CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS SURVEY

USERS' GUIDE

Prepared by:

Robert D. Reason, Co-Principal Investigator
Associate Professor and Senior Research Associate

Patrick T. Terenzini, Co-Principal Investigator
Distinguished Professor and Senior Scientist

Bradley E. Cox
Graduate Research Assistant

Brenda R. Lutovsky-Quaye
Graduate Research Assistant

Kadian L. McIntosh
Graduate Research Assistant

March 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Parsing the First Year of College
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS SURVEY

USERS' GUIDE

Project Background and Purposes

The *Parsing the First Year of College* study is a three-year project supported by a Major Grant from the Spencer Foundation and by technical assistance and other considerations from ACT, Inc. and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The project is the most comprehensive, longitudinal study of the first-year student experience done to-date. The project maps the multiple and interconnected influences shaping student learning and persistence during students' first year of college. It incorporates information on students' precollege characteristics, activities, and academic preparation; their first-year experiences; the campus' peer environment; faculty members' activities, perceptions, and values; and internal institutional structures, practices, and policies relating to the first year. The Parsing the First Year of College study examines the broad range of independent and joint influences of the multiple student, faculty, and institutional factors that shape first-year college students' experiences, learning, and persistence. A comprehensive conceptual framework guided the study's design, a framework based on the broad empirical literature that identifies educationally effective curricula, programs, student experiences, and organizational features, environments, and structures associated with cognitive development, academic success, and persistence among first-year students.

The Parsing Study also seeks to assist participating and other institutions in providing their new students with an effective educational experience during their first year of college. The usefulness of the institutional self-review and improvement process that the project is intended to facilitate rests, in part, on data reflecting how well an institution is performing on a set of performance indicators designed to identify areas of educational success, as well as areas that may require additional review, discussion, or enhancement.

An institution's chief academic officer (CAO) is an important source of information on what a college or university is doing in certain educational and operational areas relevant to first-year students' experiences. CAOs are particularly well-qualified to provide information on their institution's organizational structures, curricula, academic policies, budgets, and staffing patterns as they relate to students' first year of college. Institutional data have also been collected from students and faculty members. Results from these surveys have been reported to participating institutions in separate reports. We encourage readers to use this report in conjunction with the other data provided to their campus as part of the Parsing Project.

Methods

Design, Data Collected, Institutional Population, and Sample

The overall Parsing Study is a set of cross-sectional surveys gathering information from four key campus groups:

- *First-year Undergraduate Students*: ACT test scores; socio-demographic characteristics and family background; high school activities and academic performance; scores on the ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) in critical thinking and (for some institutions) writing skills; and first-year experiences from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE);

- *Faculty Members*: Socio-demographic characteristics; academic background; perceptions of their institution's internal organization, programming, and policies affecting first-year students' experiences; perceptions of the level of cooperation between academic and student affairs divisions; the instructional approaches they use; their out-of-class interactions with first-year students; the faculty culture and reward system; their professional development activities; and their views on institutional assessment practices relating to students' first year;

- *Chief Academic Affairs Officers*: Internal academic organizational structures, practices, programs, and policies, and

- *Chief Student Affairs Officers*: Internal organizational structures, practices, and policies in the campus's student affairs division.

Fifty institutions applied to participate in the Parsing Study. From that number, researchers at Penn State University's Center for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) selected 34 colleges and universities. These institutions were selected to provide a sample that was as nationally representative as possible and whose first-year students entering in Fall, 2006, in the aggregate, had a profile (with respect to gender and race/ethnicity) as close as possible to that of the national population of first-year students who entered college that term. Because of a number strong similarities in the research design and student data collected for the Parsing Study and the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education (WNS), eleven WNS campuses also participated in the Parsing Study's faculty and administrator surveys. Data from WNS administrators are included in the norm data reported in the tables of this report (for more information on the WNS, see: http://www.liberalarts.wabash.edu/nationalstudy). See Appendix A for a list of all participating institutions.

In the spring of 2007, researchers surveyed students, faculty members, and administrators at the 45 participating institutions. Because of the constraint that Parsing Study institutions must rely primarily on ACT test scores for admitting students, colleges and universities in the Midwest and Southern regions are over-represented. Consequently, *no claims can be made that the 45 participating institutions, their administrators, or the aggregated samples of their participating students or faculty members on those campuses are representative of a national*

population. Nonetheless, the number and diversity of participating schools suggests that data reported by these institutions may help inform decisions made at your institution.

