

**Summary Report on the 2010 Administration of the  
College Student Experience Questionnaire**

Prepared by Patricia Inman  
Academic and Enrollment Services

Kim Savage, Co PI  
Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

August 2010

## Summary Report on the 2010 Administration of the College Student Experience Questionnaire

This report presents summary data in table form on the College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), which was administered to undergraduate students during the spring semester 2010.

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 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.

The participants in the CSEQ were two independent groups of degree-seeking undergraduate students who were enrolled for at least 12 credit hours during the Spring 2010 term. The sample was composed of 2,000 randomly selected students, stratified by class level – 690 advanced freshmen (completed at least 12 credit hours prior to Spring term) and 1310 seniors (completed at least 90 credit hours prior to Spring term) one-half of whom were **native** to UIC (entered UIC as a freshman) and one-half who transferred to UIC. The sample was drawn to represent the gender and racial/ethnic mix of UIC undergraduates with over-sampling of African American and Latino populations by five percent within each class level stratum. This was done to address a historic under-response by these populations in prior administrations of the CSEQ.

Invitations to participate in the on-line survey were sent to students' UIC e-mail addresses. Additional follow-up reminder messages were sent to students who did not respond. Students who completed the survey were entered into a drawing for an Ipad and campus gift certificates. The survey submission rate was 30 percent – 29 percent for the freshmen and 31 percent for the seniors.

A profile of CSEQ respondents is outlined in Table 1.

	<b>Freshmen</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Seniors</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>%</b>
CBA	16	8.1%	57	14.0%	73	12.1%
Education	4	2.0%	12	2.9%	16	2.6%
Engineering	26	13.1%	43	10.6%	69	11.4%
A & A	11	5.6%	38	9.3%	49	8.1%
LAS	136	68.7%	212	52.1%	348	57.5%
Nursing	0	0.0%	13	3.2%	13	2.1%
AHS	5	2.5%	29	7.1%	34	5.6%
CUPPA	0	0.0%	3	0.7%	3	0.5%
Totals	198	100.0%	407	100.0%	605	100.0%
Female	124	62.6%	249	61.2%	373	61.7%
Male	74	37.4%	158	38.8%	232	38.3%
Afr Amer	23	11.6%	22	5.4%	45	7.4%
Asian	41	20.7%	98	24.1%	139	23.0%
Hispanic	49	24.7%	58	14.3%	107	17.7%
Caucasian	74	37.4%	200	49.1%	274	45.3%
Other	11	5.6%	29	7.1%	40	6.6%
Native	198	100.0%	215	52.8%	413	68.3%
Transfer	0	0.0%	192	47.2%	192	31.7%

## **Background**

### *Parent Education*

Students were asked a single question about level of parental education. Consistent with other student surveys and prior administrations of CSEQ, a large proportion of students are first generation college students. Forty-three percent of the respondents indicated first generation status, while 27% report that both parents are college graduates and another 28% reporting that one parent earned a college degree.

### *Educational Aspirations*

Results from the Entering Student Survey of UIC Freshmen have indicated that many students enter as undergraduates and aspire to advanced degrees. Overall, 83.1% of the students reported that they expect to enroll for an advanced degree when they complete college. This aspiration was fairly consistent across class levels -- 87% of the freshmen and 81% of the seniors.

*Financing college (Table 2)*

Students are asked to provide approximate proportion of college expenses covered by various sources. Overall, students indicated that ‘all or nearly all’ from: parents – 25%; scholarships and grants – 25% and loans – 15%. These figures varied across class levels. For example:

- Freshmen appear to be more loan-averse than seniors. A total of 52% indicate that loans are not part of the college financing formula while 37% of the native seniors and 33% of the transfer seniors.
- 43% of the freshmen report parents will finance ‘more than half’, ‘all or nearly all’ of college expenses. In contrast to 37% of native seniors and 26% of transfer seniors.

<b>Table 2: Meeting College Expenses</b>			
<b>SELF (job, savings, etc)</b>	<u>Freshman</u>	<u>Native Senior</u>	<u>Transfer Senior</u>
None	28%	21%	21%
Very Little	29%	40%	37%
Less than half	18%	19%	17%
About half	10%	9%	12%
More than half	5%	5%	5%
All or Nearly All	10%	6%	8%
<b>PARENTS</b>			
None	18%	14%	29%
Very Little	19%	18%	20%
Less than half	10%	12%	12%
About half	10%	19%	14%
More than half	13%	10%	8%
All or Nearly All	30%	27%	18%
<b>SCHOLARSHIP/GRANTS</b>			
None	30%	37%	32%
Very Little	12%	11%	13%
Less than half	7%	12%	14%
About half	8%	13%	8%
More than half	11%	8%	13%
All or Nearly All	32%	21%	21%
<b>LOANS</b>			
None	52%	34%	33%
Very Little	10%	8%	5%
Less than half	13%	10%	11%
About half	6%	19%	16%
More than half	8%	8%	19%
All or Nearly All	11%	20%	16%

