



Report of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) Spring 2008 Administration: Full-Time, Part-Time, 1st Year, and 2nd Year Comparison

The Kapi'olani Community College (the College) CCSSE 2008 cohort consists of 456 respondents, including 304 full-time and 146 part-time students, and 289 students who completed 0 -29 credits (thereafter referred as 1st year students) and 146 students who completed more than 30 credits (thereafter referred as 2nd year students). This report aims to present the differences between full-time and part-time, as well as 1st and 2nd year students on their CCSSE benchmark item scores. Benchmarks are groups of conceptually related survey items that address key areas of student engagement, learning, and persistence.

Table 1 below shows the five benchmark areas and the score breakdown for full-time, part-time, 1st year and 2nd year students at the College. To the right of each benchmark score column are the percentile ranges, which indicate the relative position of our students in comparison with their national counterparts (full-time, part-time, 1st year and 2nd year students, respectively) who participated in 2008 CCSSE in each benchmark area. Percentiles are important and they can give us clearer idea where our institution stands ahead or falls behind on the continuum from the poorest to the best institutions on CCSSE measures for all subgroups of students.

Table 1. Five CCSSE Benchmark Scores and Percentile Ranges for Overall 2008 Cohort and Full-Time and Part-Time Student Breakdown for Kapi'olani Community College

Benchmark	Overall		Full-Time		Part-Time		1 st Year (0 – 29 credits)		2 nd Year (30 + credits)	
	Score	Percentile	Score	Percentile	Score	Percentile	Score	Percentile	Score	Percentile
Active and Collaborative Learning	53.70	80 – 90%	62.20	90 – 100%	48.50	70 - 80%	51	80-90%	57.4	60-70%
Student Effort	46.60	10 – 20%	54.70	50%	41.70	0 - 10%	46.6	20-30%	46.7	0-10%
Academic Challenge	50.10	50 – 60%	54.40	30 – 40%	47.50	60 - 70%	47.9	50-60%	54.9	50-60%
Student-Faculty Interaction	53.30	70 – 80%	57.50	60 – 70%	50.70	80 - 90%	51.3	80%	57.2	60-70%
Support for Learners	52.30	60 - 70%	56.10	70 - 80%	50.00	60 - 70%	51.9	70-80%	52.6	60%

The strengths of the College were in the areas: Active and Collaborative Learning and Student-Faculty Interaction, in both of which the College scored above 70% of national community colleges. However our biggest challenge was Student Effort where we stood below 80% of the colleges. This challenge manifested itself most evidently in part-time and 2nd year student samples. Academic Challenge was another area where we stood just slightly above the average. This was true for every sub-group of students, except for full-time students, who ranked at the range of 30-40% among national colleges.

From the descriptive statistics, full-time students had much higher benchmark scores than part-time students, but in the area of Academic Challenge, our full-time students fell behind more than 60% of those in community colleges nation-wide. The most challenging area for part-time students was Student Effort, where our students fell in the lowest 10%.

2nd year students had higher benchmark scores than 1st year students in general, but their percentile rank dropped in all the benchmark areas, except for Academic Challenge, compared to 1st year students' relative percentile rank positions. This indicated that although our students made progress in their engagement when they gained senior status, their progress fell somewhat behind the pace of their national counterparts.

The following section examined the item scores in each benchmark area for full-time and part-time students to identify which specific areas showed our strengths and challenges. The comparison was made against three populations: seven Hawaii Community College Consortium (HCCC), 147 medium-sized community colleges (MSCC), as well as the overall CCSSE 2008 cohort (Cohort).

Table 2 shows the items that demonstrate strength of our students in comparison with their Hawaii or National counterparts, and Table 3 shows that items that indicate the challenging areas of our students. The first column shows the benchmark area that an item belongs and the total number of items in each benchmark area. The second column shows the individual items that indicate strength in Table 2 and changes in Table 3. The last three columns show the state and national comparison results for all students, full-time, part-time, 1st year and 2nd year students. The notation "H", "M", and "C" indicate significant difference exist when our students were compared to HCCC, MSCC and national CCSSE cohorts, respectively. Number of items was denoted as "k".

Table 2. Items That Show Strength

Benchmark Areas	Survey Items	All	Part-Time	Full-Time	First Year	2 nd year
Active and Collaborative Learning (k ¹ = 7)	4b. Made a class presentation			H/M/C	M/C	
	4f. Worked with other students on projects during class			M		
	4g. Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments	M/C		H/M/C	M/C	
	4h. Tutored or taught other students (paid or voluntary)	M/C		M/C		
	4i. Participated in a community -based project as a part of a regular course	M/C	M/C	M/C	M/C	M/C
Student Effort (k = 8)	13h1. Frequency: Computer lab			H		
Academic Challenge (k = 10)	6c. Number of written papers or reports of any length	M/C		M/C	M	
Student-Faculty Interaction (k = 6)	4k. Used email to communicate with an instructor	H/M/C	H/M/C	M/C	H/M/C	H/M/C
	4q. Worked with instructors on activities other than coursework			M		
Support for Learners (k = 7)	9c. Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds	M/C		M/C	M/C	
	9d. Helping you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family)	M			M	
	9e. Providing the support you need to thrive socially	M				
	13b1. Frequency: Career counseling			M/C		