Report Description

This report summarizes information gathered in a survey of the chief academic officers at the 34 institutions participating in the Parsing the First Year of College Study and the 11 schools participating in the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education (WNS). Parsing Study staff designed and conducted the survey in Spring 2007. CAOs were asked to respond to questions as they pertained to their institution at the start of the Fall 2006 academic term. Appendix B contains a copy of the questionnaire.

This report, unlike those for the student and faculty surveys, contains no formal "measures" of an institution's performance. Rather, the report summarizes the response distributions of all 45 CAOs, grouped according to their institutions' 2000 Carnegie Classification (bachelor's, masters, or doctoral degree-awarding). Thus, rather than a performance report specific to a particular institution, this document provides portraits of three distinct institutional groups in terms of their curricular requirements, organizational structures, staffing, budgets, student support services, programs, and policies relating to the first year of college as those institutions package and deliver it.

Limitations on the Data and Report

Like any piece of social science or educational research, the instruments and analyses adopted for this project have their limitations, and users should be mindful of those constraints. First, the institutions in this study were not randomly selected. All institutions volunteered for and, indeed, were selected for participation in the Parsing Study or WNS. Thus, these institutions do not constitute a random or nationally representative sample of higher education institutions, and any generalizations to other institutions based on the evidence reported here should be made cautiously.

Second, researchers at CSHE and chief academic officers at selected institutions reviewed survey instrument on which this report rests. Thus, while the survey questionnaire has some claim to content validity, it may well omit some important programs, practices, or policies or only partially reflect them.

Finally, summarizing the responses within each Carnegie Classification probably controls only partially for between-institution differences. In a number of important ways, institutions in a given classification may vary as much among themselves as they do from institutions in another classification. This report is intended to be descriptive rather than normative and, thus, no efforts have been made to adjust for differences within or between sectors for such factors as institutional complexity, wealth, or quality (by whatever measure).

Some Thoughts on Using the Tables

The tables in this report are intended to be "conversation starters." The information they provide presents a single, snapshot of institutional policies and practices at one point in time. Moreover, the interpretation of and implications inferred from the findings are likely to vary across viewers. Readers might, however, keep two questions in mind: 1) If the difference between our campus and those of others is substantive (important) and comparatively large (relative either to a norm group or to other differences in the report), is that difference one that should give us pride or concern? and 2) If the latter, then what might we do about it? The answers may warrant the attention of a particular office or individual, of a particular segment of the campus community, or of the entire institution.

Finally, these tables are only a single data source. A clearer picture of a campus's first-year experience is likely to be gained by reviewing the information presented here together with that gathered from first-year students themselves (see the ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency [CAAP] and National Survey of Student Engagement [NSSE] reports and datasets provided earlier) and from faculty datasets and reports. Those datasets and reports include students' perceptions of their experiences, their development and learning, and their performance on standardized tests of critical thinking (and, for institutions that chose to assess them, writing skills). The summaries of internal organizational structures, programs, practices, and policies provided by senior student affairs officers may also shed light on how and why one's campus may differ from others in its approach to students' first year of college.

Questions?

Individuals with questions about the survey methods or this report are invited to contact:

Robert D. Reason   Patrick T. Terenzini
Rreason@psu.edu   Terenzini@psu.edu

Appendix A

**Institutions Participating in the Parsing the First Year of College Study
and the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education**

Parsing the First Year of College Institutions

Liberal Arts Colleges

Augustana College (Rock Island, IL)
Calvin College (Grand Rapids, MI)
College of Saint Benedict & St. John's
University (St. Joseph, MN)
Cornell College (Mt. Vernon, IA)
Culver-Stockton College (Canton, MO)
Grinnell College (Grinnell, IA)
Quincy University (Quincy, IL)
Regis College of Regis University (Denver, CO)
University of Arkansas - Fort Smith

Comprehensive/Master's Universities

Adams State College (Alamosa, CO)
Austin Peay State University
Bethel University (St. Paul, MN)
College of Mount St. Joseph (Cincinnati, OH)
Jacksonville State University
Kentucky State University
Northwestern State University of Louisiana
Saint Xavier University (Chicago, IL)
Sam Houston State University
St. Cloud State University (St. Cloud, MN)
University of St. Francis (Joliet, IL)
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
Wayland Baptist University (Plainview, TX)
Youngstown State University

Research/Doctoral Universities

Bowling Green State University
Kansas State University
Loyola University Chicago
Miami University
Oakland University (Rochester, MI)
Saint Louis University
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
University of Kansas
University of Missouri - Kansas City
University of Nebraska - Lincoln
University of Wyoming

Wabash National Study Institutions

Liberal Arts Colleges

Alma College
Bard College
Coe College
Columbia College
Connecticut College
Gustavus Adolphus College
Hampshire College
Hope College
Wabash College
Whittier College

Research/Doctoral Universities

University of Kentucky

PENNSTATE

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Parsing the First Year of College Project

SURVEY OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS

This survey asks a series of questions about organizational structures, policies, and practices at your institution. **Please answer each question as it applies to your institution <u>at the start of the 2006 – 2007 academic year</u>.** Thank you.

