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*How Can it be Useful to UMBC?*

- Describe faculty engagement of students in experiences that promote learning and developmental outcomes.

- Compare UMBC responses to those of other Doctoral Research Extensive Universities (DREU).

- Identify gaps between faculty’s academic expectations and students’ reported behaviors.

- Promote discussion about pedagogy, student learning, and engagement in academic and co-curricular experiences.
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Methodology

- Faculty who taught at least one course AY2005 and had a viable e-mail address were eligible.

- An initial communication and three follow-ups were sent to faculty to solicit participation with an incentive.

- To assure anonymity, all faculty members had the same login and password to complete the web-based survey.

- Participation rate
  - UMBC: 47% (43% full completions)
  - Average institutional participation rate: 54%
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Methodology

- Faculty answered questions based on one course. From this, FSSE categorized faculty as:
  - **Lower Division (LD)**—teaching mainly freshmen and sophomores
  - **Upper Division (UD)**—teaching mainly juniors and seniors
  - **Other**
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Presentation of Results

- FSSE Respondent Demographics
- Listing of Participating DREU
- Comparison of UMBC Faculty to DREU Faculty
- Comparison of NSSE (2005) to FSSE (2005)
**Figure 1. Comparison of UMBC Respondents to the Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UMBC Sample a</th>
<th>UMBC Population b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 345)</td>
<td>(n = 794)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Minority</td>
<td>9% c</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Full-time</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Tenured/On Tenure Track</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Area of Academic Appointment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences d</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Natural Sciences</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a All percentages are based on full completions only. There are missing cases across these variables.

b Nine cases could not be identified in the population.

c 18% of cases did not indicate race.

d Social Sciences includes Business.
Listing of FSSE-participating DREU (2005)

Public DREU
Indiana University—Bloomington
Iowa State University
Oregon State University \(F\)
University of Alabama
The University of Tennessee
The University of Texas at Austin
University of Vermont
University of Wyoming \(P, F\)
Wayne State University

Private DREU
University of Denver

\(P = \text{Institutional Peer}\)
\(F = \text{Funding Peer}\)
**Figure 2. Comparison of Respondents: UMBC, DREUs, and all FSSE-participating Institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline Area of Academic Appointment</th>
<th>UMBC (^a) (n = 345)</th>
<th>DREU (^a) (n = 4,968)</th>
<th>FSSE (^a) (n = 17,380)</th>
<th>National (^d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Minority</td>
<td>9% (^b)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Full-time</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Tenured/On Tenure Track</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences (^c)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math &amp; Natural Sciences</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) All percentages are based on full completions only. There are missing cases across these variables.

\(^b\) 18% (UMBC), 10% (DREU), and 10% (FSSE) did not indicate race.

\(^c\) Social Sciences includes Business.

\(^d\) National percentages are from the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty. These percentages are based on faculty at U.S. public and private 4-year schools (FSSE Institutional Report, 2005).
**Figure 3. Use of Class Time: A Comparison of UMBC and DREU Faculty a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UMBC</th>
<th>DREU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>40 – 49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-led discussion</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>14.5 – 24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student shared responsibility</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1 – 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group activities</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1 – 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student presentations</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1 – 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1 – 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student computer use</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class writing</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performances in applied &amp; fine arts</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential (lab, field work, exhibits)</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a In your selected course section, on average, what percent of class time is spent on the following?: 1 = none; 2 = 1 – 9%; 3 = 10 – 19%; 4 = 20 – 29%; 5 = 30 – 39%; 6 = 40 – 49%; 7 = 50 – 74%; 8 = ≥75%.
Figure 4. Correlations between Use of Class Time and Class Size at UMBC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What % of class time is spent on the following? c</th>
<th>Number of students enrolled in selected course section b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>.334**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing &amp; evaluation</td>
<td>.143*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential (labs, field work, art exhibits, etc.)</td>
<td>-.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class writing</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student computer use</td>
<td>-.169**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-led discussion</td>
<td>-.187**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small group activities</td>
<td>-.211**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance in applied &amp; fine arts (e.g., dance, drama, music)</td>
<td>-.248**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-student shared responsibility (seminar, discussion, etc.)</td>
<td>-.280**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student presentations</td>
<td>-.448**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Spearman rho coefficient was used given that both variables are rank-ordered.

b How many students are enrolled in your selected course section?: 9 or less, 10 – 19, 20 – 29; 30 – 49; 50 – 99; 100 or more

c In your selected course section, on average, what percent of class time is spent on the following?: none, 1 – 9%, 10 – 19%, 20 – 29%, 30 – 39%, 40 – 49%, 50 – 74%, ≥75%.

** p < .05; * p < .01 level (2-tailed)
Comparisons illustrate an academically rigorous culture at UMBC.

- UMBC seniors and faculty perceived greater institutional emphasis on academics than DREU students and faculty, respectively.