Table 3. Items That Show Challenges

Benchmark Areas	Survey Items	All	Part-Time	Full-Time	1 st Year	2 nd Year
Active and Collaborative Learning (k ¹ = 7)	4a. Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions	H/M/C	M/C	M/C	H/M/C	M/C
Student Effort (k = 8)	4c. Prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in	H				
	4e. Came to class without completing readings or assignments	M/C	M/C	C	M/C	M/C
Academic Challenge (k = 10)	4p. Worked harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations				H	
	6a. Number of assigned textbooks, manuals, books, or book-length packs of course readings	H		H/M/C	H	
Support for Learners (k = 7)	9f. Providing the financial support you need to afford your education	M/C		M/C		

Result highlights

Our students' response patterns were very similar with those of Hawaii Consortium but much more different from those shown in medium colleges and overall national cohorts. For the overall student group, our students' item scores were significantly different from HCCC only on a few items (n = 4) but they were significantly different from MSCC and Cohort on many items, 11 and 9, respectively. Of those items that showed difference, there were more items that showed our strengths than challenges. When an item showed significant difference from MSCC, it was very often significantly different from Cohort as well. This indirectly told us that the response pattern of MSCC was similar with that of Cohort.

Our full-time students and 1st year students were fairly different from their national counterparts, judging by the great number of items that showed significant differences when compared with MSCC and Cohort. Of those items that showed differences for full-time and first-year students, most items demonstrated the strength of our full-time and 1st year students. Our part-time and 2nd year students were quite similar with their national counterparts and they were only different on four items, two showed strengths and two reflected challenges.

The overarching areas of strength were that our students participated in a community -based project as a part of a regular course (item 4i) and used email to communicate with an instructor (4k) significantly more often than their national counterparts, which was true for every sub-group: full-time, part-time, 1st year or 2nd year. In general, Active and Collaborative Learning and Support for Learners were the two strong areas where our students scored better on many items in each area.

The most challenging areas of our student engagement lay in students' less active participation in class and underpreparedness before coming to class (item 4a and 4e). This was true for every sub-group. Particular challenging areas for full-

time students were fewer book-length readings completed per semester (item 6a), which was also true for 1st year student, and sense of lack of adequate financial support (item 9f).

Exploring Challenging Areas:

This section will provide more detail on the response pattern on the four highlight challenging items: 4a, 4e, 6a and 9f. The data provided was from readily available CCSSE reports, which only included full-time and part-time student group breakdown.

On the class participation item, item 4a, it showed that 11 out of 146 (7.5%) part-time students never asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions. Nationally, only 3% of part-time students never participated in class. For full-time students, 10 out of 303 (3.3%) did not ask questions or contributed to class discussions, compared with 2.1% nationally.

In regards to the items on preparedness (items 4e.), 29 out of 145 (20%) part-time students often or very often came to class without completing readings or assignments compared to 12.5% nationally. For full-time students, and 70 out of 300 (23.3%) often or very often came to class unprepared compared to 16.5% nationally.

Number of book-length reading read (item 6a) and sense of adequacy of financial support (item 9f) were two areas where our full-time students scored much lower than national average. 130 out of 302 (43.1) full-time students read less than 4 book-length reading per academic year, compared to 28.6% nationally. 90 out of 298 (30.2%) full-time thought the school provided very little financial support they needed to afford their education, compared to 22% nationally.

Conclusion

The examination of full-time and part-time students' responses revealed more details of the meaning and reasons for the benchmark score results. In general our institution has far more strengths than the challenging areas. To address the challenging areas and improve students' engagement, administration and faculty would want to focus on encouraging students' class participation, motivating students to come to class prepared and to read more book-length readings, as well as boosting awareness of financial aid options, especially to full-time students.

More campus-based research are needed to investigate the reasons and solutions for the challenging areas identified in this research brief. The readers and stakeholders should be cautioned that the improvement suggestions given by this research brief are derived solely from analysis of statistical results. It is one source of information, but the best improvement plan would be one that is also closely integrated with the departmental ongoing improvement plans and the institutional strategic planning, as advised by CCSSE. Different programs may decide on keep strengthening our advantageous areas, while at the same time attacking one or two challenging areas.

Note:

1. Statistical significance testing was done by CCSSE. The significance level was set at $p < .001$ and an effect size greater than or equal to .20.

Contact Person:

Yao Zhang Hill
Institutional Researcher/Instructor
808-734-9763
ofie@hawaii.edu