Answers to all questions in this survey will be strictly confidential.

Please return <u>by August 6, 2007</u>.

May we please have the following information in case we have questions or need clarification? Thanks.

Person completing survey (please print):	_____
Title:	_____
Phone number:	_____
E-mail address:	_____

QUESTIONS?

About the survey? Please contact:

    Brenda R. Lutovsky, Robert D. Reason, or Patrick T. Terenzini
    at (814) 865-6346 or Parsing@psu.edu.

About the research design and methods? Please visit:

    http://www.ed.psu.edu/cshe/Parsing/home.html

or contact any of the individuals listed above.

Please answer each question as it applies to your institution <u>at the start of the 2006-07 academic year</u>.

SURVEY OF CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS

For each question below, simply check or darken the bubble next to the most appropriate answer.

1. Where in your institution does primary responsibility lie for a <u>campus-wide</u>, coordinated approach to the first year, including alignment of all first-year efforts through partnerships among academic affairs, student affairs, and other administrative units?

      O a. We have no such mechanism for campus-wide coordination of the first year.
      O b. A standing, campus-wide coordinating committee.
      O c. A specific office or individual (e.g., Dean/Director of the First Year Experience).
      O d. Both a campus-wide committee and a specific office/individual.

2. Approximately what resources does your campus earmark <u>specifically</u> for campus-wide coordination of programs and services for first-year students?

      a. Staffing: Professional   ____.__ FTE
                        Clerical   ____.__ FTE

      b. Budget (excluding personnel funds):   O Yes   O No

3. a. <u>IF you have a campus-wide coordinating committee</u>, to whom does the committee chair report (please check <u>ONE</u>)?

      O President   O Chief student affairs officer
      O Chief academic officer   O Another student affairs officer
      O Another academic officer

   b. <u>IF you have a specific office or individual</u>, to whom does that office/individual report (please check <u>ONE</u>)?

      O President   O Chief student affairs officer
      O Chief academic officer   O Another student affairs officer
      O Another academic officer

<u>A reminder: Answers to the following (indeed, all) questions will be strictly confidential</u>.

4. Does your institution have a policy of meeting students' <u>full financial need</u>?

      O Yes

      O No (skip to #6)

5. Does your institution have a policy regarding <u>the ratio of grant-to-loan aid</u> that you seek to maintain in students' financial aid packages?

      O No.

      O Yes. We try to maintain a standard ratio for all students.
            That ratio provides for: ___% in grants and
                                 ___% in loans

      O Yes, but the ratio varies depending on family income.

6. Approximately what percentage of your first-year students are eligible for a Pell Grant? _____%

Please answer each question as it applies to your institution <u>at the start of the 2006-07 academic year</u>.

7. **With respect to academic advisers of first-year students, does your institution:**	No	Informally	Systematically
a. Provide training and support for advisors?	O	O	O
b. Evaluate advisors' performance?	O	O	O
c. Reward advisors' performance?	O	O	O

8. In your new faculty orientation efforts, how much time is dedicated to **first-year students' experiences, related programs, and/or services**?

      O No time   O 2 hours or less   O Half-a-day   O A full day or more

9. What position does your institution take with regard to the following:	No position	We encourage it	We require it
a. Senior faculty (associate/full professors) teaching **first-year seminars**	O	O	O
b. Senior faculty (associate/full professors) teaching **other first-year courses**	O	O	O
c. Faculty participation in first-year student orientation activities	O	O	O
d. Faculty participation in other events for first-year students (e.g., parents' and family weekend, class trips)	O	O	O

10. What consideration is given to faculty members' involvement with first-year students (e.g., teaching, advising, informal interactions) when the following decisions are being made:	Not a consideration	Informal consideration	As a matter of policy
a. Hiring	O	O	O
b. Promotion & tenure reviews or decisions	O	O	O
c. Salary merit increases	O	O	O

11. Does your institution:	No	Optional	Optional, but encouraged	Required
a. Provide faculty development opportunities focused on teaching or advising first-year students?	O	O	O	O
b. Ask about faculty out-of-class activities with first-year student as part of an annual report or performance review?	O	O	O	O

12. Does your institution have an organizational mechanism for:	No	Yes; it's informal	Yes; it's systematic
a. An "early alert system" to identify students in academic difficulty	O	O	O
b. Early identification of first-year students having personal difficulty	O	O	O

Please answer each question as it applies to your institution <u>at the start of the 2006-07 academic year</u>.