## Time Allocation

### *Time devoted to classwork (Table 3)*

Students were asked to provide an estimate of the number of hours each week devoted to studying, writing, reading, lab work, rehearsing, etc related to classwork. Variation across class level groupings was apparent, but not strictly tied to class level. Overall 40% of the students spent 10 hours or less each week devoted to classwork, 38% of the freshmen, 46% of the native seniors and 33% transfer seniors. On the other end of the scale, 22% of the students devoted more than 20 hours each week to classwork – 19% of the freshmen, 20% of the native seniors and 27% of the transfer seniors.

	Freshmen	Native Sr	Transfer Sr	ALL
5 hrs or less	11.1%	12.3%	12.3%	11.9%
6 to 10 hrs/wk	27.3%	32.7%	23.0%	27.9%
11 to 15 hrs/wk	29.8%	19.4%	16.0%	21.8%
16 to 20 hrs/wk	12.6%	15.6%	21.4%	16.4%
21 to 25 hrs/wk	9.6%	10.0%	13.4%	10.9%
26 to 30 hrs/wk	5.1%	3.8%	5.9%	4.9%
more than 30 hrs	4.5%	6.2%	8.0%	6.2%

### *Employment (Table 4)*

The survey includes three questions related to employment; specifically, time spent working on-campus; working off-campus, and the impact of work on school work. From the on-campus and off-campus questions, an additional work variable was calculated to incorporate all work (ascertaining the students who did not work on- or off-campus; and similarly, the students who worked both on- and off-campus. The new variable revealed that 38% of the students did not work during the school year. However, this figure was 58% for freshmen and 30% for the seniors.

Working on-campus has been documented in the research as a campus engagement factor, while working off campus is a 'pull' factor, (contributing to lower levels of engagement). Of the students who are employed (62% of the respondents), only 19% work on-campus, with an additional 10% who reported employment both on- and off-campus.

<b>Table 4: Work Variables</b>				
<b>Hours spent working on campus for pay</b>				
	<u>Freshmen</u>	<u>Native Sr</u>	<u>Transfer Sr</u>	<u>ALL</u>
None; no job	89.3%	68.6%	88.0%	81.5%
1 to 10 hrs/wk	3.1%	12.9%	6.6%	7.6%
11 to 20 hrs/wk	7.1%	13.8%	4.9%	8.8%
21 to 30 hrs/wk	0.5%	4.3%	0.5%	1.9%
31 to 40 hrs/wk	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.2%
<b>Hours spent working off campus for pay</b>				
None; no job	61.4%	44.6%	40.5%	49.0%
1 to 10 hrs/wk	16.2%	16.2%	11.9%	14.8%
11 to 20 hrs/wk	13.7%	20.6%	23.8%	19.3%
21 to 30 hrs/wk	7.1%	13.2%	13.5%	11.3%
31 to 40 hrs/wk	1.0%	3.9%	7.6%	4.1%
more than 40 hrs	0.5%	1.5%	2.7%	1.5%
<b>How job affects school work</b>				
No job	53.8%	24.8%	33.9%	37.3%
Does not interfere	13.7%	24.3%	15.1%	17.9%
Takes some time	27.9%	43.3%	43.0%	38.1%
Takes lots of time	4.6%	7.6%	8.1%	6.7%
<b>Work - Recomputed variable</b>				
No job	54.0%	24.6%	35.6%	37.9%
Work on-campus only	7.6%	21.8%	5.9%	12.1%
Work off-campus only	35.4%	44.1%	52.7%	43.9%
Work both on and off-campus	3.0%	9.5%	5.9%	6.2%

#### *Quality of Effort Scales (Table 5)*

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. The 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. Using an test of significance on the variation across class levels, the campus facilities scale is the only scale where significant differences among the class levels are found.

**A note about the Quality of Effort Scales:** 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 23.45 for ‘experiences with faculty’ is based on responses to ten items relating to various kinds of student-faculty experiences. 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.

