



SURVEY OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES AND PERCEPTIONS: INSTITUTIONAL REPORT AND USER'S GUIDE

Prepared by:

Patrick T. Terenzini, Co-Principal Investigator
Distinguished Professor and Senior Scientist

Robert D. Reason, Co-Principal Investigator
Associate Professor and Senior Research Associate

Bradley E. Cox
Graduate Research Assistant

Brenda R. Lutovsky-Quaye
Graduate Research Assistant

Kadian L. McIntosh
Graduate Research Assistant

January 2009

This study was supported by a Major Grant from The Spencer Foundation and by the technical and other forms of assistance provided by ACT, Inc. and the National Survey of Student Engagement. Project staff also acknowledge the collaboration with Drs. Charles F. Blaich, Director of Inquiries at the Wabash College Center of Inquiry and Director of the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education; Ernest T. Pascarella, Mary Louise Petersen Professor of Higher Education and Wabash National Study team leader at the University of Iowa; and the faculty and staff of the 45 participating institutions who assisted in the completion of this study.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Project Background and Purposes	1
Methods.....	2
Design, Data Collected, Institutional Population, and Sample.....	2
Faculty Population and Sample	3
Data Collection	3
Reading and Using the Report Tables	5
Individual-Item Tables.....	5
Responses Received, Sample Size, and Response Rate.....	5
Interpreting Response Rates.....	6
Sampling Error.....	6
Reading and Interpreting a Sample Individual-Item Table.....	8
Factor Scale Scores	9
Reading and Interpreting a Sample Faculty Scale Table	10
Limitations and Some Final Thoughts on Using the Tables.....	12
References.....	13
Appendix A: Institutions Participating in the Parsing the First Year of College Study and the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education.....	14
Appendix B: Survey of Faculty Activities and Perception.....	15 (1-7)
Appendix C: Faculty Survey Summary Tables	16 (1-36)

SURVEY OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES AND PERCEPTIONS: INSTITUTIONAL REPORT AND USER'S GUIDE

Project Background and Purposes

Thirty-five years of research on the effects of college on students makes abundantly clear that students' college years are linked to a wide array of outcomes, including knowledge acquisition; academic and cognitive; personal and social development; higher levels of moral reasoning; educational attainment; occupational and economic benefits; attitude and value changes; and future quality of life (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005). Many students, however, are not in college long enough to realize the benefits of completing a degree. Indeed, for many students and their families, the first year of college is a make-or-break period for learning, discovering whether they made a good decision about which college to attend, deciding whether to continue college enrollment, and, if so, where. On average, four-year colleges and universities lose 27 percent of their first-year students before they start their second year (ACT, 2008). Barely more than half (53%) of the students beginning a bachelor's degree program at a four-year college or university will complete their degree at that same institution within six years (Berkner, He, & Cataldi, 2002), and the lion's share of the losses occurs in students' first year. We estimate that 60 percent or more of the students in an entering cohort who withdraw in a five-year period will do so before the start of their second year. Loss rates, moreover, are highest among historically underrepresented, low-income, and first-generation students.

Substantial evidence links students' first-year academic and out-of-class experiences to both persistence and degree completion (Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991, 2005). In addition, about two-thirds (perhaps as much as 90 percent for cognitive skills) of the gains college students make in reading, math, science, the social sciences, and cognitive skill development occur in the first two years of college (Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005).

The Parsing the First Year of College Study is examining the broad range of independent and joint influences of the multiple student, faculty, and institutional factors that shape first-year college students' experiences, learning, and persistence. A comprehensive conceptual framework guided the study's design, a framework based on the broad empirical literature that identifies educationally effective curricula, programs, student experiences, and organizational features, environments, and structures associated with cognitive development, academic success, and persistence among first-year students.

The Parsing Study also sought to assist participating and other institutions in providing their new students with an effective educational experience during their first year of college. The process of institutional self-review and improvement that the project seeks to facilitate rests, in part, on data about how well an institution is performing on a set of performance indicators designed to identify areas of institutional success, as well as areas that may require additional review, discussion, or enhancement.

Faculty members are among the most powerful influences on student development and change, exercising considerable programmatic and policy influence on the nature of the first-year experience an institution provides its new students. Faculty members help shape (if not

determine) the curriculum, the instructional practices used, the frequency and nature of student-faculty contact in- and outside the classroom, and numerous other factors that influence students' experiences, learning, and development during their first year in college. Faculty members are also an important source of information about what some of those factors are.

The *Parsing the First Year of College* study is a three-year project supported by a grant from the Spencer Foundation and by technical assistance and other considerations from ACT, Inc. and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The study is the most comprehensive, longitudinal study of the first-year student experience done to-date. The study maps the multiple and interconnected influences shaping student learning and persistence during students' first year of college. It incorporates information on students' precollege characteristics, activities, and academic preparation; their first-year experiences; the campus' peer environment; faculty members' activities, perceptions, and values; and internal institutional structures, practices, and policies relating to the first year. This report summarizes information provided by the faculty members on your campus (and others) who responded to the Parsing Study's *Survey of Faculty Activities and Perceptions*.

Methods

Design, Data Collected, Institutional Population, and Sample

The Parsing Study is a set of cross-sectional surveys gathering information from four key campus groups:

- *First-year Undergraduate Students*: ACT test scores; socio-demographic characteristics and family background; high school activities and academic performance; scores on the ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) in critical thinking and (for some institutions) writing skills; and first-year experiences from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).
- *Faculty members*: Socio-demographic characteristics; academic background; perceptions of their institution's internal organization, programming, and policies affecting first-year students' experiences; perceptions of the level of cooperation between academic and student affairs divisions; the instructional approaches they use; their out-of-class interactions with first-year students; the faculty culture and reward system; their professional development activities; and their views on institutional assessment practices relating to students' first year.
- *Chief Academic Affairs Officers*: Internal academic organizational structures, practices, programs, and policies.
- *Chief Student Affairs Officers*: Internal organizational structures, practices, and policies in the campus's student affairs division.

In the spring of 2007, researchers at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at Pennsylvania State University surveyed faculty members at 34 institutions participating in the

Parsing the First Year of College Study and 11 schools participating in the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education (WNS). Parsing Study institutions volunteered in response to a nationally broadcast invitation. Participation was limited to four-year colleges and universities using the ACT Assessment as their primary quantitative admissions instrument. From the 50 institutions that applied, the research group selected colleges and universities so as to provide a sample that was as nationally representative as possible and whose first-year students entering in Fall, 2006, in the aggregate, had a profile (with respect to gender and race/ethnicity) as close as possible to that of the national population of first-year students who entered college that term. Because of the constraint that participating institutions must rely primarily on ACT test scores for admitting students, colleges and universities in the Midwest and Southern regions are over-represented. Consequently, *no claims can be made that participating institutions or the aggregated samples of their participating students or faculty members on those campuses are representative of a national population.* Nonetheless, with the addition of the responses from faculty members at the 11 WNS schools, the combined faculty database includes the responses of 5,667 faculty members on 45 campuses. We believe those numbers alone, and the findings based on them, merit serious consideration.

Faculty Population and Sample

The study defined faculty members at the 45 participating institutions (see Appendix A) as all tenured, tenure-track, and nontenure-track instructional staff of all ranks (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor, or lecturer), regardless of their full- or part-time status. Because the study focuses on first-year student outcomes, the faculty population specifications excluded individuals in programs that serve only graduate students, who teach only evening or continuing education division courses, or who hold adjunct, clinical, or emeritus titles. In most cases, the entire faculty population (as defined) on a campus was invited to participate. At institutions where the size of the faculty prohibited a census, the Penn State University Survey Research Center (which handled data collection) drew a simple random sample of 500 faculty members.

Data Collection

Institutions provided project staff with electronic files containing contact information and faculty members' gender, race/ethnicity, academic rank, and field (humanities and fine arts, natural and physical sciences, social sciences, or professional). In January 2008, and in advance of the first mailing, the chief academic officer on each campus e-mailed faculty members advising them of the institution's participation in the study, alerting them that they would soon hear from the Penn State research group, summarizing the potential benefits to the campus, and encouraging faculty members to participate in the study. The Penn State Survey Research Center (SRC) conducted all data collection for the faculty survey.

SRC mailed a package of materials to all individuals identified by an institution as meeting the faculty population criteria. (Data collection on three campuses was completed entirely on-line.) The package included a letter from the study's Co-Principal Investigators explaining the purposes of the study, the potential benefits of the study for respondents' institution, a copy of the survey instrument (see Appendix B), a postage-paid return envelope,

and an SRC website where individuals could complete the survey on-line. Two weeks after the initial mailing, SRC sent non-respondents both postcard and e-mail reminders. About two weeks after that, SRC sent non-respondents a second complete package. After completing data collection and cleaning, SRC stripped all personally identifying information from the dataset before releasing it to the research team.

Both paper and web-based versions of the questionnaire solicited information on faculty members' personal and professional backgrounds and perceptions of their institution's performance with respect to an array of academic and non-academic features of first-year students' experiences on their campus. The survey included questions dealing with classroom practices, out-of-class interactions with first-year students, and perceptions of institutional practices and policies that relate to the first year of college.

Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education (WNS). Because of a number of strong similarities in the research design and student data collected for the Parsing Study and the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education (see: <http://www.liberalarts.wabash.edu/nationalstudy>), eleven WNS campuses also participated in the Parsing Study's faculty survey and are included in the national norm data reported in the tables of this report. Appendix A lists the participating WNS institutions.

A total of 12,822 faculty members (on the 34 Parsing and 11 WNS campuses) were invited to participate. Respondents who provided less than 80 percent of the information requested were removed from subsequent analyses. Parsing Study staff subsequently imputed any remaining missing data using the Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software (v.15). Following these procedures, researchers had usable data from 5,667 faculty members (44.2% of the target population). Copies of the campus-specific faculty dataset were sent to each participating institution's liaison in [Month/Year]. For each local dataset, the research group removed all person-specific information (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, academic field) that might identify a specific faculty member. Respondents from each institution were weighted to be representative of all faculty members at that institution with respect to gender, race/ethnicity, field, and academic rank. The campus-specific faculty dataset includes a variable labeled "global weight;" When applied (turned on) in the statistical software, all resulting analyses will be representative of the school's entire faculty population. In the enclosed report, the "global weight" for each campus was applied. Thus, the results presented in the tables below are representative of the entire faculty population on your campus.

Reading and Using the Report Tables

This section of the report provides guidance on the contents of the summary tables, the information in the statistics that accompany each item, and advice on how to interpret the meaning of the numbers and statistics. The tables are presented in two sections. The first summarizes faculty responses to each of the survey's questions (the "Item-related Tables"). The second section contains tables summarizing information arrayed as scales – aggregates of individual items, created to reduce the amount of item-specific data to a smaller number of more easily interpretable variables.

Individual-Item Tables (Part I of Report Tables)

The tables in the first part of the report follow the same question/item-numbering sequence as the survey instrument (see Appendix B). The first two rows provide information on your campus's target population size (i.e., the number of faculty members contacted, whether by census or as a sample), the number of usable responses, and the response rate. The rows numbered 1-8 profile the characteristics of faculty respondents.