13. What is your institution's <u>policy</u> regarding student evaluations of first-year courses and instructors?

    O   Student evaluations are not used (please go to # 15)
    O   Student evaluations are optional
    O   Student evaluations are required of some first-year courses
    O   Student evaluations are required of all first-year courses

14. <u>IF</u> student evaluations are used, are conferences/discussions of the results held with appropriate individuals for purposes of the faculty member's professional development:

    O   Available if requested
    O   Encouraged
    O   Required of some instructors
    O   Required of all instructors

15. <u>Beyond student ratings</u> of instruction, does your institution assess the **effectiveness** of:	Not at all	Rarely	Occasionally	Regularly
a. First-year courses	O	O	O	O
b. Programs for first-year students	O	O	O	O
c. Services for first-year students	O	O	O	O

16. Does your institution send faculty and staff members to participate in activities relating <u>specifically</u> to first-year students, such as:	No	Yes, at traveler's expense	Yes, with partial funding	Yes, with full funding
a. State or regional conferences or workshops	O	O	O	O
b. National conferences or workshops	O	O	O	O
c. Visits to other campuses to learn about their first-year courses, programs, or activities	O	O	O	O

17. Does your institution:	Yes	No
a. Retain consultants on the first year of college	O	O
b. Benchmark your first-year seminars, programs, or services against those of other institutions	O	O

18. <u>In the past three years</u>, has your institution assessed whether any of the following affect first-year student learning and/or persistence into the second year:	Learning		Persistence	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
a. Classroom experiences (e.g., pedagogies, assignments)	O	O	O	O
b. Curriculum (e.g., major, course-taking patterns, Gen. Ed. reqs.)	O	O	O	O
c. Out-of-class experiences	O	O	O	O

19. Does your institution use first-year assessment information for:	Not at all	Rarely	Occasionally	Regularly
a. Course development or redesign	O	O	O	O
b. Academic department/program evaluation	O	O	O	O
c. Academic department/program planning or development	O	O	O	O
d. Resource allocation	O	O	O	O

Please answer each question as it applies to your institution <u>at the start of the 2006-07 academic year</u>.

20. Which <u>ONE</u> of the following formats best describes <u>most</u> of the first-year seminars offered at your institution?

    O   We <u>don't currently offer first-year seminars</u> [Got to #25]

    O   <u>Basic study skills seminar</u> (tends to focus on basic skills such as reading, writing, or math)

    O   <u>Extended orientation seminar</u> (students learn about such things as campus resources, time management, study skills, and career planning)

    O   <u>Pre-Professional seminar</u> (generally taught to prepare students for the demands of a major for a profession such as medicine, law, engineering, nursing, or business)

    O   <u>Seminar with academic content</u> (content tends to be specific to a discipline or inter-disciplinary)

21. Are your first-year seminars:

    O Optional for all   O Required for some   O Required for all

22. What is the duration of the seminars?

    O   Less than one term   O   One term   O   More than one term

23. How many credits do the seminars carry?

    O   None
    O   One Semester credit / 1-2 Quarter credits
    O   Two Semester credits / 3 Quarter credits
    O   Three or more Semester credits / 4 or more Quarter credits

24. Does your institution have a cap on the size of first-year seminar sections?   O   Yes   O   No

         If yes, what is that cap?   _____

25. Does your institution have programs *specifically designed* to encourage <u>out-of-class interaction</u> between faculty and first-year students?

    O   No
    O   Yes, some departments do, but others don't
    O   Yes, it is a campus-wide program

26. Does your institution offer the following **for first-year students**:	Yes	Unsure	No
a. Learning communities	O	O	O
b. Mentoring programs	O	O	O
c. Service-learning courses (service is a required and integral part of the course)	O	O	O

Please answer each question as it applies to your institution <u>at the start of the 2006-07 academic year</u>.

27. Does your institution provide first-year students:	No	Yes; it's optional	Yes; it's required for some	Yes; it's required for all
a. Common reading programs	O	O	O	O
b. Applied or experiential learning activities	O	O	O	O

28.a. Does your institution have a <u>course requirement</u> designed to introduce students to "diversity" in areas such as gender, race, ethnicity, culture, or religion?

