

Executive Summary
for the 2022 Administration of the
National Survey of Student Engagement
(NSSE)



2022 NSSE Ad-hoc Committee

Brandi Jones, Chair, *Director of Assessment*
Jalon Berry, *Assistant Director of Inclusion Initiatives*
Mary Catherine Breen, *Executive Director, Academic Success Center*
Jessica Collier, *Associate Director of Assessment*
Meredith Conrey, *Director of Leadership Initiatives*
Kelbi Delaune, *Coordinator of Student Engagement, ORSP*
Brenda Fernandez, *Associate Director, ASC/First-Year Experience*
Taylor Morrison, *Coordinator, Academic Community Engagement*

March 3, 2023

2022 NSSE Executive Summary

The NSSE is administered at SHSU on a three-year cycle, with the Spring 2022 administration being the third administration. The survey results provide robust information about student learning, engagement, and perceptions of campus experiences. This executive summary provides highlights from the longer summary report, which also provides descriptions of the referenced comparison groups (IPEDS, Texas Public, and UG Research).

Student Satisfaction with SHSU

The NSSE captured generally positive student perceptions of institutional quality.

- Approximately 82% of first-year students and 84% of senior students evaluated their entire educational experience at SHSU as being *good* or *excellent*.
- When asked if they would attend the same institution they are now attending if they could start over again, approximately 82% of first-year students and 81% of senior students selected *probably yes* or *definitely yes*.

The percentages for 2022 were slightly lower than those for 2019. However, the 2022 results were similar to those of comparison groups.

High-Impact Practices

NSSE asks students about their participation in six HIPs: service-learning, learning community, research with faculty, internship or field experience, study abroad, and culminating senior experience (e.g., senior project or thesis, portfolio, comprehensive exam, etc.).

- 53% of first-year students reported participating in at least one HIP, which is equal to or greater than comparison groups.
- 74% of senior students participated in at least one HIP, which is significantly less than students in the IPEDS and UG Research groups. Only 38% participated in two or more.

Data from each of the NSSE administrations (2016, 2019, 2022) revealed that SHSU student participation in HIPs remains an area for improvement. Recommendations for selected HIPs are provided below:

- **Service-Learning:** Raise overall awareness of opportunities, provide education about what the opportunities entail, provide additional assistance for students with outside obligations (family, work, etc.), and support faculty to integrate ACE into more first-year courses.
- **Learning Community:** Identify courses where students would benefit from co-enrollment and expand learning communities beyond the first year.
- **Research with Faculty:** Raise awareness of research opportunities, what research entails, and the benefits of participation.
- **Culminating Senior Experience:** Place an emphasis on increasing these experiences across disciplines.

Participation rates for different groups were examined to provide insight into how engagement varies within SHSU's population. One notable difference is that only 9% of first-generation students participated in a learning community, compared to 13% of continuing generation.

Inclusiveness & Engagement with Diversity

The perceptions of both first-year and senior students at SHSU were statistically significantly higher than students at other institutions on several questions within this module, indicating that inclusiveness and engagement with diversity were strengths for both student populations.

The only item where SHSU students' average was significantly lower than the comparison group was senior responses to how often they reflected on their cultural identity during the current school year. Although the differences were not statistically significant, first-year students' responses regarding whether SHSU provides a supportive environment for the following forms of diversity were slightly lower than responses of students at other institutions: gender identity and sexual orientation. It is recommended that the campus community places a greater emphasis on student identity.

Student Engagement (Engagement Indicators)

Engagement indicators provide summaries based on sets of questions examining key dimensions of student engagement. There are 10 indicators, organized within four broad themes: *Academic Challenge*, *Learning with Peers*, *Experiences with Faculty*, and *Campus Environment*. Key strengths and areas for improvement are provided below.

Key Strengths

- **Learning with Peers:** First-year students and seniors responded that they *often* or *very often* engaged in collaborative learning at rates equivalent to or higher than the IPEDS and Texas Public groups. Within the area of *Discussions with Diverse Others*, first-year and senior students at SHSU reported higher rates than all comparison groups for all items.
- **Campus Environment:** First-year and senior students responded that the institution provided a *Supportive Environment* (e.g., providing support to help students academically, using learning support services) at rates higher than those of all three comparison groups.

Areas for Improvement

- **Academic Challenge:** Within this theme, the indicator showing the most need for improvement was *Quantitative Reasoning*, with first-year SHSU students responding that they reached conclusions based on their own analysis of numerical information at significantly lower rates than the IPEDS and Texas Public comparison groups - a result consistent with NSSE data from 2019. SHSU should seek to identify ways to further engage first-year students in quantitative reasoning, which has remained a weakness over time, and consider targeted initiatives to address areas in need of improvement.
- **Campus Environment:** Although ratings for *Quality of Interactions* were generally higher than those for comparison groups, the percentages of students rating interactions as a 6 or 7 (on a scale from 1 = *poor* to 7 = *excellent*) could be improved. For example, the percentage of both first-year and senior student ratings of positive interactions with academic advisors was only 55%. SHSU should investigate ways to increase positive ratings of interactions with faculty and staff.