Response summaries to substantive questions begin with Question 9 and run through Question 24. Readers will note that some numbered "questions" contain multiple sub-items, each with an alphabetic designation.

Each table has six columns containing the following information:

- Column 1: Survey question/item numbers and content:
- Column 2: Item response options and statistical terms for summarizing responses;
- Column 3: Statistical information on an item for your campus (see below);
- Columns 4-6: Statistical information on an item for three possible "norm" groups based on institutions' 2000 Carnegie Classification (bachelor's, master's, or doctoral degree-awarding). Norm group figures provide opportunities to compare your faculty members' responses with those of their counterparts in one or more clusters of institutions. For some purposes, the appropriate norm might be that of the group of institutions most like your campus (your "peer institutions"). For other purposes, however, a campus may want to evaluate itself against an "aspirational" or competitor sector of peer institutions.

The first two rows of cells in the report table provide important information on the number of your campus' respondents and the amount of statistical power (i.e., the precision or accuracy of the estimates) that number of respondents provides. An explanation of the terms follows:

Responses Received, Sample Size, and Response Rate (Row 1). This row gives the number of usable responses received from your faculty members. The "Sample Size" is the number of your faculty with "working" contact addresses and who we presumably reached. The sample sizes for the norm groups give the sum of faculty presumably reached at the institutions

in each category. The response rate is the percentage of usable surveys received divided by the sample size. As noted above, researchers invited all individuals on most campuses who met the study's definition of a "faculty member" to participate in the study. On some campuses, however, the faculty population size was so large it precluded (for budget reasons) taking a census. For those institutions, Penn State's Survey Research Center drew a simple random sample of 500 faculty members, and that number (corrected for bad addresses) was used in calculating the response rate on those campuses.

Interpreting Response Rates: As a general rule, the higher the response rate the better, but rates above 50 percent in faculty surveys are rare for many institutions. High rates do not ensure the representativeness of respondents for their parent population, although the likelihood of representativeness increases with the response rate, as does the accuracy of a sample's estimate of the parent population figure (see "sampling error" below). From experience with similar surveys, researchers for this study consider the response rates for the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral groups (48.4%, 51.7%, and 41.5%, respectively) to be unusually high. Campus representatives with some experience in surveying their faculty members are the best judges of just "how high" the response rate is for this study on their campus.

Sampling Error (Row 2). Populations (i.e., all individuals meeting a set of criteria) are sampled to avoid the costs of surveying an entire population and because one can obtain highly precise estimates of an entire population by using appropriate sampling techniques and sample sizes. Even when sampling, however, not all persons in a sample will respond. The "sampling error" is an estimate of how much a sample statistic or estimate (e.g., a percentage) might differ from what might have been observed had all members of the population responded to the question. Row 2 gives two numbers. The first is the size of the faculty population on your campus. For campuses where the population is smaller than 500 and a census was done, this number will be the same as the "sample size" figure. For institutions with populations larger than 500, the population size figure will be larger than the sample size of 500 (or smaller after adjusting for bad addresses). The full population size was used in estimating the sampling error.

To interpret the sampling error for your campus, let's assume that estimate is 4%. Let's also assume that 60% of your faculty responded to a particular question in a certain way. With that level of sampling error, one can be 95% confident (the "confidence level" for the sampling errors reported here) that your institution's faculty population percentage falls *somewhere* between 56% and 64% -- the interval defined by the reported percentage plus and minus 4 percentage points. [The actual percentage, however, is still the best estimate of the population percentage.] Larger sample sizes yield smaller sampling errors (i.e., greater accuracy of estimation); conversely, the sampling error will be larger for smaller institutions. Sampling error estimates also vary with the percentage for which they might be calculated. Sampling errors for percentages near 0% or 100% are the smallest. Percentages near 50%, where predictive accuracy is the most difficult to achieve, are the largest. Thus, we have calculated the sampling error for percentages of 50% so as to be the most conservative, but the plus/minus interval will shrink somewhat (and the estimation become more accurate) as percentages move away from 50% in either direction.

Starting with Question 1 (Row 3) and following, the sequence and numbering of rows correspond with those of the questionnaire. Each row provides some or all of the following statistical information:

- The *percentage* response distributions for your campus and the norm groups. (Unless otherwise noted, the denominator used in calculating these percentages is the "usable responses received" figures given in the first table. **Note: Column percentages for an item may not sum to 100% due to rounding to the nearest whole number;**
- The arithmetic *mean* of usable responses; calculations excluded "Not Applicable" and "Don't Know" responses;
- The *standard deviation*, a measure of the dispersion of responses about the mean (i.e., across an item's response options). The larger the standard deviation, the more respondents differed in their answers. A group mean plus-and-minus one standard deviation contains two-thirds of all responses, suggesting how compact or dispersed responses were; as with the means, calculations excluded responses of "Not Applicable" and "Don't Know;"
- The *effect size*, a measure of the magnitude of the difference between two means (in this case between your campus mean and each norm group's mean) divided by the norm group standard deviation. Whereas tests of statistical significance (see below) are sensitive to the size of the groups, effect sizes are not; they also adjust for differences in the variability of scores within each group.

Characterizing effect sizes, however, is more art than science, helpful to some readers but frowned-on by some psychometricians (e.g., Glass, McGaw, & Smith, 1981). Because many readers may be unfamiliar with interpreting effect sizes, however, we offer the following (arguable) characterizations: effect sizes smaller than .20 are "small" or "slight," those from .20 to .35 are "moderate," and those .35 or above are relatively "large" or "strong." We base these characterizations on experience and judgment, as well as on the opinions of psychometricians who have studied the matter (e.g., Richardson, 1996), all the while acknowledging that others might choose different adjectives or prefer none at all. Cohen (1969, 1988), for example, has suggested more stringent ranges for adjectives: .2 to .3 = "small," around .5 = "medium," and .8 or above = "large." Characterizing effect sizes is a complex business, however, and judging whether an effect size is small, medium, or large should depend on substantive, as well as statistical, considerations. We offer this discussion with some caution and advise the same in characterizing effect sizes.

- The *statistical significance* of the difference between a campus mean and each norm group mean. Statistical significance is the probability that one would be wrong in concluding that a difference is "real" and not due to chance. Asterisks in a norm-group column indicate whether a campus mean differs from that norm group mean at a statistically significant (i.e., non-chance) level:

- No asterisk: A non-significant difference probably due to chance;
- One asterisk: A five-percent probability ($p < .05$) that the difference is attributable to chance;
- Two asterisks: A one-percent probability ($p < .01$) that the difference is chance;
- Three asterisks: A probability of less than one-tenth of one percent ($p < .001$) that the difference is due to chance.

As noted above, however, tests of statistical significance are sensitive to group sizes. As sample size increases, so does statistical power and the likelihood that a relatively small difference between means may nonetheless be *statistically* significant, even if it may not substantively important. The sizes of the norm groups (and some campus respondent groups) in this report qualify as "large." Consequently, the level of statistical significance between means (whatever the level) may shed little light on the magnitude or *meaningfulness* of a difference between means. **Statistical significance should not be confused with substantive significance** – the curricular, instructional, programmatic, administrative, or policy importance implied in a difference between two means. Where one or more asterisks indicate a statistically significant difference, **we recommend relying on the effect size, campus context, and professional experience for judging whether a difference may warrant closer attention and discussion.**

Reading and Interpreting an Individual-Item Table

Consider the following sample table:

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Old Siwash University	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
11. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements. (Coding scale: 1= Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree)					
11a. First-year students know what is expected of them <i>academically</i>	Strongly disagree	6%	3%	7%	5%
	Disagree	23%	20%	28%	23%
	Undecided	22%	11%	20%	23%
	Agree	46%	56%	40%	44%
	Strongly agree	2%	10%	5%	5%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.17	3.49	3.07	3.23
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.01	1.01	1.08	1.01
	Effect size ⁷		-0.33	0.09	-0.06
Significance ⁸		***			

The sample table displays the frequency distribution of one item for a fictitious institution. The item asked faculty members whether they agreed or disagreed with a statement that their school's "first-year students know what is expected of them academically" (Item 11a). Respondents could choose one of five options ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree." In this instance, nearly half (46%) of the Old Siwash University (OSU) agreed with the statement, but only 2% did so "strongly." About a quarter disagreed with the statement, but nearly as many (22%) were undecided. Relatively few faculty at OSU (or elsewhere) had strong opinions (positive or negative) about the statement's applicability to their institution. On this item, the OSU faculty responded similarly to their counterparts at master's and doctoral degree-granting institutions (the absence of asterisks indicates no statistically significant differences in those two comparisons, and the effect sizes are small). OSU faculty did differ at a statistically significant level from their counterparts at bachelor's degree-granting institutions, who are significantly more likely to agree with the statement (for the record, "OSU" is a doctoral research university). The effect size (-.33) indicates OSU faculty members are "moderately" to "strongly" less likely to agree with the statement than are their colleagues at bachelor's degree-granting schools. Whether that difference should be a cause of concern to the Old Siwash community is a judgment best left to its faculty members, administrators, students, alumni, trustees, and others.

Factor Scale Scores (Part II of Report Tables)

For some readers, however, reviewing the item-specific tables on what faculty members do and think may seem a bit like trying to drink from a fire hose. To simplify interpretation and increase the utility of those data, Parsing Study staff completed a series of factor analyses to provide a more compact, aggregated summary of the individual-item data. These widely used "data-reduction" procedures identify individual survey items that correlate highly with one another, indicating they may be measuring the same (or a similar) construct.

Although a variety of factor analytic procedures are available, the research group adopted principal components analysis¹ because it is widely known and used and lends itself more readily to user understanding than other possible procedures. In brief, principal components analysis identifies sets of items that, because of their correlated nature, might be combined into a single aggregate indicator (a "scale score") summarizing the information in the multiple items that comprise the scale. By identifying sets of items (factors) that correlate more highly among themselves than they do with other items, the procedure both reduces the number of items with which a user must cope and permits creation of a scale (one per factor), that is a more reliable (i.e., consistent) reflection of whatever underlies the items in the factor/scale. Once scales were developed, Cronbach's *alpha* was used to evaluate their internal consistency reliability.²

¹ The principal components procedures involved the Varimax rotation of factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. Only items with rotated factor loadings greater than .40 were used to form a scale. With rare exceptions, items loading above .40 on more than one factor were discarded. Factor scales (Armor, 1974) were formed by summing respondents' scores on the component items (those with loadings of .40 or higher) on a factor and then dividing by the number of items in the scale.

² Cronbach's alpha reflects the extent to which a scale's items are correlated and, consequently, whether the scale is internally consistent, indicating that respondents who answer one item higher or lower tend to answer other items in the scale higher or lower in a consistent fashion. Alpha can range from .00 to 1.00. Psychometricians consider any scale with an alpha of .70 or higher to be acceptable, although scales with alphas in the .5 or .6 ranges are occasionally used.

The tables in the "Faculty Scale Score Comparisons" section of the report summarize faculty beliefs or perceptions reported in the individual-item tables, but in the form of scores on 18 scales. The scales cover an array of topics, such as how faculty believe their institution is performing, the instructional practices faculty use, their professional development activities, and their perceptions of the faculty culture on their campus, their institution's "planfulness" in its approach to the first year, the level of collaboration across academic and student affairs units and divisions, support for faculty members in working with first-year students, and the systematic collection and use of assessment information.

