



# **COSUMNES** RIVER COLLEGE

## **The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)**

### **Overview of 2019 Survey Results**

**Office of Equity, Institutional Effectiveness, and Innovation**

Spring 2021

Author:

Brandon Muranaka, Faculty Researcher

## Executive Summary

---

### Background

**The Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)**, a product and service of the Center for Community College Student Engagement, provides information about effective educational practice in community colleges. The Center's goal is to provide member colleges with results that can be used to inform decision making and target institutional improvements. Student engagement, or the amount of time and energy students invest in meaningful educational practices, is the underlying foundation for the Center's work. The CCSSE survey instrument is designed to capture student engagement as a measure of institutional quality.

The CCSSE was administered at Cosumnes River College in Spring 2019. In order to evaluate the results of the survey, CCSSE utilizes a three-year cohort (2017 through 2019) of participating colleges in all of its data analyses, including the computation of benchmark scores. This cohort is referred to as the 2019 CCSSE Cohort. The 2019 CCSSE Cohort includes 616 institutions from 48 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and two Canadian provinces. Three-hundred ten are classified as small (<4,500), 137 as medium (4,500-7,999), 120 as large (8,000-14,999), and 49 as extra-large institutions (15,000+) credit students. In this study, CRC is considered a large college.

### Summary of Findings

CCSSE recommends considering benchmark scores that are a difference of 5 points from the average benchmark scores of similar sized colleges and the cohort colleges. CRC's benchmark scores were all below both the similar sized colleges and the cohort colleges.

- 1) CRC scored moderately below the 2019 similar sized (large) colleges and 2019 cohort colleges in the Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark (-3.7 and -4.6 below the averages, respectively).
- 2) CRC scored moderately below the 2019 similar sized (large) colleges and cohort colleges in the Student Effort benchmark (-4.8 and -5.4 below the averages, respectively).
- 3) CRC scored slightly below the 2019 similar sized (large) colleges and cohort colleges in the Academic Challenge benchmark (-1.6 and -2.1 below the averages, respectively).
- 4) CRC scored moderately below the 2019 similar sized (large) colleges and cohort colleges in the Student-Faculty Interaction benchmark (-5.0 and -6.7 below the averages, respectively).
- 5) CRC scored moderately below the 2019 similar sized (large) colleges and cohort colleges in the Support for Learners benchmark (-4.4 and -5.5 below the averages, respectively).
- 6) African American Students scored higher than the CRC mean benchmark scores in each category.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

Overall, CRC scored below the 2019 Cohort and the 2019 similar sized colleges in all five benchmark areas. With lowest relative scores in the Student-Faculty Interaction, Support for Learners, and Student Effort benchmarks. However, these are broad stroke metrics and additional research into the specific item scores and additional qualitative data should be used to pinpoint areas where specific actions may be used to make improvements.

The results also appear to show that different demographic groups experience engagement at the college in different ways. In particular, there appear to be differences in the experiences of student groups by race and ethnicity. The Black or African American group scored above the CRC average in all benchmarks indicating that these students are more engaged in these various areas on campus, as measured by the CCSSE. White students scored below the CRC mean score in all but one category, indicating they are less engaged as measured by the CCSSE.

Future research may consider a more detailed look at specific items in the CCSSE to find areas of specific improvement for the college. Additional future research may focus on connecting the CCSSE results to student outcomes to determine if there is a specific relationship between student engagement and student success at CRC.

### **Caveats and Limitations**

CCSSE surveys students in classrooms and due to full-time students taking more courses than part-time students, the full-time students are overrepresented in this study. This is accounted for via a weighting in the aggregate dataset; however, when separating by demographic groups, the part-time/full-time weighting may be skewed depending upon the number of part-time and full-time students represented in the specific demographic group. Additionally, as data are disaggregated the size of the subsets of data become smaller, making it challenging to draw additional conclusions with smaller disaggregated groups. Finally, CCSSE does not include distance education courses and occurred prior to the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic, thus the results here should not be used alone to extrapolate conclusions regarding student engagement during the 2020 COVID-19 pandemic.

