

Community College Survey of Student Engagement

Pitt Community College

2016 Key Findings

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|---|
| Key Findings: A Starting Point | 2 |
| Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice | 3 |
| Aspects of Highest Student Engagement | 4 |
| Aspects of Lowest Student Engagement | 5 |
| 2016 <i>CCSSE</i> Special-Focus Items | 6 |
| <i>CCFSSE</i> | 8 |

Key Findings: A Starting Point

The Key Findings report provides an entry point for reviewing results from your administration of the 2016 Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE). The report provides college-specific data in an easy-to-share format including benchmark comparisons between the college, top-performing colleges, and the CCSSE cohort. It also highlights aspects of highest and lowest student engagement at the college, as well as results from five CCSSE special-focus items. Select faculty survey data are also highlighted.


Community College Student Part-Timeness

In each annual administration, the Center for Community College Student Engagement has included special-focus items on CCSSE to allow participating colleges and national researchers to delve more deeply into student experiences and areas of institutional performance of greatest interest to the field. Five items designed to elicit information about community college students and part-timeness were added to the 2016 CCSSE administration. The results of these findings are on pages 6-7 of this report.

Benchmark Overview by Enrollment Status

Figure 1 below represents your institution's CCSSE benchmark scores by student enrollment status.

Figure 1



Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice

The *CCSSE* benchmarks are groups of conceptually related survey items that address key areas of student engagement. The five benchmarks denote areas that educational research has shown to be important to students' college experiences and educational outcomes. Therefore, they provide colleges with a useful starting point for looking at institutional results and allow colleges to gauge and monitor their performance in areas that are central to their work. In addition, participating colleges have the opportunity to make appropriate and useful comparisons between their performance and that of groups of other colleges.

Performing as well as the national average or a peer-group average may be a reasonable initial aspiration, but it is important to recognize that these averages are sometimes unacceptably low. Aspiring to match and then exceed high-performance targets is the stronger strategy.

Community colleges can differ dramatically on such factors as size, location, resources, enrollment patterns, and student characteristics. It is important to take these differences into account when interpreting benchmark scores—especially when making institutional comparisons. The Center for Community College Student Engagement has adopted the policy “Responsible Uses of *CCSSE* and *SENSE* Data,” available at www.ccsse.org.

CCSSE uses a three-year cohort of participating colleges in all core survey analyses. The current cohort is referred to as the 2016 *CCSSE* Cohort (2014-2016) throughout all reports.

CCSSE Benchmarks

★ Active and Collaborative Learning

Students learn more when they are actively involved in their education and have opportunities to think about and apply what they are learning in different settings. Through collaborating with others to solve problems or master challenging content, students develop valuable skills that prepare them to deal with real-life situations and problems.

★ Student Effort

Students' own behaviors contribute significantly to their learning and the likelihood that they will successfully attain their educational goals.

★ Academic Challenge

Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. These survey items address the nature and amount of assigned academic work, the complexity of cognitive tasks presented to students, and the rigor of examinations used to evaluate student performance.

★ Student-Faculty Interaction


In general, the more contact students have with their teachers, the more likely they are to learn effectively and to persist toward achievement of their educational goals. Through such interactions, faculty members become role models, mentors, and guides for continuous, lifelong learning.

★ Support for Learners

Students perform better and are more satisfied at colleges that provide important support services, cultivate positive relationships among groups on campus, and demonstrate commitment to their success.

For further information about *CCSSE* benchmarks, please visit www.ccsse.org.

Figure 2



*Top-Performing colleges are those that scored in the top 10 percent of the cohort by benchmark.

Notes: Benchmark scores are standardized to have a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 25 across all respondents. For further information about how benchmarks are computed, please visit www.ccsse.org.

Aspects of Highest Student Engagement

Benchmark scores provide a manageable starting point for reviewing and understanding *CCSSE* data. One way to dig more deeply into the benchmark scores is to analyze those items that contribute to the overall benchmark score. This section features the five items across all benchmarks (excluding those for which means are not calculated) on which the college scored highest and the five items on which the college scored lowest relative to the 2016 *CCSSE* Cohort.

The items highlighted on pages 4 and 5 reflect the largest differences in mean scores between the institution and the 2016 *CCSSE* Cohort. While examining these data, keep in mind that the selected items may not be those that are most closely aligned with the college’s goals; thus, it is important to review all institutional reports on the *CCSSE* online reporting system at www.ccsse.org.