Factor scale score tables report the mean, standard deviation, effect size, and statistical significance of the difference between a campus' mean scale score and those of the three norm groups.

The bottom portion of the table for each scale lists the items that make up the scale. The survey item numbers are in parentheses at the end of the shorthand versions of the items in the scale for users wishing to review the specific wording of an item in a scale.

Reading and Interpreting a Faculty Scale Table

The "Cross-Divisional Collaboration" Scale table on the next page can serve as an example of how the data are arrayed and how the information can be used. The table summarizes faculty members' responses to three items dealing with perceptions of the working relationships between faculty members and student affairs professionals. The scale is labeled (recall that naming scales is more art than science) to capture what appears to be the construct (not directly measurable) underlying the three items. The "internal consistency" reliability of the scale (.89) is very high (1.0 is the maximum and psychometricians generally consider anything above .70 acceptable), indicating that the items are measuring the same (or a similar) construct.

Cross-Divisional Collaboration (Alpha = .894)

Scale Statistics	Old Siwash University	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	3.52	3.52	3.47	3.27
Standard deviation	0.82	1.02	0.98	0.95
Effect size ^a		0.00	0.05	0.26
Significance ^b				***

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

- **Student Affairs staff have the support of faculty (12e)**
- **Faculty and Student Affairs staff work closely together in orienting first-year students (12f)**
- **Faculty and Student Affairs staff work closely together in ways that promote first-year students' success (12g)**

In this example, the Old Siwash faculty members resemble their counterparts at bachelor's and master's degree-granting institutions. None of these groups holds strong opinions (positive or negative) on the level of cross-divisional collaboration on their campuses: the means are 3.52, 3.52, and 3.47, respectively, on a five-point scale where "3" is the midpoint. Old Siwash faculty, however, are significantly more likely to report cross-divisional collaboration than are their peers at doctoral degree-granting schools (mean = 3.27). Although that difference is statistically significant, however, the effect size (.26) suggests the magnitude of the difference is in the "moderate" range (.20 - .35). If Old Siwash were a bachelor's or master's degree-granting school, the evidence suggests it is comparable on this scale to other institutions in its peer group. Given that Old Siwash is (in reality) a doctoral degree-granting, Research-I university, however, and given that it is significantly and moderately above its peer institutions, the results suggest this particular operational area may be one in which Old Siwash faculty and staff can take some pride in outperforming their doctoral-institution peers in this survey. Indeed, in this instance, at least, Old Siwash looks more like a bachelor's or master's institution than a doctoral university.

Limitations and Some Final Thoughts on Using the Tables

The tables in this report are intended to be "conversation starters." The information they provide presents a single, snapshot portrait of faculty perceptions and activities on each campus at one point in time. Moreover, the interpretation of and implications suggested by the findings are likely to vary across viewers. Readers might, however, keep two questions in mind: 1) If the difference between your campus and others is substantive (important) and comparatively large (relative either to a norm group or to other differences in the report), is that difference one that should give us pride or concern? and 2) If the latter, then what might we do about it? The answers may warrant the attention of a particular office or individual, of a particular segment of the campus community, or of the entire institution.

Finally, these tables are only a single data source. A fuller, and probably more clear picture of a campus' first-year experience is likely to be gained by reviewing the information presented here together with that gathered from first-year students themselves (see the CAAP and NSSE reports and datasets provided previously). That information includes students' reports of their experiences, their development and learning, and their performance on standardized tests of critical thinking (and, perhaps, writing skills). The summaries of internal organizational structures, programs, practices, and policies provided by campus chief academic officers and senior student affairs officers (to be distributed to campuses shortly) may also shed light on how and why one's campus may differ from others in their approach to students' first year of college.

References

- ACT. (2008). *National collegiate retention and persistence to degree rates*. Iowa City, Iowa. Retrieved from http://www.act.org/research/policymakers/pdf/retain_2008.pdf.
- Armor, D. J. (1974). Theta reliability and factor scaling. In H. Costner (Ed.). *Sociological Methodology: 1973-1974*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 17-50.
- Berkner, L., He, S., & Cataldi, E. (2002). *Descriptive summary of 1995-96 Beginning Postsecondary Students: Six years later* (No. Statistical Analysis Report No. 2003-151). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Cohen, J. (1969). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Glass, G. V., McGaw, B., & Smith, M. L. (1981). *Meta-analysis in social research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students. A third decade of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Richardson, J. T. E. (1996). Measures of effect size. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 28(1), 12-22.

Appendix A

Institutions Participating in the Parsing the First Year of College Study and the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education

Parsing the First Year of College Institutions

Liberal Arts Colleges

Augustana College (Rock Island, IL)
Calvin College (Grand Rapids, MI)
College of Saint Benedict & St. John's
University (St. Joseph, MN)
Cornell College (Mt. Vernon, IA)
Culver-Stockton College (Canton, MO)
Grinnell College (Grinnell, IA)
Quincy University (Quincy, IL)
Regis College of Regis University (Denver, CO)
University of Arkansas - Fort Smith

Comprehensive/Master's Universities

Adams State College (Alamosa, CO)
Austin Peay State University
Bethel University (St. Paul, MN)
College of Mount St. Joseph (Cincinnati, OH)
Jacksonville State University
Kentucky State University
Northwestern State University of Louisiana
Saint Xavier University (Chicago, IL)
Sam Houston State University
St. Cloud State University (St. Cloud, MN)
University of St. Francis (Joliet, IL)
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Wayland Baptist University (Plainview, TX)
Youngstown State University

Research/Doctoral Universities

Bowling Green State University
Kansas State University
Loyola University Chicago
Miami University
Oakland University (Rochester, MI)
Saint Louis University
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
University of Kansas
University of Missouri - Kansas City
University of Nebraska - Lincoln
University of Wyoming

Wabash National Study Institutions

Liberal Arts Colleges

Alma College
Bard College
Coe College
Columbia College
Connecticut College
Gustavus Adolphus College
Hampshire College
Hope College
Wabash College
Whittier College

Research/Doctoral Universities

University of Kentucky

Appendix B

PENNSTATE



Parsing the First Year of College

Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University
400 Rackley Building
University Park, PA 16802-3203

814-865-6346
Fax: 814-865-3638
parsing@psu.edu
www.ed.psu.edu/cshe/parsing/home.html

Center for the Study of Higher Education
Parsing the First Year
of College Project

SURVEY OF FACULTY ACTIVITIES AND PERCEPTIONS

Supported by a grant from
The Spencer Foundation

Copyright © 2006. The Pennsylvania State University

**PARSING THE FIRST YEAR OF COLLEGE
FACULTY SURVEY**

Thank you for taking a few minutes to complete this questionnaire. If circles are provided, please completely fill in the circle next to your answer (example: ● Yes ○ No). If boxes are provided, write your numeric answer in the boxes (example:).

1. Are you: male female

2. What is your racial or ethnic background (check all that apply)?

- Black non-Hispanic
- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Hispanic
- White non-Hispanic
- Nonresident alien
- Unsure/Don't know

3. What is your highest earned academic degree?

- Bachelor's
- Master's
- Doctorate
- First Professional (i.e., law, medicine, or dentistry)

4. Is your department/discipline in the:

- Humanities and Fine Arts
- Natural or Physical Sciences
- Social Sciences
- Professional
- Other

5. a. During the Fall 2006 term, were you employed at this institution full-time or part-time?

- Full-time
- Part-time

b. If part-time have you taught in at least 3 terms during the last 3 years at this institution?

- Yes
- No
- Not applicable

6. a. During the Fall 2006 term, were you primarily:

- A faculty member/instructor
- An administrator
- A staff member

b. What is your academic rank? (mark only one)

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor/Lecturer/Other
- None. I am an administrator or staff member.

7. Including this year, how many years have you been teaching courses (full- or part-time) in higher education?

 years

8. Including this year, how long have you worked at this institution full- or part-time?

 years

9. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. My institution systematically assesses students' first-year experiences.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Results from first-year student assessments are used to strengthen first-year courses, programs, and services.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

10. Regardless of how good your institution is at educating students, how much does it emphasize "doing even better"?

- Great Emphasis
- Moderate Emphasis
- Slight Emphasis
- No Emphasis

11. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Undecided	Agree	Strongly Agree
a. The first-year students at this institution know what is expected of them <i>academically</i> .	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. The first-year students at this institution know what is expected of them <i>outside the classroom</i> .	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Admissions office professionals know my department's academic options and strengths.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. My institution does a good job of:					
1. Communicating to new students what it has to offer academically.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Enrolling new students who can benefit from what this institution has to offer.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Informing new students about the institution's <i>history and traditions</i> .	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Informing new students about the values this institution considers important.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Keeping faculty informed about the <i>academic</i> support services where they can refer new students who are having difficulties.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Keeping faculty informed about the <i>personal</i> support services where they can refer new students who are having difficulties.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Helping new students get off to a good start academically.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Facilitating new students' early involvement in the <i>academic</i> life of the institution.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Facilitating new students' early involvement in the <i>non-academic</i> life of the institution.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Conveying to new students the sense that, if they make the effort, they can succeed here.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. Conveying to new students the sense that they "belong" here.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Undecided	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly	Don't know
a. This institution has a <u>comprehensive</u> approach to helping first-year students succeed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. This institution has a <u>coherent</u> approach to helping first-year students succeed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. This institution has a clear curricular plan for students during their first year.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. First-year student success is a priority for this institution.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Student Affairs staff have the support of faculty.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Faculty and Student Affairs staff work closely together in orienting first-year students.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Faculty and Student Affairs staff work closely together in ways that promote first-year students' success.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. This institution's administration provides clear leadership to faculty and staff in promoting first-year students' success.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. To what extent are your institution's first-year courses, programs, and services:

	Not At All	Slightly	Moderately	A Great Deal	Don't know
a. Integrated "vertically" (i.e., treated as a foundational year upon which later years build)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Coordinated "horizontally" (i.e., all units dealing with first-year students communicate and work together in an organized way)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Intentional (i.e., has stated goals and objectives)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Active (i.e., actively pursues those goals and objectives).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

14. Do you typically teach a first-year seminar?

- No
- Yes, because it's required of me
- Yes, because I choose to

15. Do you typically teach other courses that serve primarily first-year students?

- No (please go to Question 18)
- Yes, because it's required of me (please go to Question 16)
- Yes, because I choose to (please go to Question 16)

16. In your courses that serve primarily first-year students (exclude first-year seminars), to what extent do you use the following:

	Not at all	Slightly	Moderately	A great deal	Not applicable
a. Lecture	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. In-class discussion	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Collaborative/cooperative learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. Experiential/problem-based learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. Group projects	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. Multiple drafts of written work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. Community service for extra credit only	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
h. Community service as an integral part of the course	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
i. Frequent feedback to students on their progress	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
j. Detailed feedback to students on their progress	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
k. Multiple-choice tests/exams	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
l. Essay or other open-ended quizzes or exams	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
m. Papers or other open-ended assignments	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
n. Student presentations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
o. Technology to further discussion outside of class	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
p. Case studies/real world examples.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
q. Hands-on experiences.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
r. Assignments or exercises focusing on application.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

17a. How many courses do you teach that serve primarily first-year students (exclude first-year seminars)?

b. Of those courses, how many are, in your view, too large to allow you to engage students individually?