## Background and Methodology

---

### Method

#### CCSSE Sampling

In CCSSE sampling procedures, students are sampled at the classroom level. As a result, full-time students, who by definition are enrolled in more classes than part-time students, are more likely to be sampled. To adjust for this sampling bias, a statistical weighting procedure is applied to CCSSE results when analysis contains both full-time and part-time students. Weighting is uniquely calculated for each institution and is based on the most recent publicly available IPEDS enrollment figures.

In CCSSE sampling procedures, students are sampled at the classroom level. The survey was administered in classes randomly selected from among all face-to-face and hybrid courses offered by the institution during the spring academic term. Certain course types are not eligible for inclusion in the CCSSE administration. These include non-credit, dual-enrollment, distance learning, most ESL courses, individual instruction, and individual study or self-paced classes.

#### Excluded Respondents

Excluding certain respondents from institutional and cohort-level reports ensures that results are comparable across institutions. Respondents are excluded from institutional reports for the following reasons:

- The respondent did not indicate whether they were enrolled full-time or part-time at the institution.
- The survey is invalid. A survey is invalid if a student does not answer any of the 19 sub-items in item 4, answers very often to all 19 sub-items, or answers never to all 19 sub-items.
- The student reported their age as under 18.
- The student indicated that they had taken the survey in a previous class or did not respond to item 3.
- Oversample respondents are not included because they are selected outside of CCSSE's primary sampling procedures.

## Student Demographics

### 2019 Student Respondent Profile

The analyses in this report reflect 540 respondents. Please note that percentages may not total 100% in each category due to missing data and/or rounding.

#### *Enrollment Status*

39% of surveyed students report being part-time college students. Population data indicate that 75% of students attend our college part-time. The inverse representation of part-time and full-time students in our respondent and actual student populations is the result of random sampling and the in-class administration process. For this reason, survey results are either weighted or disaggregated on the full-time/part-time variable so that reports will accurately reflect the underlying student population.

#### *Age*

Student respondents at our college range in age from 18 to 65+ years old. 72% are between 18 and 24 years old. (For the campus in Spring 2019, CRC had 61.2% of students between the ages of 18 and 24).

#### *Gender Identity*

44% of student respondents identify as a man and 48% as a woman, while 8% identify as Other or that they prefer not to respond. (For the campus in Spring 2019, CRC had 42.9% male, 55.2% female, and 1.8% unknown).

#### *Racial/Ethnic Identification*

68% of our student respondents identify with a single racial/ethnic identity: 20% White, 14% Hispanic or Latino, 8% Black or African American, 24% Asian, 0% American Indian or Alaska Native, and 2% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander. 13% marked more than one category when responding to the question, "What is your racial or ethnic identification?" (For the campus in Spring 2019, CRC had 22.9% White, 27.1% Hispanic or Latino, 10.4% Black or African American, 30.7% Asian Pacific Islander, and 0.4% Native American).

#### *International Students*

4% of our students responded yes to the question, "Are you an international student or non-resident alien?"

#### *First-Generation Status*

37.8% (204 First-Generation out of 540) of student respondents indicate that neither parent has attended at least some college; accordingly, these students are considered "first-generation." (For the campus in Spring 2019, CRC had 30.8% First-Generation Students).

51.9% (280 / 540) of respondents indicate that their mothers have at least some college experience, while 44.3% (239 / 540) indicate that their fathers do.

The results for the following student respondent categories are weighted according to the most recent IPEDS population data.

#### *Non-Native English Speaking Students*

At our college, 31.8% (163 / 513) of CCSSE respondents are non-native English speakers.

### *College-Sponsored Activities*

85.8% (454 / 529) of students respondents do not participate in any college-sponsored activities (including organizations, campus publications, student government, intramural sports, etc.) while 10.2% (54 / 529) spend 1 to 5 hours per week participating in these activities.

### *Total Credit Hours Earned*

42.1% (210 / 499) of surveyed students have completed fewer than 15 credit hours; 23.9% (119 / 499) have completed 15-29 credit hours; and 34.1% (170 / 499) have completed more than 30 credit hours.