	<u>Freshmen</u>	<u>Native Sr</u>	<u>Transfer Sr</u>	<u>ALL</u>
Library Scale	17.24	16.31	16.39	16.64
<i>Std Dev</i>	5.32	4.85	4.31	4.86
Computer & IT	25.19	26.40	25.89	25.85
<i>Std Dev</i>	5.42	4.90	5.14	5.16
Course Learning	13.34	33.51	34.44	33.75
<i>Std Dev</i>	5.59	5.94	6.07	5.88
Writing Experiences	19.48	18.76	18.50	18.91
<i>Std Dev</i>	3.99	4.86	4.35	4.44
Exp with Faculty	23.39	23.61	23.32	23.45
<i>Std Dev</i>	6.67	6.90	7.08	6.87
Art, Music, Theater	14.63	14.10	14.12	14.28
<i>Std Dev</i>	6.05	5.59	5.26	5.64
Campus Facilities	19.89	18.59	17.33	18.62
<i>Std Dev</i>	5.56	5.18	4.68	5.25
Clubs & Organizations	9.02	9.88	8.71	9.23
<i>Std Dev</i>	4.33	4.83	4.08	4.46
Personal Exp	19.41	19.22	18.30	18.99
<i>Std Dev</i>	5.68	5.38	5.00	5.33
Student Acquaintances	27.64	27.38	26.56	27.21
<i>Std Dev</i>	7.41	7.10	7.22	7.24
Science & Quant Exp	25.96	25.07	23.64	24.92
<i>Std Dev</i>	8.41	8.65	8.71	8.63
Topics of Conversation	25.55	26.07	27.05	26.21
<i>Std Dev</i>	7.72	6.51	6.19	6.85
Info in Conversation	16.68	16.44	16.85	16.65
<i>Std Dev</i>	4.32	4.08	3.88	4.10

## **Self Reported Gains**

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. The results are shown graphically in **Figure 1** (see page 9). The only gains that for which the variation across class levels were significant were: Vocational Preparation; Values and Ethical Standards; and Learning on One’s Own.

## **Student Satisfaction with College**

The CSEQ includes 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.

Overall, freshmen are more satisfied than seniors. Transfer seniors are more satisfied than native seniors. A total of 79% of the freshmen respondents indicated that they ‘like’ or are ‘enthusiastic’ about UIC (in comparison, 73% of the native seniors and 76% of the transfer seniors).

When asked “If you could start over again, would you go to UIC?”, 77% of the freshmen indicated ‘yes’ or ‘definitely yes’; in contrast these figures are 68% and 74% for native seniors and transfer seniors respectively.

## **College Environment (Table 6)**

Respondents were asked to rate the emphasis UIC gave to the following aspects of the college environment and student development: academic, aesthetic, analytical, diversity, information literacy, vocational and relevancy of courses. The rating scale ranged from 1 = weak emphasis to 7= strong emphasis. Differences among the comparison groups were significant for the aesthetic, diversity and vocational ratings.

## **College Relationships (Table 7)**

A key factor in how students engage with the campus community is based on relationships established on campus. The CSEQ includes three items on students’ relationships – with other students, with administrative personnel and with faculty. Students rate the relationship on a seven point scale. Consistent over administrations of the CSEQ, students rate their relationships with other students highest, followed by faculty and administrative staff. Significant variation across comparison groups is found in the rating of relationships with administrative personnel – between freshmen and native seniors. Table 7 provides the detail of these ratings.



**Table 6: UIC Emphasis on Aspects of Student Development**

	<u>Freshmen</u>	<u>Native Sr</u>	<u>Transfer Sr</u>	<u>ALL</u>
Scholarship	5.87	5.55	5.59	5.67
<i>Std Dev</i>	1.23	1.18	1.31	1.25
Aesthetics	5.10	4.51	4.53	4.71
<i>Std Dev</i>	1.47	1.61	1.71	1.62
Analytical	5.58	5.45	5.49	5.51
<i>Std Dev</i>	1.26	1.32	1.31	1.30
Diversity	5.85	5.53	5.39	5.59
<i>Std Dev</i>	1.34	1.49	1.49	1.45
Information Literacy	5.47	5.27	5.25	6.33
<i>Std Dev</i>	1.41	1.27	1.45	1.38
Vocational	5.11	4.62	4.78	4.83
<i>Std Dev</i>	1.58	1.53	1.72	1.62
Practical Courses	5.30	4.66	4.87	4.93
<i>Std Dev</i>	1.61	1.61	1.72	1.66

**Table 7: Relationships on Campus**

	<u>Freshmen</u>	<u>Native Sr</u>	<u>Transfer Sr</u>	<u>ALL</u>
Other Students	5.66	5.48	5.47	5.53
<i>Std Dev</i>	1.39	1.38	1.38	1.38
Admin Personnel	4.96	4.28	4.60	4.60
<i>Std Dev</i>	1.64	1.59	1.78	1.69
Faculty	5.32	5.02	5.28	5.20
<i>Std Dev</i>	1.38	1.32	1.45	1.39

**Figure 1: CSEQ 2010 Self Reported Gains**