      O Yes   O No

  b. If yes, must students meet that requirement before reaching sophomore class status?

      O Yes   O No

29. What is the highest curricular level at which opportunities are available for students to study each of the following topics:	None	Course(s)	Minor / Certificate	Major field
a. Racial / Ethnic studies	O	O	O	O
b. Women's studies	O	O	O	O
c. Religious studies	O	O	O	O
d. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender studies	O	O	O	O
e. Foreign languages / cultures	O	O	O	O

30. Does your institution offer <u>campus-wide</u>:	Not offered	Annually	Each Term	Monthly	Weekly
a. Convocation	O	O	O	O	O
b. Speaker series events	O	O	O	O	O
c. Ethnic or cultural events	O	O	O	O	O

31. Does your institution offer <u>preparatory or developmental</u> **courses** in:	No	Yes, but not for credit	Yes, for credit
a. Math	O	O	O
b. Writing	O	O	O
c. Reading	O	O	O
d. Basic study skills (e.g., note-taking, time management, active listening)	O	O	O
e. English as a Second Language (ESL)	O	O	O

Thank you very much for your assistance.
Please return this survey in the postage-paid envelope provided, or to:

Brenda R. Lutovsky
Parsing the First Year of College Project
Center for the Study of Higher Education
400 Rackley Building
Pennsylvania State University
University Park, PA 16802-3203

Appendix C

CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS SURVEY

SUMMARY TABLES

Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University
Parsing the First Year of College Study

**SPRING 2006 CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICER
SURVEY REPORT**

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Overall	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's[1]	Master's[1]	Doctoral[1]
	Response Rate:				
	Responses Received	45	17	16	12
	Target Population	45	17	16	12
	Response Rate:[2]	100%	100%	100%	100%
1. Where in your institution does primary responsibility lie for a campus-wide, coordinated approach to the first year, including alignment of all first-year efforts through partnerships among academic affairs, student affairs, and other administrative units?					
No such mechanism.		38%	41%	25%	50%
Standing, campus-wide coordinating committee		4%	6%	0%	8%
Specific office or individual (e.g., Dean/Director of the First Year Experience)		38%	29%	56%	25%
Both a campus-wide committee and a specific office/individual		20%	24%	19%	17%
2. Approximately what resources does your campus earmark specifically for campus-wide coordination of programs and services for first-year students?					
	Professional Staff (FTE)	1.58	0.88	2.39	1.50
	Clerical Staff (FTE)	0.58	0.35	0.62	0.85
	Budget (excluding personnel funds): Yes, have budget	73%	71%	94%	50%
3a. If you have a campus-wide coordinating committee, to whom does the committee chair report (please check ONE)?[3]					
	# schools w/ committee	*n = 11*	*n = 5*	*n = 3*	*n = 3*
	President	18%	20%	0%	33%
	Chief Academic Officer	36%	60%	33%	0%
	Another academic officer	18%	0%	33%	33%
	Chief Student Affairs Officer	27%	20%	33%	33%
	Another student affairs officer	0%	0%	0%	0%
3b. If you have a specific office or individual, to whom does that office/individual report (please check ONE)?[3]					
	# schools w/ office/individual	*n = 24*	*n = 9*	*n = 10*	*n = 5*
	President	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Chief Academic Officer	58%	89%	30%	60%
	Another academic officer	21%	0%	30%	20%
	Chief Student Affairs Officer	21%	11%	40%	20%
	Another student affairs officer	0%	0%	0%	0%
4. Does your institution have a policy of meeting students' full financial need?					
	Yes	18%	24%	6%	25%
5. Does your institution have a policy regarding the ratio of grant-to-loan aid that you seek to maintain					
			Insufficient Data [4]		
6a. Approximately what percentage of your first-year students are eligible for a Pell Grant?					
		23%	19%	36%	13%