### *External Commitments*

38.4% (201/524) of student respondents work 21 or more hours per week; 9.4% (49 / 524) care for dependents 6–10 hours per week; and 14.9% (78 / 525) spend 6–10 hours per week commuting to class.

### *Goals*

Students were asked to indicate their reasons or goals for attending this college and could mark multiple goals as applicable. 84.3% (430 / 510) identified transferring to a 4-year college or university as a goal, while 67.5% (339 / 502) identified obtaining an associate degree and 35.7% (178/499) identified completing a certificate program as a goal. 52.4% (258/492) indicated that obtaining or updating job-related skills is a goal, and 22.2% (109/490) a career change as a goal for attending the college.

## Findings and Analysis

---

### Background and Definitions

To assist colleges in their efforts to reach for excellence, the Center reports national benchmarks of effective educational practice in community colleges. Research shows that the more actively engaged students are—with college faculty and staff, with other students, and with the subject matter—the more likely they are to learn and to achieve their academic goals.

CCSSE benchmarks are groups of conceptually related survey items that focus on institutional practices and student behaviors that promote student engagement—and are positively related to student learning and persistence. Benchmarks are used to compare each institution's performance to that of similar institutions and with the CCSSE Cohort. Each individual benchmark score is computed by averaging the scores on survey items that make up that benchmark. Benchmark scores are standardized so that the mean (the average of all participating students) always is 50 and the standard deviation is 25. If the institution deviates from the comparison group score (e.g., other large colleges) by five or more points are worth particular consideration. The five benchmarks of effective educational practice in community colleges are: active and collaborative learning, student effort, academic challenge, student-faculty interaction, and support for learners. These benchmarks are defined next:

1. *Active and Collaborative Learning*: Measures the extent to which students are actively involved in their education and have opportunities to think about and apply their learning, e.g., through collaborative learning.
2. *Student Effort*: Measures the amount of effort and “time on task” students contribute to their learning.
3. *Academic Challenge*: Measures the nature and amount of assigned academic work, the complexity of cognitive tasks presented to students, and the standards faculty members use to evaluate student performance.
4. *Student-Faculty Interaction*: Measures the extent to which students interact with faculty, e.g., through working directly together on projects or assignments.
5. *Support for Learners*: Measures the extent to which students are provided with resources to succeed either through collaborative learning with peers or through learning support services.

### High Level Findings

In this section, analysis progresses from a high level review of each of these benchmark scores for CRC, to a breakdown of benchmarks by Race/Ethnicity, and finally an analysis of question items that contribute to each benchmark. Table 1 summarizes the comparison of CRC benchmark scores with the similar sized colleges and the 2019 cohort colleges surveyed.

#### Summary of Benchmark Scores for CRC

*Table 1.* Summary of CRC Benchmark Scores Compared to Similar Sized Colleges and the 2019 Cohort College Surveyed

Benchmark	CRC	Large Colleges		2019 Cohort Colleges	
	Score	Score	Difference	Score	Difference
Active and Collaborative Learning	45.4	49.1	-3.7	50.0	-4.6
Student Effort	44.6	49.3	-4.8	50.0	<b>-5.4</b>
Academic Challenge	47.9	49.4	-1.6	50.0	-2.1
Student-Faculty Interaction	43.3	48.3	<b>-5.0</b>	50.0	<b>-6.7</b>
Support for Learners	44.5	48.9	-4.4	50.0	<b>-5.5</b>

#### Benchmark Scores by Race and Ethnicity

Applying the 5 points difference recommendation to the benchmark scores of students from various racial/ethnic groups at CRC to the overall benchmark score for CRC reveals the following results. Table 2 denotes the differences greater than 5 using bold. Note that for groups with a sample size less than 10 results are not reported.

