

**Norms Report on the
2012 Administration of the
College Student Experiences Questionnaire
With 2004, 2006, 2008, and 2010 UIC Norms
and National Norms from
Doctoral/Research-Extensive Institutions and
University of Illinois at Chicago**

Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Office of the Vice Provost for Academic and Enrollment Services

August, 2012

Table of Contents	
Table of Contents	i
Preface	ii
Introduction	1
Survey Instrument	
Methodology	
Psychometric Properties of CSEQ	
CSEQ Norms Limitations	
Explanation of Tables	
Tables	5
Table 1: Student Characteristics	
Table 2: Reading and Writing Activities	
Table 3: Satisfaction with College	
Table 4: Quality of Effort Scales	
Table 5: Library Experiences Scale Individual Items	
Table 6: Computer and Information Technology Experiences Individual Items	
Table 7: Course Learning Individual Items	
Table 8: Writing Experiences Individual Items	
Table 9: Experiences with Faculty Individual Items	
Table 10: Art, Music and Theater Experiences Individual Items	
Table 11: Campus Facilities Individual Items	
Table 12: Clubs and Organizations Individual Items	
Table 13: Personal Experiences Individual Items	
Table 14: Student Acquaintances Individual Items	
Table 15: Scientific and Quantitative Experiences Individual Items	
Table 16: Topics of Conversations Individual Items	
Table 17: Information in Conversations Individual Items	
Table 18: College Environment	
Table 19: College Relationships	
Table 20: Estimate of Gains	
Appendix A: List of Research I Institutions Included in Norms	77
Appendix B: College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ)	79

Preface

This report represents the on-going efforts of the university to understand the quality of undergraduate academic and support experiences, attitudes, and characteristics of students at the University of Illinois at Chicago. The results of the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) for 2012 with 2004, 2006, 2008, and 2010 results along with national norms are presented for use by the University community.

This assessment report was prepared under the guidance of the Office of the Vice Provost for Academic and Enrollment Services and the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.

We are, of course, indebted to the UIC students who took time from their busy student schedules to complete the survey.

We welcome your comments and suggestions on this report. We also welcome future research collaborations on the CSEQ to build on our current assessment findings, provide evidence of effectiveness, and promote educational improvement.

Nick Ardinger
Co-Principal Investigator, CSEQ
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student
Affairs

Patricia Inman
Co-Principal Investigator, CSEQ
Office of the Vice Provost for
Academic and Enrollment Services

Robert Rouzer
Research and Assessment Committee
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student
Affairs

Introduction

This report presents summary data in table form on the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), which was administered to undergraduate students of the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC) in 2012. It was previously administered in 2004, 2006, 2008, and 2010. A total of 20 tables are presented which summarize the results of student responses to different sections of the CSEQ. **The report also contains national norms based on Doctoral/Research-Extensive institutions. See Appendix A for a list of these institutions.**

Survey Instrument

The College Student Experiences Questionnaire is a nationally recognized standardized survey instrument developed at the Center for the Study of Evaluation at UCLA by C. Robert Pace. In 1994, the CSEQ operations moved to Indiana University Bloomington under the management of Professor George Kuh at the Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning. The web-administered comprehensive survey contains 197 quantitative items distributed as follows:

- 16 background information about students
- 140 academic and support activities
- 10 student satisfaction with and rating of the college environment
- 23 gains in educational goals

The CSEQ measures the quality of effort or student involvement in college academic and personal/social experiences, student opinions on the college environment, and gain in achieving educational goals. A copy of the CSEQ can be found in Appendix B.

Methodology

The UIC subjects were two independent groups of undergraduate students who were administered the CSEQ in spring 2012. The sample was composed of 2000 randomly selected undergraduate degree-seeking students who were enrolled for at least 12 credit hours during the Spring 2012 term. The sample was stratified by class level – 600 advanced freshmen (completed at least 12 credit hours prior to Spring term) and 1400 seniors (completed at least 90 credit hours prior to Spring term). Past survey administration has shown that African American and Latino students under respond to the CSEQ. Thus, in drawing the 2012 sample, we oversampled African American and Latino students by 5% in both the freshman and senior stratum.

In 2004, the sample was composed of 1,200 randomly selected undergraduate degree seeking students who were enrolled for at least 12 credit hours during the Spring 2004 term. In 2006, the sample was composed of 2,000 students fitting the same qualifications as the 2004 administration (degree seeking undergraduates, etc). In the 2006 administration we over-sampled the African American and Latino populations by five percent within each stratum. Both the 2004 and 2006 senior samples were limited to seniors who were native to UIC (entered as freshmen). In 2008, that restriction was removed from the sample to better represent the entire senior class. The 2010 samples followed the selections criteria used in 2008.