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
		Overall	Norms for . . .		
			Bachelor's[1]	Master's[1]	Doctoral[1]
7. With respect to academic advisers of first-year students, does your institution:					
Provide training and support for advisors?	No	2%	0%	6%	0%
	Yes, Informally	27%	12%	38%	33%
	Yes, Systematically	71%	88%	56%	67%
Evaluate advisors' performance?	No	27%	29%	38%	8%
	Yes, Informally	35%	47%	38%	17%
	Yes, Systematically	28%	24%	25%	75%
Reward advisors' performance?	No	33%	35%	50%	8%
	Yes, Informally	40%	35%	44%	42%
	Yes, Systematically	27%	30%	6%	50%
8. In your new faculty orientation efforts, how much time is dedicated to first-year students' experiences, related programs, and/or services?					
	None	24%	23%	31%	17%
	2 hours or less	69%	71%	69%	67%
	Half-a-day	7%	6%	0%	17%
	A full day or more	0%	0%	0%	0%
9.What position does your institution take with regard to the following:					
9a. Senior faculty (associate/full professors) teaching first-year seminars	No position	22%	12%	25%	33%
	We encourage it	67%	65%	69%	67%
	We require it	11%	23%	6%	0%
9b. Senior faculty (associate/full professors) teaching *other* first-year courses	No position	11%	12%	19%	0%
	We encourage it	76%	59%	75%	100%
	We require it	13%	29%	6%	0%
9c. Faculty participation in first-year student orientation activities	No position	15%	12%	19%	17%
	We encourage it	76%	71%	81%	75%
	We require it	9%	18%	0%	8%
9d. Faculty participation in other events for first-year students (e.g., parents' and family weekend, class trips)	No position	20%	6%	38%	17%
	We encourage it	78%	88%	63%	83%
	We require it	2%	6%	0%	0%
10. What consideration is given to faculty members' involvement with first-year students (e.g., teaching, advising, informal interactions) when the following decisions are being made:					
10a. Hiring	Not at consideration	31%	30%	38%	25%
	Informal consideration	51%	35%	6%	67%
	Considered as a matter of policy	18%	35%	6%	8%
10b. Promotion & tenure reviews or decisions	Not at consideration	22%	18%	31%	17%
	Informal consideration	56%	47%	50%	75%
	Considered as a matter of policy	22%	35%	19%	8%
10c. Salary merit increases	Not at consideration	53%	65%	69%	17%
	Informal consideration	40%	29%	31%	67%
	Considered as a matter of policy	7%	6%	0%	17%

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
			Norms for . . .		
		Overall	Bachelor's[1]	Master's[1]	Doctoral[1]
11. Does your institution . . .					
a. Provide faculty development opportunities focused on teaching or advising first-year students?	No	15%	0%	25%	25%
	Optional	29%	18%	44%	25%
	Option, but encouraged	47%	59%	31%	50%
	Required	9%	24%	0%	0%
b. Ask about faculty out-of-class activities with first-year student as part of an annual report or performance review?	No	51%	47%	56%	50%
	Optional	22%	6%	25%	42%
	Option, but encouraged	22%	35%	19%	8%
	Required	4%	12%	0%	0%
12. Does your institution have an organizational mechanism for:					
a. An "early alert system" to identify students having academic	No	4%	6%	0%	8%
	Yes, it's informal	7%	0%	13%	8%
	Yes, it's systematic	89%	94%	88%	83%
b. Early identification of first-year students having personal difficulty	No	11%	12%	13%	8%
	Yes, it's informal	38%	29%	38%	50%
	Yes, it's systematic	51%	59%	50%	42%
13. What is your institution's policy regarding student evaluations of first-year courses and instructors?					
Student evaluations are not used		0%	0%	0%	0%
Student evaluations are optional		7%	18%	0%	0%
Student evaluations are required of some first-year courses		31%	29%	44%	17%
Student evaluations are required of all first-year courses		62%	53%	56%	83%
14. If student evaluations are used, are conferences/discussions of the results held with appropriate individuals for purposes of the faculty member's professional development?					
	Available if requested	22%	35%	6%	25%
	Encouraged	40%	24%	44%	58%
	Required of some instructors	27%	29%	31%	17%
	Required of all instructors	11%	12%	19%	0%
15. Beyond student ratings of instruction, does your institution assess the effectiveness of:					
a. First-year courses	Not at all	9%	6%	6%	17%
	Rarely	11%	6%	19%	8%
	Occasionally	36%	41%	38%	25%
	Regularly	44%	47%	38%	50%
b. Programs for first-year students	Not at all	9%	6%	13%	8%
	Rarely	9%	12%	6%	8%
	Occasionally	33%	35%	38%	25%
	Regularly	49%	47%	44%	58%
c. Services for first-year students	Not at all	4%	6%	6%	0%
	Rarely	16%	12%	13%	25%
	Occasionally	31%	35%	31%	25%
	Regularly	49%	47%	50%	50%

