian University
Adams State College
Alaska Pacific University
Appalachian State University
Aurora University
Austin Peay State University
Baruch College of the City University of New York
Boise State University
Brenau University
Brooklyn College of the City University of New York
Butler University
California State University, Bakersfield
California State University, Los Angeles
California State University, San Bernardino
California State University, San Marcos
Canisius College
City College of the City University of New York
College of Charleston
College of New Jersey
College of St. Scholastica
College of Staten Island of the City University New York
Dominican University
Drake University
Eastern Kentucky University
Edgewood College

University of California, Santa Cruz
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Carnegie Classification 1994: Master’s Universities and Colleges I (cont.)
Elmira College
Framingham State College
Georgia College & State University
Georgia Southwestern State University
Hunter College of the City University of New York
Indiana University Northwest
Indiana University Southeast
Indiana Wesleyan University
Kean University
La Salle University
Lehman College of the City University of New York
Lewis University
Loyola College, Maryland
Loyola University, New Orleans
Madonna University
Marshall University
Marywood University
Meredith College
Monmouth University
Montclair State University
Moorhead State University, Minnesota
Morehead State University, Kentucky
Northeastern Illinois University
Northern Michigan University
Northwestern State University of Louisiana
Norwich University
Olivet Nazarene University
Our Lady of the Lake University
Pacific Lutheran University
Queens College of the City University of New York
Radford University
Rockhurst University
Sacred Heart University
Saint Francis College
Saint Michael's College
Saint Xavier University
Salisbury State University
Samford University
Santa Clara University
Seattle Pacific University
Slippery Rock University
South Dakota State University
Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville
Southwest Texas State University
Suffolk University
Towson University
Truman State University
University of Central Arkansas
University of Dubuque
University of Massachusetts, Boston
University of Massachusetts, Dartmouth
University of Minnesota Duluth
University of North Carolina, Wilmington

University of California, Santa Cruz
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Carnegie Classification 1994: Master’s Universities and Colleges I (cont.)
University of Richmond
University of Texas at Brownsville
University of Texas at El Paso
University of Texas at San Antonio
University of Texas at Tyler
University of Texas of the Permian Basin
University of Texas-Pan American
University of Wisconsin, La Crosse
University of Wisconsin, Stout
Villanova University
William Carey College
William Paterson University of New Jersey

Carnegie Classification 1994: Master's Universities and Colleges II
Baker University
California State University, Monterey Bay
College of Notre Dame of Maryland
College of St. Catherine
Eastern College
Elon College
Indiana University, Kokomo
Longwood College
MidAmerica Nazarene University
North Central College
Pfeiffer University
Point Loma Nazarene University
Southern Arkansas University
St. Edward's University
University of Maryland, Eastern Shore
University of Southern Indiana
University of Wisconsin, Green Bay
Weber State University

Carnegie Classification 1994: Baccalaureate Colleges I
Antioch College
Beloit College
Bucknell University
Centre College
Colgate University
College of Wooster
Connecticut College
Denison University
DePauw University
Earlham College
Eckerd College
Franklin & Marshall College
Gordon College
Goucher College
Gustavus Adolphus College
Hampden-Sydney College
Hastings College
Houghton College

University of California, Santa Cruz
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Carnegie Classification 1994: Baccalaureate Colleges I (cont.)
Judson College (AL)
Juniata College
Lafayette College
Lake Forest College
Lawrence University
Macalester College
Nebraska Wesleyan University
Occidental College
Ohio Wesleyan University
Presbyterian College of South Carolina
Randolph-Macon Woman's College
Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
Salem College
Spelman College
St. Lawrence University
Sweet Briar College
University of North Carolina, Asheville
University of Puget Sound
University of the South
Ursinus College
Virginia Wesleyan College
Wabash College
Wartburg College
Wesleyan College of Georgia
William Jewell College

Carnegie Classification 1994: Baccalaureate Colleges II
Albertson College of Idaho
Alvernia College
Asbury College
Augustana College
Barton College
Bloomfield College
Carroll College
Cedar Crest College
Cedarville College
Columbia College of South Carolina
Columbia College of Chicago
Concordia University
Covenant College
Davis & Elkins College
Elmhurst College
Evergreen State College
Franklin Pierce College
Graceland College
Greenville College
Grove City College
Holy Family College
Howard Payne University
Indiana University East
John Brown University
Judson College of Illinois
Lee University

University of California, Santa Cruz
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Carnegie Classification 1994: Baccalaureate Colleges II (cont.)
Lees-McRae College
Marymount College
Marymount Manhattan College
Medgar Evers College of the City University of New York
Millikin University
Mount Mary College
Northland College
Ohio State University at Mansfield
Ramapo College of New Jersey
Regis College
Roanoke College
Saint Vincent College
Stillman College
Susquehanna University
Texas Lutheran University
Trinity Christian College
Unity College
University of Maine at Farmington
University of the Ozarks
Ursuline College
Waynesburg College
West Virginia University Institute of Technology
Wilmington College
York College of Pennsylvania
York College of the City University of New York
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### APPENDIX D