*Table 2.* Summary of Benchmark Scores for Race/Ethnicity Subgroups at CRC Compared to CRC Benchmark Scores

Benchmark	Race/Ethnicity	N	Score	CRC Score	Difference
<b>Active and Collaborative Learning</b>	Asian	140	44.2	45.4	-1.2
	Black or African American	43	54.4	45.4	<b>9.0</b>
	Hispanic or Latino	83	40.7	45.4	-4.7
	Pacific Islander (non-Native Hawaiian)	15	56.5	45.4	<b>11.1</b>
	White	109	45.5	45.4	0.1
	Other	21	41.6	45.4	-3.8



	2 or more	72	51.1	45.4	<b>5.7</b>
<b>Student Effort</b>	Asian	140	46.7	44.6	2.1
	Black or African American	43	49.1	44.6	4.5
	Hispanic or Latino	83	45.2	44.6	0.6
	Pacific Islander (non-Native Hawaiian)	15	46.7	44.6	2.1
	White	109	38.6	44.6	<b>-6.0</b>
	Other	21	48.8	44.6	4.2
	2 or more	72	39.5	44.6	<b>-5.1</b>
<b>Academic Challenge</b>	Asian	140	48.3	47.9	0.4
	Black or African American	43	52.8	47.9	4.9
	Hispanic or Latino	82	46.7	47.9	-1.2
	Pacific Islander (non-Native Hawaiian)	15	50.4	47.9	2.5
	White	109	45.2	47.9	-2.7
	Other	21	49.1	47.9	1.2
	2 or more	72	50.6	47.9	2.7
<b>Student-Faculty Interaction</b>	Asian	140	45.7	43.3	2.4
	Black or African American	43	47.7	43.3	4.4
	Hispanic or Latino	83	40.5	43.3	-2.8
	Pacific Islander (non-Native Hawaiian)	15	49.1	43.3	<b>5.8</b>
	White	109	40.1	43.3	-3.2
	Other	21	39.0	43.3	-4.3
	2 or more	72	47.6	43.3	4.3
<b>Support for Learners</b>	Asian	139	48.6	44.5	4.1
	Black or African American	43	48.8	44.5	4.3
	Hispanic or Latino	82	48.2	44.5	3.7
	Pacific Islander (non-Native Hawaiian)	15	45.4	44.5	0.9
	White	109	37.3	44.5	<b>-7.2</b>
	Other	20	46.2	44.5	1.7
	2 or more	72	44.8	44.5	0.3

#### Active and Collaborative Learning

- Black or African American students' Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark score was 9 points higher than the CRC Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark score (54.4 and 45.4, respectively).
- Pacific Islander (non-Native Hawaiian) students' Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark score was 11.1 points higher than the CRC Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark score (56.5 and 45.4, respectively).
- Students identifying as 2 or more race/ethnicities had an Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark score 5.7 points higher than the CRC Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark score (51.1 and 45.4, respectively).

#### Student Effort

- White students' Student Effort benchmark score was 6 points below the CRC Student Effort benchmark score (38.6 and 44.6, respectively).
- Students identifying as 2 or more race/ethnicities had a Student Effort benchmark score 5.1 points lower than the CRC Student Effort benchmark score (39.5 and 44.6, respectively).

#### Academic Challenge

- None of the race/ethnicity Academic Challenge benchmark scores were more than 5 points away from the CRC benchmark score.

#### Student-Faculty Interaction

- Pacific Islander (non-Native Hawaiian) students' Student-Faculty Interaction benchmark score was 5.8 points higher than the CRC Student-Faculty Interaction benchmark score (49.1 and 43.3, respectively).

#### Support for Learners

- White students' Support for Learners benchmark score was 7.2 points below the CRC Support for Learners benchmark score (37.3 and 44.5, respectively).

### Detailed Findings by Item

Each benchmark contained specific items, the analysis that follows considered trends and differences found in specific items under each benchmark.

#### Active and Collaborative Learning Item Analysis

CRC scored moderately below the 2019 similar sized (large) colleges and 2019 cohort colleges in the Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark (-3.7 and -4.6 below the averages, respectively).

##### *Results for Items in the Active and Collaborative Learning Benchmark*

Item 4a (Frequency of asking questions in class or contributing to class discussions) was the only item with statistically significant (t-test,  $\alpha < 0.01$ ) and with effect size in absolute value greater than 0.20 when compared to both the similar large colleges and the 2019 cohort. Upon closer examination of the results from item 4a, the subgroups of Asian (N=140, mean = 2.42), Hispanic or Latino (N=83, mean = 2.50), other (N=21, mean = 2.65), and those preferring not to respond (N=27, mean = 2.68) had mean responses lower than the college mean (2.70).