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
			Norms for . . .		
		Overall	Bachelor's[1]	Master's[1]	Doctoral[1]
16. Does your institution send faculty and staff members to participate in activities relating specifically to first-year students, such as:					
a. State or regional conferences or workshops	Not at all	18%	36%	6%	8%
	Yes, at traveler's expense	2%	6%	0%	0%
	Yes, with partial funding	31%	12%	38%	50%
	Yes, with full funding	49%	47%	56%	42%
b. National conferences or workshops	Not at all	11%	18%	6%	8%
	Yes, at traveler's expense	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Yes, with partial funding	33%	18%	38%	50%
	Yes, with full funding	56%	65%	56%	42%
c. Visits to other campuses to learn about their first-year courses, programs, or activities	Not at all	42%	47%	50%	25%
	Yes, at traveler's expense	7%	12%	6%	0%
	Yes, with partial funding	20%	12%	19%	33%
	Yes, with full funding	31%	29%	25%	42%
17. Does your institution					
a. Retain consultants on the first year of college	Yes	16%	6%	13%	33%
	No	84%	94%	88%	67%
b. Benchmark your first-year seminars, programs, or services against those of other institutions	Yes	44%	53%	38%	58%
	No	56%	47%	63%	42%
18. In the past three years, has your institution assessed whether any of the following affect first-year student learning and/or persistence into the second year:					
a. Classroom experiences (e.g., pedagogies, assignments)					
	Learning	69%	77%	56%	75%
	Persistence	49%	41%	56%	50%
b. Curriculum (e.g., major, course-taking patterns, Gen. Ed. reqs.)					
	Learning	56%	59%	38%	75%
	Persistence	44%	47%	31%	42%
c. Out-of-class experiences					
	Learning	47%	47%	50%	42%
	Persistence	51%	41%	56%	58%
19. Does your institution use first-year assessment information for:					
a. Course development or redesign	Not at all	11%	29%	0%	0%
	Rarely	9%	0%	25%	0%
	Occasionally	53%	47%	50%	67%
	Regularly	27%	24%	25%	33%
b. Academic department/program evaluation	Not at all	18%	36%	13%	0%
	Rarely	20%	12%	44%	0%
	Occasionally	33%	24%	31%	50%
	Regularly	29%	29%	13%	50%
c. Academic department/program planning or development	Not at all	16%	24%	19%	0%
	Rarely	20%	24%	31%	0%
	Occasionally	42%	35%	38%	58%
	Regularly	22%	18%	13%	42%
d. Resource allocation	Not at all	27%	35%	19%	25%
	Rarely	27%	24%	31%	25%
	Occasionally	30%	12%	50%	33%
	Regularly	16%	29%	0%	17%

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
			Norms for . . .		
		Overall	Bachelor's[1]	Master's[1]	Doctoral[1]
20. Which ONE of the following formats best describes most of the first-year seminars offered at your institution?					
We don't currently offer first-year seminars[5]		4%	6%	0%	8%
Basic study skills seminar (tends to focus on basic skills such as reading, writing, or math)		4%	6%	6%	0%
Extended orientation seminar (students learn about such things as campus resources, time management, study skills, and career planning)		31%	6%	50%	42%
Pre-Professional seminar (generally taught to prepare students for the demands of a major for a profession such as medicine, law, engineering, nursing, or business)		7%	0%	6%	17%
Seminar with academic content (content tends to be specific to a discipline or inter-disciplinary)		53%	82%	38%	33%
21. Are your first-year seminars. . . [5]					
	# schools w/ FY seminars	*n = 43*	*n = 16*	*n = 16*	*n = 11*
	Optional for all	26%	13%	13%	64%
	Required for some	21%	13%	25%	27%
	Required for all	55%	75%	63%	9%
22. What is the duration of the seminars?[5]					
	Less than one term	7%	6%	13%	0%
	One term	84%	69%	88%	100%
	More than one term	9%	25%	0%	0%
23. How many credits do the seminars carry?[5]					
	None	7%	6%	0%	17%
	1 Sem/ 1-2 Quarters	35%	18%	44%	50%
	2 Sem / 3 Quarters	11%	12%	19%	0%
	3 + Sem / 4 + Quarters	47%	65%	38%	33%
24. Does your institution have an enrollment cap on the size of first-year seminar sections?[5]					
	Yes	87%	94%	81%	83%
	Average Cap Size	16	17	16	15
25. Does your institution have programs specifically designed to encourage out-of-class interaction between faculty and first-year students?					
	No	20%	24%	31%	75%
	Yes, some departments do	58%	35%	69%	0%
	Yes, it is a campus-wide program	22%	41%	0%	25%
26. Does your institution offer the following for first-year students:					
Learning communities	Yes	58%	41%	44%	100%
	Unsure	0%	0%	0%	0%
	No	42%	59%	56%	0%
Mentoring programs	Yes	78%	71%	75%	92%
	Unsure	0%	0%	0%	0%
	No	22%	29%	25%	8%
Service-learning courses (service is required and integral part of the course)	Yes	64%	71%	44%	83%
	Unsure	0%	0%	0%	0%
	No	36%	29%	56%	17%