18. In a typical academic term, how many times per week do you interact with first-year students outside of class and:

- a. discuss intellectual or academic-related matters times/week
- b. exchange brief greetings times/week
- c. discuss matters related to the student's future career times/week
- d. work together on an institutional or professional activity times/week
- e. discuss a student's personal (non-academic) matters times/week
- f. have casual conversations times/week
- g. discuss non-academic topics of mutual interest times/week

19. How often do you:

	Never	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
a. Provide opportunities for your first-year students in your classes to learn about people who differ from them in:				
Background characteristics (e.g., gender, race)	○	○	○	○
Attitudes or values (e.g., politics, religion)	○	○	○	○
b. Give your first-year students assignments that require them to examine ideas/perspectives other than their own?	○	○	○	○
c. Champion a less-accepted point of view for the sake of argument (i.e., play the devil's advocate)?	○	○	○	○
d. Ask first-year students <u>in your classes</u> to wrestle with ideas or points of view that differ from their own?	○	○	○	○
e. Encourage students to integrate into your course things they're learning in other courses?	○	○	○	○
f. Change course content or your teaching in response to student feedback?	○	○	○	○

20. a. During the typical academic term, approximately how many hours per week do you devote to this institution?

		hours/week
--	--	------------

b. Of those hours, approximately how many do you spend on each of the following activities (these estimates need not sum to the number reported in question 20a). Please write the hours per week in the boxes provided. If not sure, give your best estimate. If none, write "0."

- | | | | |
|--|--|--|------------|
| a. Teaching first-year undergraduate students (including class preparation time, time in class, grading, etc.) | | | hours/week |
| b. Advising, supervising, or otherwise helping first year students | | | hours/week |
| c. Interacting with first-year students outside of class | | | hours/week |
| d. Administrative duties related to first-year students | | | hours/week |
| e. Research/scholarship in your field | | | hours/week |
| Total = | | | hours/week |
- (need not sum to hours in 20a)

21. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

At this institution:	Disagree strongly	Disagree	Agree	Agree strongly	Not Applicable
a. Faculty are rewarded for teaching first-year students (e.g., promotion and tenure, merit salary).	○	○	○	○	○
b. Faculty are encouraged to interact with first-year students outside the classroom.	○	○	○	○	○
c. Teaching is more important than research.	○	○	○	○	○
d. When hiring new faculty members, candidates' teaching abilities are more important than their research abilities.	○	○	○	○	○
e. Faculty are assisted to learn about first-year students and how to help them succeed.	○	○	○	○	○
f. My faculty colleagues consider the first year as an important time to help students lay the foundation for the rest of their college education.	○	○	○	○	○
g. Faculty are encouraged to use the services of the on-campus instructional support center.	○	○	○	○	○

22. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements:

This institution provides instructors adequate support for working with students who:	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly	Not Applicable
a. are from a variety of cultural backgrounds	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. are underprepared for college work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. are gifted	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
d. have disabilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
e. have family and/or work obligations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
f. are older or returning students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
g. are athletes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. This institution does a good job in:

	Disagree strongly	Disagree somewhat	Agree somewhat	Agree strongly	Not Applicable
a. Placing first-year students in courses appropriate to their academic preparation.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Providing adequate support for all of the kinds of first-year students we admit.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

24. In the past two years, approximately how many times have you:

	None	Once	Twice	Three or more times
a. Participated in a conference, workshop, or other formal activity that focused on <u>teaching and learning</u> ?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
b. Participated in a conference, workshop or other formal activity on <u>first-year students</u> and how to help them succeed?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
c. Read literature related to first-year students and how to help them succeed.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Please return this survey in the envelope provided.
Thanks very much for your help.**

Appendix C

FACULTY SURVEY SUMMARY TABLES

**SPRING 2006 FACULTY SURVEY COMPARISON
 REPORT FOR GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS COLLEGE**

PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

Item Number and Content	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's[1]	Master's ¹	Doctoral ¹
Response Rate:				
Responses Received	83	1,551	1,969	2,479
Target/Sample	200	3,152	3,853	5,969
Response Rate[2]	42%	48%	52%	42%
Population	200	3152	4024	11339
Sampling Error[3]	8%	2%	2%	2%
for Percentages (Overall)				
1. Gender:				
Male	53%	54%	52%	62%
Female	47%	46%	48%	38%
Total[11]	100%	100%	100%	100%
2. Racial/ethnic background:				
Black, non-Hispanic	0%	2%	6%	3%
American Indian or Alaskan Native	0%	0%	0%	0%
Asian/Pacific Islander	3%	3%	4%	7%
Hispanic	4%	3%	2%	2%
White, non-Hispanic	91%	91%	86%	86%
Multiracial[4]	3%	2%	1%	1%
Non-resident alien	0%	0%	0%	0%
Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
3. Highest earned degree:				
Bachelor's	0%	1%	1%	2%
Master's	18%	23%	32%	21%
Doctorate	81%	75%	65%	75%
First-Professional	1%	1%	2%	3%
Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
4. Discipline/Field in:				
Humanities/Fine Arts	49%	44%	28%	23%
Natural/Physical Sciences	21%	21%	17%	23%
Social Sciences	19%	19%	14%	13%
Professional	5%	10%	25%	28%
Other	6%	6%	15%	14%
Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%

Item Number and Content	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
5a. During Fall '06 term, employed at this institution:				
Full-time	99%	92%	91%	90%
Part-time	1%	8%	9%	10%
Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
5b. If part-time, taught in at least 3 terms during the last 3 years at this institution:				
Yes	0%	7%	7%	8%
No	0%	2%	2%	2%
Not applicable	100%	92%	91%	90%
Total[5]	100%	100%	100%	100%
6a. During F'06 term, was primarily a:				
Faculty member or				
Instructor	95%	96%	93%	93%
Administrator	6%	4%	6%	6%
Staff member	0%	0%	1%	1%
Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
6b. Academic Rank:				
Professor	32%	32%	25%	27%
Associate Professor	30%	26%	22%	28%
Assistant Professor	27%	26%	28%	21%
Instructor/Lecturer/Other	11%	16%	24%	23%
Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
7. Years teaching courses in higher education:				
Mean	16.30	16.44	14.91	16.72
Standard deviation[6]	10.85	11.03	10.64	12.93
8. Years employed full- or part-time at this institution:				
Mean	13	12.53	10.87	12.97
Standard deviation ⁶	10.57	10.23	9.55	10.34

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
<p>9. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements. (Coding scale: 1= Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree)</p>					
9a. Institution systematically assesses students' first-year experiences	Strongly disagree	6%	4%	4%	5%
	Disagree	13%	17%	15%	18%
	Undecided	21%	16%	24%	27%
	Agree	44%	46%	44%	40%
	Strongly agree	16%	16%	13%	10%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.52	3.52	3.45	3.32
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.10	1.09	1.04	1.05
Effect size ⁷		0.00	0.07	0.19	
Significance ⁸					
9b. Assessment results used to strengthen first-year courses, programs, and services	Strongly disagree	9%	7%	6%	7%
	Disagree	16%	18%	18%	17%
	Undecided	30%	25%	34%	37%
	Agree	36%	38%	35%	32%
	Strongly agree	9%	12%	8%	7%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.22	3.30	3.22	3.16
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.09	1.10	1.01	1.01
Effect size ⁷		-0.08	-0.01	0.06	
Significance ⁸					
10. Regardless of how good your institution is at educating students, how much does it emphasize "doing even better"? (Coding scale: 4 = Great emphasis to 1 = No emphasis)	Great emphasis	35%	41%	28%	31%
	Moderate emphasis	46%	48%	46%	48%
	Slight emphasis	14%	10%	20%	18%
	No emphasis	5%	2%	6%	3%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.14	3.27	2.97	3.07
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.82	0.72	0.85	0.79
	Effect size ⁷		-0.18	0.20	0.08
Significance ⁸					

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
11. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements. (Coding scale: 1= Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree)					
11a. First-year students know what is expected of them <i>academically</i>	Strongly disagree	6%	3%	7%	5%
	Disagree	25%	20%	28%	23%
	Undecided	13%	11%	20%	23%
	Agree	53%	56%	40%	44%
	Strongly agree	4%	10%	5%	5%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.24	3.49	3.07	3.23
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.08	1.01	1.08	1.01
	Effect size ⁷		-0.25	0.16	0.01
Significance ⁸		*			
11b. First-year students know what is expected of them <i>outside the classroom</i>	Strongly disagree	4%	3%	8%	6%
	Disagree	26%	19%	28%	24%
	Undecided	25%	31%	34%	38%
	Agree	40%	42%	26%	30%
	Strongly agree	5%	5%	3%	3%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.17	3.26	2.88	2.98
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.00	0.93	0.99	0.94
	Effect size ⁷		-0.10	0.29	0.20
Significance ⁸			*		
11c. Admissions office professionals know my department's academic options and strengths	Strongly disagree	8%	6%	7%	9%
	Disagree	16%	22%	23%	24%
	Undecided	10%	25%	29%	31%
	Agree	56%	40%	33%	30%
	Strongly agree	10%	7%	7%	6%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.48	3.20	3.10	2.99
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.10	1.06	1.07	1.06
	Effect size ⁷		0.27	0.36	0.47
Significance ⁸		*	**	***	
11d.1. Communicating to new students what it has to offer academically	Strongly disagree	4%	1%	2%	1%
	Disagree	11%	7%	10%	10%
	Undecided	8%	12%	18%	18%
	Agree	63%	62%	57%	58%
	Strongly agree	15%	17%	13%	12%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.78	3.87	3.69	3.70
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.96	0.82	0.88	0.86
	Effect size ⁷		-0.12	0.10	0.09
Significance ⁸					

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
11d.2. Enrolling new student who can benefit from what this institution has to offer	Strongly disagree	1%	1%	2%	2%
	Disagree	9%	5%	10%	9%
	Undecided	5%	13%	19%	21%
	Agree	59%	60%	55%	56%
	Strongly agree	25%	21%	14%	12%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	4.01	3.94	3.68	3.67
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.88	0.79	0.90	0.87
	Effect size ⁷		0.09	0.37	0.40
Significance ⁸			**	***	
11d.3. Informing new students about the institution's history and traditions	Strongly disagree	0%	1%	3%	2%
	Disagree	11%	12%	16%	14%
	Undecided	24%	21%	31%	29%
	Agree	36%	43%	37%	38%
	Strongly agree	28%	24%	13%	17%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.84	3.76	3.42	3.54
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.98	0.98	1.00	1.00
	Effect size ⁷		0.08	0.42	0.31
Significance ⁸			***	**	
11d.4. Informing new students about the values this institution considers important	Strongly disagree	1%	1%	3%	2%
	Disagree	6%	6%	14%	13%
	Undecided	10%	11%	27%	26%
	Agree	52%	50%	39%	42%
	Strongly agree	30%	31%	17%	18%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	4.05	4.05	3.53	3.62
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.90	0.87	1.03	0.97
	Effect size ⁷		0.01	0.51	0.44
Significance ⁸			***	***	
11d.5. Keeping faculty informed about the <u>academic</u> support services where they can refer students having difficulty	Strongly disagree	0%	1%	2%	3%
	Disagree	0%	7%	12%	17%
	Undecided	3%	7%	9%	13%
	Agree	51%	54%	55%	54%
	Strongly agree	46%	31%	23%	13%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	4.46	4.09	3.85	3.57
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.56	0.83	0.97	1.01
	Effect size ⁷		0.45	0.62	0.88
Significance ⁸		***	***	***	