- UMBC seniors report greater institutional emphasis on academics than faculty.

![Bar chart](chart.png)

% Very Much or Quite a Bit: Institution Emphasizes Spending Significant Amounts of Time on Academics

- UMBC Faculty: 78
- UMBC Seniors: 89
- DREU Faculty: 62
- DREU Seniors: 77
### Figure 6. Time Spent by Students Preparing for Class (Per Class Per Week)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Area</th>
<th>Faculty expectation of hours/week&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Faculty belief of actual hours/week&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Student reported hours/week from NSSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Division (n = 100)</td>
<td>Upper Division (n = 198)</td>
<td>Lower Division (n = 99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>5.5 (31)</td>
<td>5.5 (43)</td>
<td>1.5 (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>5.5 (38)</td>
<td>5.5 (85)</td>
<td>1.5 (38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences &amp; Mathematics</td>
<td>9.5 (15)</td>
<td>7.5 (23)</td>
<td>5.5 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Computer Science</td>
<td>5.5 (11)</td>
<td>7.5 (35)</td>
<td>3.5 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>4.5 (4)</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.5 (5)</td>
<td>3.5 (8)</td>
<td>3.5 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Areas</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: (1) Faculty associated with “Business” courses are included in the Social Sciences; (2) N’s are quite small for some cells. N’s are included in the parentheses.; (3) For students “Other” represents undeclared and interdisciplinary students.”
Figure 6a. Hours Spent Preparing for Class (Per Class Per Week)
A Comparison of Lower Division Faculty Expectations & Beliefs and First-year Students’ Reported Behaviors

Note: Some bars represent less than 30 cases and should be interpreted with caution.
* Includes “professional” and “other.”
Figure 6b. Hours Spent Preparing for Class (Per Class Per Week)
A Comparison of Upper Division Faculty Expectations & Beliefs and Senior-level Students’ Reported Behaviors

Note: Some bars represent less than 30 cases and should be interpreted with caution.
* Includes “professional” and “other.”
Figure 7. Comparison of Faculty & Students Contributions to Educational & Personal Development (% Responding “Quite a Bit” or “Very Much”)

- Critical Thinking
- Writing
- Quantitative Analysis
- Speaking
- Computers & IT

UMBC Faculty: Red
UMBC Seniors: Orange
DREU Faculty: Black
DREU Seniors: Grey

Critical Thinking:
- UMBC Faculty: 94%
- UMBC Seniors: 83%
- DREU Faculty: 85%
- DREU Seniors: 79%

Writing:
- UMBC Faculty: 59%
- UMBC Seniors: 58%
- DREU Faculty: 71%
- DREU Seniors: 70%

Quantitative Analysis:
- UMBC Faculty: 49%
- UMBC Seniors: 45%
- DREU Faculty: 45%
- DREU Seniors: 44%

Speaking:
- UMBC Faculty: 48%
- UMBC Seniors: 60%
- DREU Faculty: 60%
- DREU Seniors: 65%

Computers & IT:
- UMBC Faculty: 44%
- UMBC Seniors: 75%
- DREU Faculty: 44%
- DREU Seniors: 37%
Figure 8a. Comparison of Faculty & Students Engaging in Applied Learning Experiences

(\% Faculty Responding “Important” or “Very Important,” \% Seniors Responding “Have Done” or “Planned to Do”)
Figure 8b. Comparison of Faculty & Students Engaging in Applied Learning Experiences

(\% Faculty Responding “Important” or “Very Important,” \% Seniors Responding “Have Done” or “Planned to Do”)
Figure 9. Comparison of Faculty & Students
Institutional Emphasis on Academic Life vs. Student Life
(% Responding “Quite a Bit” or “Very Much”)

- UMBC Faculty
- UMBC Seniors
- DREU Faculty
- DREU Seniors

Bar chart showing the percentage of faculty and students who feel that their institution emphasizes academic life vs. student life. The categories include:
- Time in Academics
- Academic Support
- Campus Events & Activities
- Social Support
- Non-academic Support

The chart indicates the percentage of respondents who feel the emphasis is “Quite a Bit” or “Very Much” for each category.
Contact among diverse groups of students
Conversations with students racially/ethnically different
Conversations with students different in terms of religion, political ideology, personal values

Figure 10. Comparison of Faculty & Students

Culture of Diversity

UMBC Faculty  UMBC Seniors  DREU Faculty  DREU Seniors
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Conclusions

- UMBC values a culture of academic rigor and a culture of diversity.

- Similar to DREU, UMBC faculty and students perceive less institutional support for students’ social integration.

- Faculty’s use of active learning techniques in the classroom is limited, especially in larger classes.

- Faculty believe students need additional applied learning experiences.
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Limitations

- Data limit the extent to which more robust analyses could be conducted.

- Comparison of NSSE and FSSE could be more meaningful if:
  - The context within which the questions were asked were similarly situated for faculty and students
  - Response sets were congruent for similar questions