FSSE Background

The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), is a web-based national survey developed by Indiana University’s Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning. The FSSE was designed to complement the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), a student engagement instrument administered to undergraduate students. The FSSE is designed to collect information about student engagement in educational activities from the viewpoint of the faculty. The survey also centers on faculty perceptions of how often their students engage in different activities, the importance faculty place on various areas of learning and development, the value and frequency of interactions faculty have with students, and how faculty members organize class time.

FSSE 2008 Respondents

The FSSE at CSU Stanislaus was administered during the spring 2008 semester. A total of 165 CSU Stanislaus faculty members responded to the survey, representing a 39 percent response rate for CSU Stanislaus. In addition to the FSSE, a campus-developed Faculty Supplemental Survey was administered. Sixty-six faculty members responded to the supplemental survey for a 40 percent response rate.

2008-09 Faculty Supplemental Survey

With the assistance of the Office of Institutional Research, the Office of Service Learning constructed and administered the 2008-09 FSSE Faculty Supplemental Survey in order to seek improvement to its services to faculty, staff and students as CSU Stanislaus. Additionally, the survey sought to gather data in order to provide insight into ways to improve faculty development programming and services. The findings are summarized as follows.

Faculty Service Learning, Community Engagement

Do you think students’ engagement in the community is an important component of their learning experience at the University? 1

91% of faculty respondents feel, with some level of importance, that student engagement in the community is important to student learning.

Do you think community engagement can be an effective teaching strategy? 2

95% of faculty respondents believe community engagement can be effective in teaching, with 63% of faculty respondents indicating that community engagement can be an “effective to very effective” teaching strategy.

Are you currently teaching a course that has a service learning or community-based project or component? 3

74% of faculty respondents indicated they are not currently teaching a course that incorporates service learning or includes a community-based project or component.

If you are using service learning as pedagogy, please let us know why.

26% of faculty respondents currently are teaching a course that has a service learning component. These faculty reported equal emphasis on the following reasons:

- Teaches my students to apply discipline-specific knowledge to community issues: 23%
- Develops my students’ critical thinking skills: 25%
- Enables my students to critically self-reflect on their own assumptions and values: 23%
- Provides an opportunity for my students to demonstrate their knowledge and sensitivity to issues of culture, diversity, and social justice: 25%
Faculty Service Learning, Community Engagement (cont.)

If you have not incorporated community engagement into your courses, what would enable or encourage you to do so? ³
Faculty respondents report substantial emphasis on these top three choices:
- Sufficient time to develop a meaningful project: 79%
- Resources to support the course: 69%
- Assistance finding placements: 43%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you have not incorporated community engagement into your courses, what would enable or encourage you to do so?</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percent of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient time to develop a meaningful project</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources to support the course</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance finding placements</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance with communication with community partner</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to try something new in the course</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition in the faculty promotion and tenure policies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional recognition</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning

Please list specific ways the Faculty Development Center can better meet your needs related to instruction, service, research, scholarship, and creative activities. ⁴
31% of faculty respondents are generally satisfied or pleased with the activities / workshops provided by the Faculty Development Center. Highlighted suggestions include:
- Create alternative / additional scheduling for programs and workshops: 21%
- Bring in more guest speakers: 17%
- Offer grant writing assistance / lectures / instruction: 10%
- Host more "meet and greets" for faculty: 10%
- Offer "How-To" lectures / tutoring: 7%
- Provide webinars and online information: 4%

Have you participated in a campus-based faculty development workshop/event in the past year? ²
70% of faculty respondents have attended or participated in a campus-based faculty development workshop or event in the past year.

If you have not participated in a campus-based faculty development workshop / event in the past year, please identify the two biggest obstacles to your participation. ⁵
Due to an excessive workload, 52% of faculty respondents are too busy or have a lack of time to participate.

Other obstacles:
- Workshops / programs conflict with schedule: 28%
- No workshops offered in my discipline / not interested: 12%
- Lengthy workshops: 4%
- No communication of events: 4%

Notes:
1. "Some level of importance" is defined by combining the response values of "Very important," "Important," and "Somewhat important."
2. "Effective to very effective" is defined by combining the response values of "Very effective," "Effective," and "Somewhat effective."
3. Percentages based on a multiple response analysis for a “Mark all that apply” question.
4. Percentages based on a multiple response analysis. Text responses were re-coded into categories for analysis. N = 29 total recoded responses.
5. Percentages based on a multiple response analysis. Text responses were re-coded into categories for analysis. N = 25 total recoded responses.

Data source: 2008-09 Faculty Supplemental Survey, Office of Institutional Research, One University Circle, Turlock, CA 95382. Tel: 209-667-3281 or www.ir@csustan.edu.
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