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
11d.6. Keeping faculty informed about the <u>personal</u> support services where they can refer students having difficulty	Strongly disagree	0%	1%	3%	4%
	Disagree	5%	12%	17%	20%
	Undecided	4%	15%	15%	22%
	Agree	48%	50%	49%	45%
	Strongly agree	43%	22%	16%	9%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	4.30	3.80	3.60	3.35
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.04	1.06	1.03	1.03
Effect size ⁷		0.47	0.68	0.93	
Significance ⁸		***	***	***	
11d.6. Helping new students get off to a good start academically	Strongly disagree	0%	1%	2%	2%
	Disagree	15%	10%	13%	13%
	Undecided	13%	19%	26%	33%
	Agree	56%	55%	48%	44%
	Strongly agree	16%	16%	10%	8%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.76	3.76	3.5	3.42
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.91	0.86	0.92	0.89
Effect size ⁷		0	0.27	0.38	
Significance ⁸			*	**	
11d.8. Facilitating new students' early involvement in the <u>academic</u> life of the institution	Strongly disagree	8%	3%	3%	2%
	Disagree	19%	13%	17%	17%
	Undecided	21%	21%	29%	31%
	Agree	45%	49%	43%	43%
	Strongly agree	8%	15%	8%	7%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.29	3.59	3.36	3.35
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.08	0.98	0.96	0.93
Effect size ⁷		-0.30	-0.07	-0.06	
Significance ⁸		**			
11d.9. Facilitating new students' early involvement in the <u>non-academic</u> life of the institution	Strongly disagree	0%	1%	2%	1%
	Disagree	0%	4%	11%	9%
	Undecided	13%	19%	36%	38%
	Agree	49%	49%	40%	43%
	Strongly agree	39%	28%	11%	9%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	4.29	3.98	3.47	3.49
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.67	0.83	0.89	0.82
Effect size ⁷		0.37	0.92	0.97	
Significance ⁸		**	***	***	

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
11d.10. Conveying to new students the sense that, if they make the effort, they can succeed here	Strongly disagree	1%	0%	2%	1%
	Disagree	5%	4%	6%	7%
	Undecided	15%	17%	22%	26%
	Agree	47%	57%	56%	53%
	Strongly agree	32%	22%	14%	13%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	4.04	3.96	3.75	3.70
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.90	0.77	0.84	0.82
	Effect size ⁷		0.10	0.35	0.41
Significance ⁸			**	***	
11d.11. Conveying to new students the sense that they "belong" here	Strongly disagree	0.00%	0.62%	1.28%	0.74%
	Disagree	3.80%	4.27%	8.71%	7.73%
	Undecided	5.06%	20.89%	27.92%	29.46%
	Agree	48.10%	49.30%	47.44%	48.45%
	Strongly agree	43.04%	24.92%	14.65%	13.62%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	4.32	3.93	3.65	3.67
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.75	0.83	0.88	0.83
	Effect size ⁷		0.47	0.76	0.79
Significance ⁸		***	***	***	

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
12. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.					
(Coding scale: 1= Disagree strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree somewhat, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Agree somewhat, 5 = Agree strongly. "Don't Know")					
12a. Institution has a <u>comprehensive</u> approach to helping first-year students succeed	Disagree strongly	3%	4%	5%	6%
	Disagree somewhat	16%	15%	18%	19%
	Undecided	9%	10%	18%	25%
	Agree somewhat	42%	46%	40%	36%
	Agree strongly	30%	24%	18%	14%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.83	3.71	3.47	3.31
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.13	1.12	1.14	1.12
Effect size ⁷		0.11	0.32	0.47	
Significance ⁸			**	***	

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
12b. Institution has a <u>coherent</u> approach to helping first-year students succeed	Disagree strongly	3%	5%	5%	6%
	Disagree somewhat	21%	15%	17%	19%
	Undecided	14%	14%	22%	27%
	Agree somewhat	33%	46%	40%	36%
	Agree strongly	30%	20%	16%	11%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.68	3.61	3.45	3.27
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.19	1.12	1.10	1.09
Effect size ⁷		0.07	0.21	0.37	
Significance ⁸				**	
12c. Institution has a clear curricular plan for students during their first year	Disagree strongly	1%	4%	4%	4%
	Disagree somewhat	19%	16%	12%	13%
	Undecided	9%	8%	13%	17%
	Agree somewhat	45%	37%	40%	38%
	Agree strongly	26%	35%	31%	28%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.79	3.82	3.80	3.72
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.08	1.20	1.13	1.12
Effect size ⁷		-0.03	-0.01	0.06	
Significance ⁸					
12d. First-year student success is a priority for this institution	Disagree strongly	0%	1%	3%	3%
	Disagree somewhat	1%	6%	9%	10%
	Undecided	14%	10%	14%	17%
	Agree somewhat	45%	38%	39%	39%
	Agree strongly	40%	46%	35%	31%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	4.26	4.23	3.95	3.86
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.73	0.88	1.05	1.05
Effect size ⁷		0.04	0.30	0.39	
Significance ⁸			**	***	
12e. Student Affairs staff have the support of faculty members	Disagree strongly	0%	1%	2%	2%
	Disagree somewhat	4%	11%	8%	9%
	Undecided	11%	19%	23%	32%
	Agree somewhat	46%	43%	42%	40%
	Agree strongly	39%	26%	25%	17%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	4.25	3.82	3.80	3.61
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.77	0.98	0.96	0.95
Effect size ⁷		0.44	0.47	0.68	
Significance ⁸		***	***	***	

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
12f. Faculty and Student Affairs staff work closely together in orienting first-year students	Disagree strongly	3%	7%	6%	8%
	Disagree somewhat	23%	23%	20%	23%
	Undecided	10%	18%	23%	28%
	Agree somewhat	40%	32%	33%	30%
	Agree strongly	25%	20%	17%	11%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.65	3.36	3.33	3.13
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.17	1.22	1.16	1.13
Effect size ⁷		0.24	0.28	0.46	
Significance ⁸		*	*	***	
12g. Faculty and Student Affairs staff work closely together in ways that promote first-year students' success	Disagree strongly	1%	6%	6%	8%
	Disagree somewhat	15%	19%	20%	23%
	Undecided	14%	22%	27%	33%
	Agree somewhat	39%	35%	32%	27%
	Agree strongly	30%	18%	14%	9%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.85	3.40	3.29	3.07
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.07	1.17	1.13	1.08
Effect size ⁷		0.39	0.50	0.73	
Significance ⁸		***	***	***	
12h. This institution's administration provides clear leadership to faculty and staff in promoting first-year students' success	Disagree strongly	9%	6%	11%	10%
	Disagree somewhat	18%	20%	21%	22%
	Undecided	29%	22%	21%	28%
	Agree somewhat	28%	36%	29%	29%
	Agree strongly	18%	17%	17%	12%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.30	3.37	3.18	3.11
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.20	1.15	1.26	1.16
Effect size ⁷		-0.06	0.09	0.16	
Significance ⁸					

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
13. To what extent are first-year courses, programs, and services: (Coding scale: 1 = Not at all, 2 = Slightly, 3 = Moderately, 4 = A great deal. "Don't Know" responses excluded from calculation of means and standard deviations)					
13a. Integrated "vertically" (i.e., treated as a foundational year upon which later years build)	Not at all	9%	5%	5%	5%
	Slightly	33%	19%	18%	19%
	Moderately	41%	40%	42%	42%
	A great deal	18%	36%	35%	34%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.70	3.07	3.07	3.05
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.87	0.86	0.85	0.85
Effect size ⁷		-0.44	-0.44	-0.42	
Significance ⁸		***	***	***	
13b. Coordinated "horizontally" (i.e., all units dealing with first-year students communicate and work together in an organized way)	Not at all	24%	17%	16%	20%
	Slightly	24%	32%	34%	38%
	Moderately	44%	39%	38%	33%
	A great deal	8%	12%	12%	8%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.37	2.45	2.45	2.28
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.94	0.90	0.90	0.88
Effect size ⁷		-0.09	-0.09	0.10	
Significance ⁸					
13c. Intentional (i.e., has stated goals and objectives)	Not at all	1%	6%	6%	5%
	Slightly	18%	15%	18%	21%
	Moderately	39%	38%	42%	42%
	A great deal	43%	41%	34%	31%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.25	3.15	3.04	3.00
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.77	0.88	0.87	0.86
Effect size ⁷		0.12	0.25	0.30	
Significance ⁸			*	**	
13d. Active (i.e., actively pursues those goals and objectives)	Not at all	1%	6%	6%	6%
	Slightly	23%	17%	22%	26%
	Moderately	49%	46%	46%	45%
	A great deal	27%	32%	26%	23%
	Don't Know	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.03	3.04	2.92	2.85
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.74	0.84	0.85	0.85
Effect size ⁷		-0.02	0.13	0.21	
Significance ⁸					

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
14. Do you typically teach a <u>first-year seminar</u> ?	1. No	51%	63%	86%	86%
	2. Yes; it's required	11%	11%	5%	4%
	3. Yes; I choose to	38%	26%	9%	10%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
15. Do you typically teach <u>other</u> courses that serve primarily first-year students?	1. No	32%	32%	50%	64%
	2. Yes; it's required	23%	24%	23%	13%
	3. Yes; I choose to	46%	44%	27%	23%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
<p>16. In your courses that serve primarily first-year students (<u>exclude first-year seminars</u>), to what extent do you use the following:</p> <p>(Coding scale: 1 = Not at all, 2 = Slightly, 3 = Moderately, 4 = A great deal. "Not Applicable" responses excluded from calculation of means and standard deviations. Respondents not teaching courses serving primarily first-year students excluded.)</p>					
16a. Lecture	Not at all	9%	4%	1%	1%
	Slightly	11%	14%	6%	5%
	Moderately	25%	25%	15%	9%
	A great deal	23%	25%	28%	21%
	Not Applicable	32%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.93	3.04	3.40	3.42
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.03	0.90	0.77	0.79
Effect size ⁷		-0.13	-0.62	-0.62	
Significance ⁸			***	***	
16b. In-class discussion	Not at all	1%	1%	1%	1%
	Slightly	13%	9%	8%	6%
	Moderately	21%	23%	19%	13%
	A great deal	34%	35%	22%	16%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.31	3.36	3.25	3.24
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.82	0.77	0.78	0.81
Effect size ⁷		-0.06	0.08	0.09	
Significance ⁸					