Figure 3 displays the aggregated frequencies for the items on which the college performed most favorably relative to the 2016 *CCSSE* Cohort. For instance, 10.0% of Pitt Community College students, compared with 8.0% of other students in the cohort, responded *often* or *very often* on item 4i. It is important to note that some colleges’ highest scores might be lower than the cohort mean.

Figure 3




Table 1

| Benchmark | Item Number | Item |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|---|
| Active and Collaborative Learning | 4i | Participated in a community-based project as a part of a regular course |
| Student-Faculty Interaction | 4k | Used email to communicate with an instructor |
| Student-Faculty Interaction | 4l | Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor |
| Student-Faculty Interaction | 4m | Talked about career plans with an instructor or advisor |
| Student-Faculty Interaction | 4q | Worked with instructors on activities other than coursework |

Notes:

For Item(s) 4 (except 4e), *often* and *very often* responses are combined.

Aspects of Lowest Student Engagement

Figure 4 displays the aggregated frequencies for the items on which the college performed least favorably relative to the 2016 CCSSE Cohort. For instance, 21.8% of Pitt Community College students, compared with 25.4% of other students in the cohort, responded *often* or *very often* on item 4g. It is important to note that some colleges' lowest scores might be higher than the cohort mean.

Figure 4




Table 2

| Benchmark | Item Number | Item |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|---|
| Active and Collaborative Learning | 4g | Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments |
| Student Effort | 6b | Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment |
| Academic Challenge | 6c | Number of written papers or reports of any length |
| Student Effort | 10a | Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, doing homework, or other activities related to your program) |
| Student Effort | 13h1 | Frequency: Computer lab |

Notes:

For Item(s) 4 (except 4e), *often* and *very often* responses are combined.

For Item(s) 6, 5 to 10, 11 to 20, and *more than 20* responses are combined.

For Item 10a, 11 - 20, 21 - 30, and *more than 30* responses are combined.

For Item(s) 13, *sometimes* and *often* responses are combined.

2016 CCSSE Special-Focus Items

The Center adds special-focus items to *CCSSE* each year to augment the core survey, helping participating colleges and the field at large to further explore fundamental areas of student engagement. The 2016 special-focus items elicit new information about students' experiences associated with enrollment status such as persistence, goals, expectations for time to completion, and knowledge about whether or not instructors teach full time at their college. Frequency results from the first five special focus module items for your college and the 2016 *CCSSE* Part-Timeness item-set respondents are displayed across pages 6 and 7.

Figure 5: Including this term, but excluding summers, how many academic terms have you been enrolled at this college?




Figure 6: Of the academic terms you have been enrolled at this college but excluding summers, how many academic terms have you been enrolled full time?




Figure 7: What is your number one goal for attending this college?




Figure 8: From the time you started here, how long do you anticipate it will take you to complete your certificate or degree at this college?





Figure 9: Do you know if your instructors this academic term teach full time or part time at this college?



CCFSSE

The Community College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (CCFSSE), designed as a companion survey to CCSSE, elicits information from faculty about their perceptions regarding students’ educational experiences, their teaching practices, and the ways they spend their professional time—both in and out of the classroom. CCFSSE data suggest that at most colleges, part-time faculty outnumber full-time faculty, and are also less likely to refer students to academic support services. Below you will find frequency results for part- and full-time faculty at your college describing how frequently they refer students to advising and planning services, peer tutoring, and skill labs. *CCFSSE cohort respondent data are provided.*

Figure 10: How often do you refer students to the following services?




Table 3

| Response | Academic Advising/ Planning | | Peer or Other Tutoring | | Skill Labs (writing, math, etc.) | |
|--------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| | Full-Time Faculty | Part-Time Faculty | Full-Time Faculty | Part-Time Faculty | Full-Time Faculty | Part-Time Faculty |
| N.A. | 1.6% | 4.3% | 1.4% | 3.9% | 4.7% | 7.5% |
| Rarely/Never | 13.0% | 21.2% | 12.6% | 18.1% | 20.0% | 23.3% |
| Sometimes | 47.1% | 50.9% | 41.6% | 39.7% | 38.2% | 35.0% |
| Often | 38.3% | 23.5% | 44.3% | 38.3% | 37.1% | 34.2% |