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
			Norms for . . .		
		Overall	Bachelor's[1]	Master's[1]	Doctoral[1]
27. Does your institution provide first-year students:					
Common reading programs	No	31%	41%	31%	16%
	Yes, it's optional	11%	6%	25%	0%
	Yes, required of some	16%	12%	6%	33%
	Yes, required for all	42%	41%	38%	50%
Applied or experimental learning activities	No	18%	18%	25%	8%
	Yes, it's optional	42%	41%	31%	58%
	Yes, required of some	24%	29%	13%	33%
	Yes, required for all	16%	12%	31%	0%
28.a. Does your institution have a course requirement designed to introduce students to "diversity" in areas such as gender, race, ethnicity, culture?					
	Yes	51%	41%	38%	83%
28b. If yes, must students meet that requirement before reaching sophomore class status?					
	# "yes" answers question 28a	*n=23*	*n=7*	*n=6*	*n=10*
	Yes, required before sophomore	4%	0%	13%	0%
29. What is the highest curricular level at which opportunities are available for students to study each of the following topics:					
Racial/Ethnic studies	None	2%	0%	6%	0%
	Course(s)	36%	29%	50%	25%
	Minor/Certificate	31%	41%	31%	17%
	Major field	31%	29%	13%	58%
Women's Studies	None	7%	6%	13%	0%
	Course(s)	20%	12%	44%	0%
	Minor/Certificate	29%	35%	31%	17%
	Major field	44%	47%	13%	83%
Religious studies	None	13%	12%	13%	17%
	Course(s)	16%	0%	25%	25%
	Minor/Certificate	4%	0%	6%	8%
	Major field	67%	88%	56%	50%
Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender studies	None	47%	41%	75%	17%
	Course(s)	47%	41%	25%	83%
	Minor/Certificate	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Major field	7%	18%	0%	0%
Foreign languages/ cultures	None	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Course(s)	9%	6%	19%	0%
	Minor/Certificate	7%	6%	13%	0%
	Major field	84%	88%	69%	100%
30. Does your institution offer campus-wide:					
Convocation	Not offered	26%	24%	38%	17%
	Annually	40%	41%	25%	58%
	Each Term	20%	24%	25%	8%
	Monthly	4%	0%	0%	17%
	Weekly	9%	12%	13%	0%

Item Number and Content	Response Options	Column Percentages			
			Norms for . . .		
		Overall	Bachelor's[1]	Master's[1]	Doctoral[1]
Speaker series events	Not offered	7%	0%	19%	0%
	Annually	9%	12%	13%	0%
	Each Term	27%	18%	38%	25%
	Monthly	27%	41%	19%	17%
	Weekly	31%	29%	13%	58%
Ethnic or cultural events	Not offered	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Annually	11%	12%	19%	0%
	Each Term	27%	12%	50%	17%
	Monthly	38%	53%	31%	25%
	Weekly	24%	24%	0%	58%
31. Does your institution offer preparatory or developmental courses in:					
Math	No	29%	53%	6%	25%
	Yes, not for credit	31%	12%	44%	42%
	Yes, for credit	40%	35%	50%	33%
Writing	No	33%	47%	13%	42%
	Yes, not for credit	24%	12%	38%	25%
	Yes, for credit	42%	41%	50%	33%
Reading	No	49%	65%	25%	58%
	Yes, not for credit	24%	12%	44%	17%
	Yes, for credit	27%	24%	24%	25%
Basic study skills (e.g., note-taking, time management, active listening)	No	40%	41%	31%	50%
	Yes, not for credit	29%	24%	38%	25%
	Yes, for credit	31%	35%	31%	25%
English as a Second Language (ESL)	No	51%	65%	63%	17%
	Yes, not for credit	20%	6%	19%	42%
	Yes, for credit	29%	29%	19%	42%

Notes:

[1] 2000 Carnegie Classification.

[2] Sample size represents the number of responses received divided by the number of surveys distributed.

[3] Some schools had *both* an office/individual *and* a committee, while 15 schools (7 bachelors, 4 masters, 4 doctoral) reported having no such mechanism.

[4] Only one institution provided a usable response to this survey item.

[5] Percentages reported for questions 21 through 24 are calculated using only those schools who report having a first year seminar. Of the 45 participating institutions, 43 have first-year seminars (16 bachelors, 16 masters, 11 doctoral).