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
16c. Collaborative or cooperative learning	Not at all	1%	5%	4%	4%
	Slightly	8%	12%	11%	8%
	Moderately	36%	25%	18%	12%
	A great deal	24%	26%	17%	12%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.22	3.05	2.93	2.90
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.72	0.92	0.95	1.00
	Effect size ⁷		0.19	0.31	0.32
Significance ⁸			**	**	
16d. Experiential or problem-based learning	Not at all	5%	8%	5%	4%
	Slightly	9%	15%	11%	7%
	Moderately	33%	23%	17%	11%
	A great deal	23%	22%	17%	14%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.09	2.86	2.91	2.95
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.87	1.00	0.99	1.02
	Effect size ⁷		0.23	0.18	0.14
Significance ⁸		*			
16e. Group projects	Not at all	9%	12%	13%	11%
	Slightly	14%	17%	14%	8%
	Moderately	33%	23%	13%	10%
	A great deal	14%	16%	10%	7%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.76	2.61	2.39	2.37
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.94	1.03	1.07	1.10
	Effect size ⁷		0.15	0.35	0.35
Significance ⁸			**	**	
16f. Multiple drafts of written work	Not at all	15%	18%	18%	13%
	Slightly	10%	14%	12%	9%
	Moderately	20%	17%	10%	6%
	A great deal	24%	19%	10%	7%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.79	2.55	2.25	2.20
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.17	1.16	1.14	1.14
	Effect size ⁷		0.21	0.47	0.52
Significance ⁸			***	***	

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
16g. Community service for extra credit	Not at all	59%	58%	41%	30%
	Slightly	8%	7%	6%	4%
	Moderately	1%	2%	3%	1%
	A great deal	1%	1%	1%	0%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	1.21	1.20	1.28	1.21
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.57	0.54	0.65	0.55
	Effect size ⁷ Significance ⁸		0.02	-0.1	0
16h. Community services as an integral part of the course	Not at all	54%	53%	41%	29%
	Slightly	8%	9%	6%	4%
	Moderately	4%	3%	2%	1%
	A great deal	3%	3%	2%	1%
	Not Applicable	32%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	1.36	1.35	1.29	1.29
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.76	0.78	0.69	0.71
	Effect size ⁷ Significance ⁸		0.01	0.09	0.09
16i. Frequent feedback to students on their progress	Not at all	1%	1%	1%	1%
	Slightly	6%	5%	3%	2%
	Moderately	19%	22%	12%	11%
	A great deal	43%	41%	34%	22%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.53	3.51	3.58	3.50
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.73	0.67	0.68	0.72
	Effect size ⁷ Significance ⁸		0.03	-0.07	0.05
16j. Detailed feedback to students on their progress	Not at all	5%	3%	2%	2%
	Slightly	8%	9%	7%	6%
	Moderately	19%	22%	14%	11%
	A great deal	37%	35%	28%	17%
	Not Applicable	32%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.29	3.30	3.36	3.22
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.95	0.85	0.83	0.90
	Effect size ⁷ Significance ⁸		-0.01	-0.09	0.08

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
16k. Multiple-choice tests or examinations	Not at all	38%	39%	14%	13%
	Slightly	15%	13%	9%	7%
	Moderately	5%	8%	11%	6%
	A great deal	11%	8%	17%	10%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	1.87	1.77	2.61	2.38
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.13	1.05	1.21	1.22
	Effect size ⁷		0.09	-0.62	-0.42
Significance ⁸			***	***	
16l. Essay or other open-ended assignments	Not at all	3%	10%	9%	7%
	Slightly	11%	7%	10%	5%
	Moderately	16%	17%	14%	10%
	A great deal	38%	34%	17%	14%
	Not Applicable	32%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.35	3.10	2.80	2.87
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.87	1.09	1.10	1.14
	Effect size ⁷		0.24	0.51	0.43
Significance ⁸		*	***	***	
16m. Papers or other open-ended assignments	Not at all	4%	5%	8%	6%
	Slightly	9%	7%	9%	5%
	Moderately	14%	15%	14%	9%
	A great deal	42%	40%	20%	16%
	Not Applicable	32%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.39	3.33	2.92	2.94
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.93	0.95	1.08	1.14
	Effect size ⁷		0.07	0.44	0.40
Significance ⁸			***	***	
16n. Student presentations	Not at all	11%	16%	18%	12%
	Slightly	19%	15%	11%	8%
	Moderately	25%	20%	11%	9%
	A great deal	13%	16%	10%	8%
	Not Applicable	32%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.58	2.54	2.27	2.33
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.00	1.09	1.15	1.15
	Effect size ⁷		0.04	0.27	0.22
Significance ⁸			*		

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
16o. Technology to further discussion outside of class	Not at all	20%	17%	11%	9%
	Slightly	24%	22%	11%	9%
	Moderately	14%	19%	15%	10%
	A great deal	11%	10%	13%	9%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.25	2.31	2.59	2.51
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.05	1.01	1.10	1.10
	Effect size ⁷		-0.06	-0.30	-0.23
Significance ⁸			**	*	
16p. Case studies or real-world examples	Not at all	9%	7%	5%	4%
	Slightly	18%	13%	10%	6%
	Moderately	19%	25%	18%	11%
	A great deal	24%	22%	18%	15%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.87	2.93	2.96	3.04
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.06	0.97	0.98	0.99
	Effect size ⁷		-0.06	-0.09	-0.17
16q. Hands-on experience	Not at all	15%	13%	10%	7%
	Slightly	13%	13%	9%	7%
	Moderately	19%	18%	13%	9%
	A great deal	23%	24%	19%	12%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.76	2.77	2.81	2.73
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.15	1.12	1.14	1.14
	Effect size ⁷		-0.01	-0.05	0.02
16r. Assignments or exercises focusing on application	Not at all	5%	6%	3%	2%
	Slightly	13%	10%	6%	4%
	Moderately	18%	22%	15%	12%
	A great deal	34%	30%	26%	18%
	Not Applicable	31%	32%	50%	64%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.19	3.12	3.27	3.24
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.98	0.96	0.90	0.91
	Effect size ⁷		0.08	-0.08	-0.05
Significance ⁸					

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
17a. How many courses do you teach that serve primarily first-year students (excluding first-year seminars)?	Mean	2.22	1.99	2.16	2.02
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.76	0.89	1.18	2.08
	Effect size ⁷		0.25	0.05	0.10
	Significance ⁸		*		
17b. Of those courses, how many are, in your view, <u>too large</u> to allow you to engage students individually?	Mean	0.95	0.81	1.10	0.84
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.80	1.29	3.00	1.22
	Effect size ⁷		0.11	-0.05	0.10
	Significance ⁸				

Note: Respondents not teaching courses serving primarily first-year students excluded.

18. In a typical academic term, how many <u>times per week</u> do you interact with first-year students <i>outside</i> of class to:					
a. Discuss intellectual or academic-related matters	Mean	3.94	3.93	3.01	2.17
	Standard deviation ⁶	4.05	4.77	5.45	5.06
	Effect size ⁷		0.00	0.17	0.35
	Significance ⁸				**
b. Exchange brief greetings	Mean	17.24	14.43	9.92	7.13
	Standard deviation ⁶	17.92	22.51	14.73	18.52
	Effect size ⁷		0.12	0.50	0.55
	Significance ⁸			***	***
c. Discuss matters related to the students' future career	Mean	2.15	2.28	2.26	1.43
	Standard deviation ⁶	2.03	3.46	4.52	3.33
	Effect size ⁷		-0.04	-0.03	0.22
	Significance ⁸				
d. Work together on an institutional or professional activity	Mean	1.04	1.09	1.07	0.67
	Standard deviation ⁶	3.75	4.05	4.29	2.14
	Effect size ⁷		-0.01	-0.01	0.17
	Significance ⁸				
e. Discuss a student's personal (non-academic) matters	Mean	2.61	2.44	2.02	1.15
	Standard deviation ⁶	3.11	3.97	4.37	3.19
	Effect size ⁷		0.04	0.14	0.46
	Significance ⁸				***
f. Have casual conversations	Mean	7.12	6.30	5.19	3.62
	Standard deviation ⁶	6.87	9.84	8.89	14.98
	Effect size ⁷		0.08	0.22	0.23
	Significance ⁸				*
g. Discuss non-academic topics of mutual interest	Mean	3.45	3.54	2.99	2.20
	Standard deviation ⁶	4.52	6.09	5.36	13.96
	Effect size ⁷		-0.01	0.09	0.09
	Significance ⁸				

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
19a. How often do you provide opportunities for first-year students in your classes to learn about people which differ from them in: (Coding scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Often, 4 = Very often; respondents not teaching first-year students excluded)					
19a.1. Background characteristics (e.g., gender, race)	Never	9%	17%	20%	24%
	Sometimes	44%	37%	37%	30%
	Often	26%	23%	25%	22%
	Very often	20%	23%	18%	23%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.59	2.53	2.41	2.44
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.92	1.02	1.00	1.09
	Effect size ⁷		0.06	0.18	0.14
19a.2. Attitudes and values (e.g., politics, religion)	Never	11%	16%	21%	25%
	Sometimes	27%	28%	34%	27%
	Often	29%	31%	25%	23%
	Very often	33%	25%	20%	25%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.86	2.65	2.44	2.48
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.02	1.03	1.03	1.11
	Effect size ⁷		0.21	0.41	0.34
19b. Give your first-year students assignments that require them to examine ideas or perspectives other than their own	Never	7%	12%	18%	19%
	Sometimes	18%	24%	34%	25%
	Often	42%	36%	28%	27%
	Very often	33%	27%	20%	28%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.01	2.78	2.50	2.64
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.92	0.98	1.01	1.09
	Effect size ⁷		0.24	0.51	0.34
19c. Champion a less-accepted point of view for the sake of an argument (play devil's advocate)	Never	13%	13%	22%	23%
	Sometimes	42%	46%	42%	40%
	Often	27%	26%	22%	22%
	Very often	18%	15%	14%	15%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.53	2.43	2.28	2.28
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.93	0.91	0.97	0.98
	Effect size ⁷		0.11	0.26	0.25
Significance ⁸			*	*	

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
19d. Ask first-year students in your classes to wrestle ideas or points of view that differ from their own	Never	7%	10%	18%	18%
	Sometimes	24%	31%	38%	32%
	Often	44%	35%	27%	28%
	Very often	25%	24%	17%	22%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.90	2.73	2.42	2.55
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.88	0.93	0.97	1.02
	Effect size ⁷		0.18	0.49	0.34
Significance ⁸			***	**	
19e. Encourage students to integrate into your courses things they're learning in other courses	Never	16%	12%	11%	11%
	Sometimes	38%	48%	39%	39%
	Often	27%	28%	35%	33%
	Very often	18%	12%	15%	17%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.51	2.41	2.54	2.55
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.98	0.85	0.88	0.90
	Effect size ⁷		0.12	-0.03	-0.05
Significance ⁸					
19f. Change course content or your teaching in response to student feedback	Never	0%	2%	4%	3%
	Sometimes	44%	46%	45%	45%
	Often	41%	38%	38%	35%
	Very often	15%	14%	12%	17%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.73	2.64	2.57	2.67
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.72	0.74	0.76	0.79
	Effect size ⁷		0.12	0.21	0.08
Significance ⁸					