By contrast for Item 4a, African American students (N=43, mean = 2.83), White (N=109, mean = 2.91), Pacific Islander (N=15, mean = 2.92), and 2 or more race/ethnicity students (N=72, mean = 2.99) had mean responses higher than the college mean (2.70); however, although these means may not be significantly different. These results contribute to the finding that the subgroups of African American, Pacific Islander and 2 or more racial/ethnic group students scored higher in the Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark when compared to the CRC Active and Collaborative Learning benchmark score.

For Item 4i (Frequency: Participated in a community-based project (service-learning activity) as part of a regular course), full-time students scored a mean lower than the similar sized colleges and the 2019 cohort (both statistically significant and with sufficiently large absolute value difference).

#### Student Effort Item Analysis

CRC scored moderately below the 2019 similar sized (large) colleges and cohort colleges in the Student Effort benchmark (-4.8 and -5.4 below the averages, respectively).

##### *Results for Items in the Student Effort Benchmark*

Item 12h1 (Frequency of computer lab use) was the only item with statistically significant (t-test,  $\alpha < 0.01$ ) and with effect size in absolute value greater than 0.20 when compared to both the similar large colleges and the 2019 cohort. Examining the results of item 12h1, 56.2% of responses indicated never using a computer lab on campus, 8.1% used a computer lab once, 18.4% used a computer lab between 2-4 times, and 17.2% used the computer lab 5 times or more.

The two groups scoring lower on the Student Effort benchmark were the White and respondents who identified with 2 or more race/ethnicity groups. Looking at the computer lab usage responses reveals these two student subgroups reported never using the computer lab or using it less frequently than the remaining groups, with the exception of the Pacific Islander (non-Native Hawaiian) group.

#### Computer Lab Usage



- 58.3% of Asian students never used a computer lab (38% used the computer lab more than one time).
- 43.5% of African American students never used a computer lab (42.1% used a computer lab more than one time).
- 47.4% of Hispanic or Latino students never used a computer lab (44.3% used a computer more than one time).
- 80.0% of Pacific Islander (non-Native Hawaiian) students never used a computer lab (20.0% used a computer more than one time).
- 65.9% of White students never used a computer lab (24.1% used a computer more than one time).
- 22.4% of students identified as other never used a computer lab (75.3% used a computer more than one time).
- 60.2% of students identified as 2 or more ethnicities never used a computer lab (27.8% used a computer more than one time).
- 49.3% of students preferring not to respond never used a computer lab (40.8% used a computer more than one time).

Item 12h1 was statistically significant and had a significant effect size for both part-time and full-time students; however, for CRC full-time students the difference was more than for part-time students when compared to the similar sized college and 2019 cohort (-0.28 for part-time versus -0.41 for full-time and -0.31 for part-time and -0.45 for full-time, respectively).

### **Academic Challenge Item Analysis**

CRC scored slightly below the 2019 similar sized (large) colleges and cohort colleges in the Academic Challenge benchmark (-1.6 and -2.1 below the averages, respectively). The academic challenge benchmark did not differ significantly for CRC from the similar size colleges or the 2019 cohort. Additionally, no single item mean difference was statistically significant from the similar size colleges or the 2019 cohort. When reviewing the Academic Challenge benchmark scores of the various race/ethnicity groups, no group's Academic Challenge benchmark score different from the CRC Academic benchmark score by 5 points or more.

### **Student-Faculty Interaction Item Analysis**

CRC scored moderately below the 2019 similar sized (large) colleges and cohort colleges in the Student-Faculty Interaction benchmark (-5.0 and -6.7 below the averages, respectively).

#### *Results for Items in the Student-Faculty Interaction Benchmark*

Item 4j (frequency of using email to communicate with instructors) and item 4l (frequency of talking about career plans with an instructor or advisor) were lower means with statistically significant (t-test,  $p < 0.01$ ) and with effect size in absolute value greater than 0.20 when compared to the 2019 cohort.