#### COLLEGE ACTIVITIES: Academic, Intellectual, and Social Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>Research I &amp; II</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Var. Name</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your reading or classes with faculty members outside of class</td>
<td>FACIDEAS</td>
<td>1st Yr.</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from your reading or classes with faculty members outside of class</td>
<td>FACIDEAS</td>
<td>1st Yr.</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student-life activities, etc.)</td>
<td>FACOTHER</td>
<td>1st Yr.</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with a faculty member on a research project</td>
<td>FACRESCH</td>
<td>1st Yr.</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance</td>
<td>FACFEED</td>
<td>1st Yr.</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor</td>
<td>FACGRADE</td>
<td>1st Yr.</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed ideas from reading or classes with others outside of class</td>
<td>FACIDEAS</td>
<td>1st Yr.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T-tests: institution vs. comparison group means (without your institution's data), 2-tailed, p<0.001.

T-tests: institution and national means (without your institution's data), 2-tailed, p<0.001.
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### APPENDIX D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>UCSC Mean</th>
<th>Research I &amp; II Mean</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Cooperation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Yr.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1st Yr.</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1st Yr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with other students on projects during class</td>
<td>CLASSGRP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made a class presentation</td>
<td>CLPRESN</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments</td>
<td>OCCGRP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course</td>
<td>COMMPSST</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutored or taught other students</td>
<td>TUTOR</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>UCSC Mean</th>
<th>Research I &amp; II Mean</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used e-mail to communicate with an instructor or other students</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used an electronic medium (e-mail, list-serve, chat group, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment</td>
<td>ITACADEM</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Academic Effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>UCSC Mean</th>
<th>Research I &amp; II Mean</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations</td>
<td>WORKHARD</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewrote a paper or assignment several times</td>
<td>RERWROPAP</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came to class unprepared</td>
<td>UNPREP</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. T-tests: institution vs. comparison group means (without your institution's data); 2-tailed, p<0.001.
2. T-tests: institution and national means (without your institution’s data); 2-tailed, p<0.05.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>Research I &amp; II</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Activities: Academic, Intellectual, and Social Experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length</td>
<td>READASGN</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>packs of course readings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of books read on your own (not assigned)</td>
<td>READOWN</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more</td>
<td>WRITEMOR</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 20 pages</td>
<td>WRITEFEW</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character of Mental Learning Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorizing facts, ideas or methods from your courses and</td>
<td>MEMORIZE</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reading so you can repeat them in pretty much the same</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience or</td>
<td>ANALYZE</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theory such as examining a particular case or situation in</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depth and considering its components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or</td>
<td>SYNTESZ</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experiences into new, more complex interpretations and</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making judgments about the value of information,</td>
<td>EVALUATE</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arguments, or methods such as examining how others</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of their conclusions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in</td>
<td>APPLYING</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new situations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T-tests: Institution vs. comparison group means (without your institution's data), 2-tailed, p<0.001.
* T-tests: Institution and national means (without your institution's data), 2-tailed, p<0.001.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>Research I &amp; II</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COLLEGE ACTIVITIES: Academic, Intellectual, and Social Experiences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of the examinations taken this year at this institution</td>
<td>EXAMST</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, lab work, rehearsal, etc., related to your academic program)</td>
<td>ACADPREP</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, social fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)</td>
<td>COCURRIC</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working for pay on campus</td>
<td>WORKON</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working for pay off campus</td>
<td>WORKOFF</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxing and socializing (watching TV, partying, stretching, playing games, etc.)</td>
<td>SOCIAL</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing care for dependents living with you (parents, children, spouse, etc.)</td>
<td>CAREDEPD</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The response type for the items in this section of the College Student Report is categorical. Refer to frequency data for comparative results.

*T-tests: institution vs. comparison group means (without your institution's data), 2-tailed, p<0.001.

4-T-test: institution and national means (without your institution's data), 2-tailed, p<0.001.
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## APPENDIX D

### EDUCATIONAL AND PERSONAL GROWTH

#### Personal and Social Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>Research I &amp; II</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being honest and truthful</td>
<td>GNTRUTH</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding yourself</td>
<td>GNSELF</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding people of other racial</td>
<td>GNDIVERS</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the welfare of your</td>
<td>GNCOMMUN</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting in elections</td>
<td>GNOTIZN</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning effectively on your own</td>
<td>GNINQ</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with others</td>
<td>GNOTHERS</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### General Education Gains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>Research I &amp; II</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
<td>Sig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effect Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>GNWRIT</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td>GNSPEAK</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td>GNCRIT</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring a broad general education</td>
<td>GNGENLED</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*T-tests: institution vs. comparison group means (without your institution's data); 2-tailed, p<0.001.