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
20a. During the typical academic term, approximately how many <u>hours per week</u> do you devote to this institution?	Mean	55.34	50.33	44.78	47.72
	Standard deviation ⁶	9.55	12.78	14.56	14.44
	Effect size ⁷		0.39	0.73	0.53
	Significance ⁸		***	***	***
20b. Of those hours, the approximate number spent in each of the following activities:					
20b.a. Teaching first- year undergrads (incl. class prep., time in class, grading, etc.)	Mean	18.00	14.75	10.45	7.52
	Standard deviation ⁶	12.09	11.90	11.53	10.69
	Effect size ⁷		0.27	0.66	0.98
	Significance ⁸		*	***	***
20b.b Advising, supervising, or otherwise helping first-year students	Mean	4.28	3.58	3.32	2.18
	Standard deviation ⁶	5.68	3.98	4.38	3.79
	Effect size ⁷		0.18	0.22	0.55
	Significance ⁸				***
20b.c. Interacting with first-year students outside of class	Mean	2.76	2.44	2.14	1.34
	Standard deviation ⁶	3.77	3.71	3.69	2.43
	Effect size ⁷		0.09	0.17	0.58
	Significance ⁸				***
20b.d. Administrative duties related to first-year students	Mean	1.85	2.10	2.22	1.74
	Standard deviation ⁶	2.93	4.33	4.75	4.32
	Effect size ⁷		-0.06	-0.08	0.03
	Significance ⁸				
20b.e. Research or scholarship in your field	Mean	5.85	6.75	7.96	15.12
	Standard deviation ⁶	4.93	6.66	8.27	12.92
	Effect size ⁷		-0.13	-0.26	-0.72
	Significance ⁸			*	***

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
<p>21. Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements as they pertain to this institution:</p> <p>(Coding scale: 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Agree strongly.)</p> <p>"Not Applicable" responses excluded from calculation of means and standard deviations)</p>					
a. Faculty are rewarded for teaching first-year students (e.g., promotion and tenure, merit salary)	Strongly disagree	32%	23%	27%	25%
	Disagree	51%	43%	48%	48%
	Undecided	13%	27%	22%	23%
	Agree	5%	6%	3%	4%
	Strongly agree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	1.92	2.17	2.02	2.07
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.82	0.85	0.79	0.80
Effect size ⁷		-0.28	-0.12	-0.18	
Significance ⁸		*			
b. Faculty are encouraged to interact with first-year students outside the classroom	Strongly disagree	6%	4%	9%	11%
	Disagree	26%	18%	35%	40%
	Undecided	60%	60%	46%	43%
	Agree	8%	18%	10%	7%
	Strongly agree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.72	2.92	2.57	2.46
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.71	0.71	0.79	0.78
Effect size ⁷		-0.29	0.19	0.34	
Significance ⁸		*		**	
c. Teaching is more important than research	Strongly disagree	1%	3%	7%	24%
	Disagree	9%	13%	16%	48%
	Undecided	36%	41%	39%	20%
	Agree	54%	43%	38%	8%
	Strongly agree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.44	3.23	3.08	2.13
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.72	0.79	0.90	0.87
Effect size ⁷		0.26	0.40	1.51	
Significance ⁸		*	***	***	

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
d. When hiring new faculty members, candidates' teaching abilities are more important than their research abilities	Strongly disagree	4%	3%	7%	26%
	Disagree	15%	21%	22%	55%
	Undecided	30%	43%	41%	15%
	Agree	51%	33%	30%	4%
	Strongly agree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.30	3.05	2.95	1.97
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.86	0.81	0.89	0.76
Effect size ⁷		0.30	0.40	1.76	
Significance ⁸		**	***	***	
e. Faculty are assisted to learn about first-year students and how to help them succeed	Strongly disagree	1%	6%	12%	17%
	Disagree	20%	28%	45%	48%
	Undecided	63%	51%	36%	30%
	Agree	15%	14%	7%	4%
	Strongly agree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.94	2.74	2.38	2.23
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.65	0.77	0.78	0.77
Effect size ⁷		0.26	0.73	0.92	
Significance ⁸		*	***	***	
f. My faculty colleagues consider the first year an important time to help students lay the foundation for the rest of their college education	Strongly disagree	1%	2%	4%	7%
	Disagree	14%	11%	16%	22%
	Undecided	65%	59%	58%	57%
	Agree	20%	28%	22%	14%
	Strongly agree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.07	3.12	2.98	2.79
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.62	0.68	0.74	0.76
Effect size ⁷		-0.07	0.12	0.37	
Significance ⁸				**	
g. Faculty are encouraged to use the services of the on-campus instructional support center	Strongly disagree	0%	3%	4%	5%
	Disagree	10%	12%	17%	21%
	Undecided	66%	59%	56%	58%
	Agree	24%	26%	23%	16%
	Strongly agree	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.15	3.09	2.99	2.86
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.57	0.70	0.74	0.73
Effect size ⁷		0.09	0.21	0.40	
Significance ⁸				***	

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
22. This institution provides instructors adequate support for working with students who: (Coding scale: 1 = Disagree strongly, 2 = Disagree somewhat, 3 = Agree somewhat, 4 = Agree strongly. "Not Applicable" responses excluded from calculation of means and standard deviations)					
a. Are from a variety of cultural backgrounds	Disagree strongly	14%	8%	9%	8%
	Disagree somewhat	25%	30%	25%	25%
	Agree somewhat	53%	49%	49%	51%
	Agree strongly	9%	12%	17%	16%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.59	2.65	2.74	2.74
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.84	0.80	0.84	0.82
Effect size ⁷		-0.08	-0.17	-0.18	
Significance ⁸					
b. Are underprepared for college work	Disagree strongly	16%	11%	14%	14%
	Disagree somewhat	47%	36%	30%	37%
	Agree somewhat	30%	40%	41%	40%
	Agree strongly	6%	13%	15%	9%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.28	2.56	2.58	2.44
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.82	0.85	0.91	0.84
Effect size ⁷		-0.33	-0.33	-0.19	
Significance ⁸		**	**		
c. Are gifted	Disagree strongly	9%	6%	10%	8%
	Disagree somewhat	27%	22%	32%	26%
	Agree somewhat	42%	46%	42%	44%
	Agree strongly	23%	26%	16%	22%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.81	2.93	2.64	2.79
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.90	0.84	0.86	0.87
Effect size ⁷		-0.14	0.20	0.02	
Significance ⁸					
d. Have disabilities	Disagree strongly	3%	8%	5%	4%
	Disagree somewhat	20%	23%	14%	14%
	Agree somewhat	43%	46%	45%	48%
	Agree strongly	35%	23%	36%	34%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.13	2.84	3.11	3.11
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.80	0.86	0.83	0.79
Effect size ⁷		0.34	0.03	0.02	
Significance ⁸		**			

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
e. Have family and/or work obligations	Disagree strongly	13%	11%	8%	10%
	Disagree somewhat	58%	46%	32%	36%
	Agree somewhat	25%	37%	44%	43%
	Agree strongly	4%	6%	15%	11%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.22	2.37	2.67	2.54
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.71	0.76	0.83	0.81
Effect size ⁷		-0.20	-0.54	-0.40	
Significance ⁸			***	***	
f. Are older or returning adults	Disagree strongly	28%	17%	6%	9%
	Disagree somewhat	54%	45%	23%	30%
	Agree somewhat	18%	33%	48%	47%
	Agree strongly	0%	5%	23%	14%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	1.91	2.27	2.89	2.66
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.67	0.80	0.82	0.83
Effect size ⁷		-0.46	-1.20	-0.91	
Significance ⁸		***	***	***	
g. Are athletes	Disagree strongly	4%	6%	3%	3%
	Disagree somewhat	18%	22%	14%	10%
	Agree somewhat	48%	49%	50%	45%
	Agree strongly	31%	23%	33%	42%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.09	2.90	3.12	3.26
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.79	0.82	0.77	0.75
Effect size ⁷		0.24	-0.03	-0.22	
Significance ⁸		*			

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
23. This institution does a good job in: (Coding scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree somewhat, 3 = Agree somewhat, 5 = Agree strongly. "Not Applicable" responses excluded from calculation of means and standard deviations)					
a. Placing first-year students in courses appropriate to their academic preparation	Disagree strongly	0%	2%	5%	5%
	Disagree somewhat	13%	14%	16%	16%
	Agree somewhat	60%	57%	57%	58%
	Agree strongly	28%	28%	23%	21%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	3.18	3.11	2.97	2.95
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.62	0.68	0.75	0.75
Effect size ⁷		0.10	0.27	0.31	
Significance ⁸			*	**	
b. Providing adequate support for all of the kinds of first-year students we admit	Disagree strongly	5%	4%	7%	7%
	Disagree somewhat	30%	21%	27%	28%
	Agree somewhat	54%	55%	50%	53%
	Agree strongly	11%	19%	16%	13%
	Not Applicable	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.74	2.90	2.75	2.71
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.73	0.74	0.80	0.77
Effect size ⁷		-0.21	-0.01	0.04	
Significance ⁸					

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
24. In the past two years, approximately how many times have you: (Coding scale: 0 = None, 1 = Once, 2 = Twice, 3 = Three or more times)					
a. Participated in a conference, workshop, or other formal activity that focused on <u>teaching and learning</u>	None	11%	12%	15%	20%
	Once	30%	20%	20%	22%
	Twice	28%	28%	26%	23%
	Three or more times	31%	41%	38%	35%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.82	2.97	2.86	2.74
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.01	1.04	1.09	1.14
	Effect size ⁷		-0.15	-0.04	0.07
Significance ⁸					
b. Participated in a conference, workshop, or other formal activity on <u>first-year students</u> and how to help them succeed	None	60%	57%	68%	74%
	Once	30%	23%	18%	15%
	Twice	5%	11%	8%	6%
	Three or more times	2%	10%	6%	6%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	1.51	1.74	1.52	1.44
	Standard deviation ⁶	0.74	1.00	0.87	0.85
	Effect size ⁷		-0.23	-0.02	0.07
Significance ⁸		*			
c. Read literature related to first-year students and how to help them succeed	None	28%	42%	44%	52%
	Once	31%	21%	20%	19%
	Twice	19%	14%	13%	12%
	Three or more times	20%	23%	23%	17%
	Total ¹¹	100%	100%	100%	100%
	Mean	2.32	2.18	2.17	1.94
	Standard deviation ⁶	1.11	1.20	1.22	1.15
	Effect size ⁷		0.11	0.12	0.33
Significance ⁸				**	

FACULTY SCALE SCORE COMPARISONS

First Year Assessment and Use (Alpha = .870)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	3.39	3.41	3.34	3.24
Standard deviation	1.04	1.04	0.96	0.97
Effect size ^a		-0.02	0.06	0.15
Significance ^b				

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

- Institution systematically assesses students' first-year experiences (9a)
- Results from first-year student assessments are used to strengthen first-year courses, programs, and services (9b)

Planned Approach to First Year (Alpha=.861)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	3.89	3.84	3.67	3.54
Standard deviation	0.82	0.89	0.94	0.92
Effect size ^a		0.05	0.24	0.38
Significance ^b			*	***

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

- Institution has a **comprehensive** approach to helping first-year students succeed (12a)
- Institution has a **coherent** approach to helping first-year students succeed (12b)
- Institution has a clear curricular plan for students during their first year (12c)
- First-year student success is a priority for this institution (12d)