Invitations to participate in the on-line survey were sent to students' UIC e-mail addresses under the return address of the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. Three follow-up reminder messages were sent to students who did not respond. Students who completed the survey were entered into a drawing for campus gift certificates. In 2012, the overall response rate was 28 percent - 27 percent and 28 percent respectively for freshmen and seniors.

The comparison group presented in this report includes 29 Doctoral-granting Research-Extensive Universities (DRU-Extensive) as categorized by the *Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, 2000 Edition*.

Psychometric Properties of CSEQ

The CSEQ has been recognized for years as an instrument with good psychometric properties because it reliably measures educational practices that affect student outcomes. Extensive data regarding these properties are detailed in *CSEQ Norms for the Fourth Edition* (2003). Individuals who wish to review this information are encouraged to view the CSEQ website at <http://www.indiana.edu/~cseq/index.html> or contact the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs.

CSEQ Norms Limitations

Institutional data used to compile the national norms were not always collected from randomly selected samples on individual campuses. Rather, a variety of sampling techniques and survey methods was used, depending on institutional needs. However, case selection for the norms was done carefully and deliberately to minimize the effects of large numbers of cases from any one institution, and to remove any institutions with too few cases. For a full explanation of the national norms information and process, see *CSEQ Norms for the Fourth Edition*, (2003).

Explanation of Tables

Student Characteristics (Table 1)

Table 1 presents data on the characteristics and background of respondents ranging from age, gender and ethnicity to time spent per week working or time spent in class and studying.

Reading and Writing Activities (Table 2)

Table 2 presents statistics on the number of textbooks or assigned books read and the number of non-assigned books read. In writing activities, the table shows the number of essay examinations given in a course as well as the number of term papers or other written reports requested of students.

Student Satisfaction with College (Table 3)

Table 3 displays the results of two indicators of student satisfaction with their college experiences: 1) how well students like college and 2) if students could start college over again would they pick the same college they are now attending.

Another way of analyzing student satisfaction is to calculate a satisfaction index (overall opinion index) or mean scale score for the above two survey items. The mean scale score was derived by assigning values of 1 to 4 to the responses to the two items and then combining them to produce a scale score ranging from 2 to 8.

Quality of Effort Scales (Table 4)

The rationale behind the CSEQ is that the outcome of a college experience depends not only on the environment provided by the institution but on the quality of effort expended by the student in using the facilities and services of the campus. Quality of effort is defined as involvement in this report and is measured by how frequently students performed particular activities during the current school year. For example, in Table 5 regarding experiences with faculty, quality of effort is defined as how frequently students “talked with a faculty member” as measured on a four-point scale of 1 = Never, 2 = Occasionally, 3 = Often and 4 = Very Often.

Table 4 lists quality of effort scale scores for 13 major scale scores representing the following: library, course learning, computer and information technology, writing experiences, experiences with faculty, science, arts, personal, student acquaintances, topic of conversation, information in conversations, facilities, and clubs and organizations.

Each quality of effort scale score represents responses to a set of highly correlated questions pertaining to activities related to that scale. For example, the mean scale score of 21.96 for “experiences with faculty” is based on responses to ten items relating to various kinds of student-faculty experiences, which are shown in Table 9. The content of these ten items range from those tasks requiring routine involvement to those representing a higher quality of involvement or effort. For example, “asked instructor for course information” (#1 on the list) requires only routine effort or involvement by the student, whereas “worked with faculty member on research” (#10 on the list) requires a higher level or quality of effort by a student. A respondent must have responded to all ten items to be placed on the scale. The mean scale scores are calculated by assigning a value of 1 to 4 to the response on each of the items and adding these values up. The ten items will have a range from 10 to 40. The mean of these scores for all respondents will be

the quality of effort mean score for that activity. A higher the mean indicates a higher the quality of effort.

College Activities (Tables 5 -17)

Table 5 through Table 17 shows response information to individual items that comprise each of the Quality of Effort Scales. Table 5 through Table 17 would also be of interest to individuals who want more specific information about student responses to these sub- tasks or specific activities.

College Environment (Table 18)

Respondents were asked to rate the emphasis UIC gave to the following aspects of their college environment: academic, aesthetic, analytical, diversity, information literacy, vocational and relevancy of courses. The rating scale ranged from 1 = weak emphasis to 7= strong emphasis.

College Relationships (Table 19)

Table 19 shows how respondents rated their college relationships with other students, faculty and administrators. A seven-point scale was used to rate the relationships.

Estimate of Gain in Performance (Table20)

The CSEQ also measures the amount of gain or progress perceived by students in 25 different academic and social/personal areas, such as writing, history, literature, ethics, self-understanding, and careers. Respondents were asked the following question: “In thinking over your experiences in college up to now, to what extent do you feel you have gained or made progress in each of the following respects?” Students were asked to complete a four-point rating scale measuring the amount of gain from 1 = Very Little, 2 = Some, 3 = Quite a Bit and 4 = Very Much.