*T-tests: institution and national means (without your institution's data); 2-tailed, p<0.001.
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#### APPENDIX D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>Research I &amp; II</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATIONAL AND PERSONAL GROWTH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Career-Related Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing quantitative problems</td>
<td>GNQUANT</td>
<td>1st Yr 2.45</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior 2.73</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using computing and information technology</td>
<td>GCOMPUT</td>
<td>1st Yr 2.49</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior 2.54</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td>GNWORK</td>
<td>1st Yr 2.23</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior 2.53</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OPINIONS ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Emphasis</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>UCSC</th>
<th>Research I &amp; II</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socializing significant amounts of time studying and on academic work</td>
<td>ENVSCHO</td>
<td>1st Yr 2.86</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior 3.07</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing the support you need to help you succeed</td>
<td>ENVSUPRT</td>
<td>1st Yr 2.78</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior 2.68</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and</td>
<td>ENVINTER</td>
<td>1st Yr 2.74</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>racial or ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior 2.14</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family,</td>
<td>ENVNACAD</td>
<td>1st Yr 2.07</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior 1.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing the support you need to thrive socially</td>
<td>ENVSOCIAL</td>
<td>1st Yr 2.46</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Senior 1.95</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*T-tests: institution vs. comparison group means (without your institution's data), 2-tailed, \(p<0.001\).

*T-tests: institution and national means (without your institution's data), 2-tailed, \(p<0.001\).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Var. Name</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>UCSC Mean</th>
<th>Research I &amp; II Mean</th>
<th>National Mean</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OPINIONS ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with other students</td>
<td>ENVSU</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Yr</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with faculty members</td>
<td>ENVFAC</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Yr</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships with administrative personnel</td>
<td>ENFAH</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and offices</td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Yr</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Educational Satisfaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?</td>
<td>ENTIREXP</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Yr</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?</td>
<td>ENFAH</td>
<td>1st Yr</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Yr</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T-tests: institution vs. comparison group means (without your institution's data); 2-tailed, p<0.001.

* T-tests: institution and national means (without your institution's data); 2-tailed, p<0.001.
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CSR Items Comprising Each of the Five Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice

Level of Academic Challenge:
- Time spent preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, and other activities related to your academic program).
- Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings.
- Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more.
- Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 20 pages.
- Coursework emphasizes: Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory.
- Coursework emphasizes: Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences.
- Coursework emphasizes: Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods.
- Coursework emphasizes: Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.
- Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations.
- Campus environment emphasizes spending significant amounts of time studying and on academic work.

Active and Collaborative Learning:
- Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions.
- Made a class presentation.
- Worked with other students on projects during class.
- Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments.
- Tutored or taught other students.
- Participated in community-based project as part of a regular course.
- Discussed ideas from your reading or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.).

Student Interactions with Faculty Members:
- Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor.
- Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor.
- Discussed ideas from your reading or classes with faculty members outside of class.
- Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student-life activities, etc.).
- Received prompt feedback from faculty on your academic performance.
- Worked with a faculty member on a research project.

Enriching Educational Experiences:
- Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, publications, student government, sports, etc.).
- Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment.
- Community service or volunteer work.
- Foreign language coursework and study abroad.
- Independent study or self-designed major.
- Culminating senior experience (comprehensive exam, capstone course, thesis, project, etc.).
- Had serious conversations with students with religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values very different from yours.
- Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own.
- Used an electronic medium (e-mail, list serve, chat group, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment.
- Campus environment encourages contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds.
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Supportive Campus Environment:

- Campus environment emphasizes providing the support you need to help you succeed academically.
- Campus environment emphasizes helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.).
- Campus environment emphasizes providing the support you need to thrive socially.
- Quality of relationships with other students.
- Quality of relationships with faculty members.
- Quality of relationships with administrative personnel and offices.
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NSSE 2000 Participating Institutions Categorized by the 2000 Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education as Doctoral/Research Universities-Extensive

American University
Brigham Young University
Catholic University of America
Georgia Institute of Technology
Indiana University, Bloomington
Iowa State University
Kent State University
Loyola University, Chicago
Michigan State University
New Mexico State University
Northern Illinois University
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
Ohio University
Oklahoma State University
Oregon State University
Pennsylvania State University
Rice University
State University of New York at Buffalo
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Syracuse University
Temple University
Tu!ane University
University of Alabama at Birmingham
University of Arkansas
University of California, Santa Cruz
University of Colorado at Boulder
University of Florida
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Idaho
University of Iowa
University of Maryland, College Park
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
University of Mississippi
University of Missouri, Columbia
University of New Mexico
University of Pittsburgh
University of Texas at Austin
University of Utah
University of Virginia
University of Wyoming
Virginia Commonwealth University
Washington State University
West Virginia University

University of California, Santa Cruz