Cross-Divisional Collaboration (Alpha = .894)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	3.90	3.52	3.47	3.27
Standard deviation	0.87	1.02	0.98	0.95
Effect size ^a		0.37	0.44	0.67
Significance ^b		**	***	***

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

- Student Affairs staff have the support of faculty (12e)
 - Faculty and Student Affairs staff work closely together in orienting first-year students (12f)
 - Faculty and Student Affairs staff work closely together in ways that promote first-year students' success (12g)
-

Holistic Organization of the First Year (Alpha = .867)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	2.83	2.93	2.87	2.80
Standard deviation	0.64	0.72	0.74	0.72
Effect size ^a		-0.13	-0.05	0.05
Significance ^b				

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

First-year courses, programs, and services are:

- **Integrated "vertically"** (i.e., treated as a foundational year upon which later years build) (13a)
- **Coordinated "horizontally"** (i.e., all units dealing with first year students communicate and work together in an organized way) (13b)
- **"intentional"** (i.e., have stated goals and objectives) (13c)
- **"active"** (i.e., actively pursue those goals and objectives) (13d)

Socializing Students (Alpha = .765)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	4.13	3.93	3.52	3.58
Standard deviation	0.56	0.65	0.75	0.67
Effect size ^a		0.30	0.82	0.82
Significance ^b		**	***	***

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

- **Inform new students about the institutions history and tradition** (11d.3)
- **Inform new students about the values this institution considers important** (11d.4)
- **Facilitate new students' early involvement in the non-academic life of the institution** (11d.9)
- **Convey to new students the sense that they "belong" here** (11d.11)

Foundations for Academic Success (Alpha = .879)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	3.50	3.54	3.32	3.30
Standard deviation	0.60	0.58	0.66	0.64
Effect size ^a		-0.06	0.27	0.31
Significance ^b			*	**

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

- **First-year students know what is expected of them academically (11a)**
- **Admissions office professionals know my department's academic options and strengths (11c)**
- **Facilitate new students' early involvement in the academic life of the institution (11d.8)**
- **Communicate to new students what the school has to offer academically (11d.1)**
- **Enroll new students who can benefit from what the institution has to offer (11d.2)**
- **Help new students get off to a good start academically (11d.6)**
- **Convey to new students new the sense that, if they make the effort, they can succeed here (11d.10)**
- **Places first-year students in courses appropriate to their academic preparation (23a)**
- **Provide adequate support for all of the kinds of first-year students admitted (23b)**

Faculty Awareness – Student Resources (Alpha = .829)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	4.38	3.94	3.73	3.46
Standard deviation	0.62	0.82	0.92	0.95
Effect size ^a		0.54	0.71	0.97
Significance ^b		***	***	***

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

- **Keep faculty informed about the academic support services for students having difficulties (11d.5)**
- **Keep faculty informed about the personal support services for students having difficulties (11d.6)**

Active Teaching and Assessment (Alpha = .751)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	2.89	2.83	2.44	2.49
Standard deviation	0.70	0.66	0.66	0.70
Effect size ^a		0.10	0.68	0.58
Significance ^b			***	***

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

In courses that serve primarily first-year students (excluding first-year seminars), to what extent do you use the following:

- Lecture (reversed coded) (16a)
- In-class discussion (16b)
- Multiple drafts of written work (16f)
- Multiple-choice tests or exams (reversed coded) (16k)
- Papers or other open-ended assignments (16m)
- Student presentations (16n)

Learning Through Application (Alpha = .815)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	3.01	2.88	2.86	2.84
Standard deviation	0.68	0.74	0.75	0.79
Effect size ^a		0.17	0.19	0.22
Significance ^b				

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

In courses that serve primarily first-year students (excluding first-year seminars), to what extent do you use the following:

- Collaborative/cooperative learning (16c)
- Experiential/problem-based learning (16d)
- Group projects (16e)
- Hands-on experiences (16q)
- Assignments or exercise focusing on application (16r)

Community Service (Alpha = .630)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	1.30	1.29	1.29	1.27
Standard deviation	0.62	0.56	0.57	0.53
Effect size ^a		0.01	0.01	0.06
Significance ^b				

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

In courses that serve primarily first-year students (excluding first-year seminars), to what extent do you use the following:

- Community service for extra credit (16g)
- Community service as an integral part of the course (16h)

Student Feedback (Alpha = .796)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	3.41	3.40	3.47	3.36
Standard deviation	0.77	0.70	0.69	0.74
Effect size ^a		0.01	-0.09	0.07
Significance ^b				

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

In courses that serve primarily first-year students (excluding first-year seminars), to what extent do you use the following:

- Give frequent feedback to students on their progress (16i)
- Give detailed feedback to students on their progress (16j)

Promoting Encounters with Difference (Alpha = .902)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	2.95	2.72	2.38	2.28
Standard deviation	0.79	0.91	0.89	1.01
Effect size ^a		0.25	0.64	0.66
Significance ^b		*	***	***

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

- Provide opportunities for first-year students in your classes to learn about people who differ from them in background characteristics (19a.1)
- Provide opportunities for first-year students in your classes to learn about people who differ from them in (19a.2) attitudes or values (e.g., politics, religion)
- Give your first-year students assignments that require them to examine ideas/perspectives other than their own (19b)
- Ask first-year students in your classes to wrestle with ideas or points of view that differ from their own (19d)

Institutional Emphasis on the First Year (Alpha = .754)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	2.66	2.74	2.49	2.39
Standard deviation	0.48	0.53	0.59	0.59
Effect size ^a		-0.15	0.29	0.46
Significance ^b			*	***

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

- Faculty are rewarded for teaching first-year students (e.g., promotion and tenure, merit salary) (21a)
- Faculty are encouraged to interact with first-year students outside the classroom (21b)
- Faculty are assisted to learn about first-year students and how to help them succeed (21e)
- Faculty colleagues consider the first year as an important time to help students lay the foundation for the rest of their college education (21f)

Institutional Emphasis on Teaching (Alpha = .872)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	3.37	3.14	3.01	2.05
Standard deviation	0.71	0.74	0.82	0.74
Effect size ^a		0.31	0.43	1.77
Significance ^b		**	***	***

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

- Teaching is more important than research (21c)
- When hiring new faculty members, candidates' teaching abilities are more important than their research abilities (21d)

Professional Development (Alpha = .625)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	0.90	0.96	0.84	0.69
Standard deviation	0.77	0.95	0.90	0.87
Effect size ^a		-0.06	0.06	0.24
Significance ^b				*

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

- Participated in a conference, workshop, or other formal activity that focused on teaching and learning (24b)
- Read literature related to first-year students and how to help them succeed (24c)

Faculty-Student Contact - Casual (Alpha = .905)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	9.27	8.09	6.03	4.32
Standard deviation	8.23	11.33	8.31	15.05
Effect size ^a		0.10	0.39	0.33
Significance ^b			***	**

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

Arithmetic mean of:

- Weekly contacts to exchange brief greetings (18b)
- Weekly contacts to have casual conversation (18f)
- Weekly contacts to discuss non-academic topics of mutual interest (18g)

Faculty-Student Contact - Substantive (Alpha = .789)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	2.90	2.88	2.43	1.58
Standard deviation	2.46	3.40	3.99	3.37
Effect size ^a		0.01	0.12	0.39
Significance ^b				***

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

Arithmetic mean of:

- Weekly contacts to discuss intellectual or academic-related matters (18a)
- Weekly contacts to discuss matters related to a student's future career (18c)
- Weekly contacts to discuss a student's personal (non-academic) matters (18e)

Support for Faculty Working with All Students (Alpha= .837)

Scale Statistics	Gustavus Adolphus College	Norms for . . .		
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral
Mean	2.58	2.65	2.82	2.79
Standard deviation	0.50	0.57	0.61	0.59
Effect size ^a		-0.12	-0.40	-0.36
Significance ^b			***	**

^a Effect size = difference between institution mean score and norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

^b Statistical significance: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

^c Alpha reflects scale's internal consistency reliability. Can range from .00 to 1.0, with .60 or higher considered acceptable.

Scale Component Items

Arithmetic mean of responses to: "This institution provides instructors adequate support for working with students who:"

- are from a variety of cultural backgrounds (22a)
- are underprepared for college work (22b)
- are gifted (22c)
- have disabilities (22d)
- have family and/or work obligations (22e)
- are older or returning students (22f)
- are athletes (22g)

End Notes

[1] 2000 Carnegie Classification.

[2] Sample size represents the total number of surveys sent to faculty members, minus those that were undeliverable. The response rate represents the number of responses divided by the number of surveys successfully delivered. Please refer to this report's narrative introduction for details about the data collection procedures.

[3] An estimate of how much a reported percentage for your institution may differ from the campus population percentage. If the sampling error is, say, $\pm 5\%$, then your institution's population percentage may fall anywhere in the interval defined by your reported percentage plus or minus five percentage points. Larger sample sizes yield smaller sampling errors.

[4] Respondents who self-identified with two or more racial/ethnic groups.

[5] Number of respondents may be less than the base-n since the question was not relevant to all respondents.

[6] A measure of the dispersion of responses about the mean. The larger the standard deviation, the more respondents varied in their answers.

[7] Effect size is a measure of the magnitude of the difference between two group means expressed in standard deviation units. Effect size = institution mean minus a norm group mean divided by the norm group's standard deviation.

[8] The principal components procedures involved the varimax rotation of factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. Only items with rotated factor loadings greater than .40 were used to form scales. With rare exceptions, items loading higher than 4.0 on more than one factor were discarded. Factor scales (Armor, 1964) were formed by summing respondents' scores on the component items (those with loadings of .40 or higher) on a factor and then dividing by the number of items in the scale.

[9] Cronbach's alpha reflects the extent to which the items comprising a scale are correlated and, consequently, whether the scale is internally consistent: respondents answering one item high or low tend to answer other items in the scale higher or lower in a consistent fashion. Alpha can range from .00 to 1.00. Psychometricians consider any scale with an alpha of .70 or higher to be acceptable, although scales with alphas in the .5 or .6 ranges are occasionally used.

[10] Each summary contains statistical information on institutional and norm group scores. In addition to each scale's mean and standard deviation (measure of the dispersion of respondents' scores), an estimate of the "effect size" of the difference between means is provided. Effect size = mean difference between institution score and score of norm group divided by the norm group standard deviation. Because tests of statistical significance are sensitive to large sample sizes and the variability of scores within groups, statistical significance tests (of whatever size) shed little light on the magnitude of a difference between means. An effect size, on the other hand, reflects the magnitude of the difference between two means after adjusting for differences in the variability of scores. Characterizing effect sizes, however, is more art than science, helpful to some readers, frowned-upon by some psychometricians. Because many readers will not be familiar with the complexities of interpreting effect sizes, however, we will characterize these adjusted effect sizes that are smaller than .20 as "small" or "slight," those from .20 - .35 as "moderate," and those .35 or above as "large" or "strong." We base these characterizations on our experience and judgment, all the while acknowledging that others might choose different adjectives or prefer none at all. Cohen (1969, 1996) has suggested somewhat more stringent ranges for his adjectives.

[11] Percentages may not sum to 100% due to rounding.