For Item 4j the largest response group in the CRC sample was the "sometimes" (35.9%) response regarding using email to communicate with an instructor, while the largest group in the 2019 cohort was the "very often" response group (36.2%). This seems to indicate that a sizeable number of CRC students did not often or very often use email to communicate with their instructors.

Item 4k (frequency of discussing grades or assignments with an instructor) was statistically significant and of large enough effect size below the 2019 cohort for full-time students only (-0.25).

The scale for Item 4k indicated 1 = never, 2 = sometimes, 3 = often, and 4 = very often, the CRC mean for item 4k is 2.50. This mean value indicates that students discuss grades or assignments with instructors between sometimes and often.

The Pacific Islander (non-Native Hawaiian) racial/ethnic subgroup had a Student-Faculty Interaction benchmark score 5.8 points above the CRC Student-Faculty Interaction benchmark score. With a relatively small N (N=21) and no other groups with a benchmark score more than 5 points from the CRC benchmark score, it is difficult to determine which item to investigate further.

### **Support for Learners**

CRC scored moderately below the 2019 similar sized (large) colleges and cohort colleges in the Support for Learners benchmark (-4.4 and -5.5 below the averages, respectively).

#### *Results for Items in the Support for Learners Benchmark*

Item 9b (Amount of emphasis by college providing the support you need to help you succeed at this college), Item 9e (Amount of emphasis by college providing the support you need to thrive socially), and Item 12a1 (Frequency of use of academic advising/planning) were lower means with statistical significant (t-test,  $\alpha < 0.01$ ) and with effect size in absolute value greater than 0.20 when compared to both similarly sized college and the 2019 cohort. Item 12b1 (Frequency of use of career counseling) show higher mean response that was both statistically significant and of sufficient effect size.

Items 9b, 9e, and 12b1 showed statistically significant and sufficiently large effect size across both full-time and part-time students.

Part-time students responded to Item 12b1 (Frequency of use of career counseling) slightly higher than full-time students when compared to the similar size colleges and the cohort, but still lower than the full-time CRC students (0.81 for part-time and 0.86 for full-time).

Item 9d (Amount of emphasis by college: Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)) showed a statistically significant and sufficiently large effect size for full-time students when compared to the 2019 cohort.

The CRC mean response for Item 12b1 was 0.82 (on the scale from 0 = Never to 1=1 time, 2=2-4 times, 3 = 5 or more times). This suggests that students on average use career counseling less than one time during the academic year. The students using career counseling the least were White students (0.58) while the students that indicated using career counseling the most were Hispanic or Latino (1.18).

White students and students preferring not to respond to the race/ethnicity item showed Support for Learner benchmark scores more than 5 points below the CRC Support for Learners benchmark score. These two groups score the lowest in Item 9e and Item 12b1, which could have contributed to their overall lower Support for Learner benchmark scores.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

---

Overall, CRC scored below the 2019 Cohort and the 2019 similar sized colleges in all five benchmark areas. This is a very broad conclusion and points to areas of potential improvement in the lowest categories of Student-Faculty Interaction, Support for Learners, and Student Effort. However, these broad stroke implications shouldn't change policies or practices without additional research into the specific item scores and additional qualitative data to pinpoint areas where specific actions may be used to make improvements.

The results also appear to show that different demographic groups experience engagement at the college in different ways. In particular, there appear to be differences in the experiences of student groups by race and ethnicity. The Black or African American group scored above the CRC average in all benchmarks (scores ranging from 4.3 to 9 points above the CRC mean scores). This seems to indicate that these students are more engaged in these various areas on campus, as measured by the CCSSE. While White students scored below the CRC mean score in all but one category (and that category was only marginally above the mean for CRC, score differences ranged from -7.2 to 0.1).

Future research may consider a more detailed look at specific items in the CCSSE to find areas of specific improvement for the college. Additional future research may focus on connecting the CCSSE results to student outcomes to determine if there is a specific relationship between student engagement and student success at CRC.