# University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College

## 2008 Community College Faculty Survey of Student Engagement

### 2008 CCFSSE Cohort Institutions and Respondents

All institutions that participated in the 2008 *CCSSE* survey administration were invited to participate in the *CCFSSE*. The survey was administered via the Web: faculty members at participating institutions were sent an invitation email and asked to respond to an online survey. All faculty members who taught spring credit courses were invited to participate. The *CCFSSE* survey was completed by 25,623 faculty members across the 2006, 2007, and 2008 administrations. Invitations to participate were sent to 274 Raymond Walters faculty. A total of 113 RWC faculty participated in the *CCFSSE*—93 full-time faculty and 20 part-time faculty.

#### Response Rates

The average institutional response rate for the 2008 *CCFSSE* administration was 30%<sup>1</sup> Raymond Walters College had a higher CCFSSE response rate of 41% (69% rate for Full-time faculty and a 14% rate for part-time faculty.)

## Representation of Institutions

Table 1 provides information about the representation of the 2008 *CCFSSE* Cohort member colleges as compared to community and technical colleges across the nations.

Table 1. Colleges by Size and Urbanicity

	2008 CCFSSE Cohort Member Colleges	National Population	2008 CCFSSE Cohort Proportion of National Population
By Size			
# of Institutions	286	1052	27%
Small (up to 4,499)	135	574	24%
Medium (4,500-7,999)	67	229	29%
Large (8,000-14,999)	59	157	38%
Extra-Large (15,000+)	25	92	27%
By Urbanicity			
# of Institutions	286	1054	27%
Urban-serving	60	184	33%
Suburban-serving	63	223	28%
Rural-serving	163	647	25%

## Representation of Faculty Respondents

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The *CCFSSE* institutional response rate is the number of surveys returned divided by the attempted number of survey invitations sent.

The 2008 *CCFSSE* Cohort faculty respondents generally mirror the national two-year college faculty population, with the exception of employment status, as illustrated in Table 2. Raymond Walters College respondents differed even more than the CCFSSE Cohort. 82% indicated their employment status was full-time, compared to 59% and 33% for the 2008 CCFSSE Cohort and National faculty data respectively.

#### Gender

55% of all respondents to the *CCFSSE* were female, and 45% were male. 67% of RWC respondents reported that they were female. Nationally, women comprise 49% of faculty at two-year institutions.

#### **Race and Ethnicity**

The 2008 *CCFSSE* Cohort respondents' race and ethnicity closely parallel the NCES faculty data for two-year institutions<sup>2</sup> Raymond Walters College respondents indicated higher percentages of Asian and White faculty, but lower percentages of Black and Hispanic than the 2008 CCFSSE Cohort and NCES faculty data

#### **Employment Status**

Fifty-nine percent of 2008 *CCFSSE* Cohort respondents identified themselves as full-time faculty members, while 41% indicated that they were employed on a part-time basis. These percentages are quite different from NCES national data, which indicate that only 33% of community college faculty members are employed full-time. Faculty members at participating institutions are sent an email invitation and asked to respond to the survey online. The inverse employment status representation is likely a product of colleges being unable to provide as many valid email addresses for part-time faculty as full-time.

	2008 CCFSSE Cohort	National Population	Raymond Walters College
Gender	Conort		College
Male	45%	51%	33%
Female	55%	49%	67%
Race/Ethnicity			
American Indian/Native American	1%	<1%	1%
Asian, Asian American or Pacific Islander	3%	3%	7%
Native Hawaiian	<1%	_3	0%
Black or African American, Non-Hispanic	6%	7%	1%
White, Non-Hispanic	82%	83%	89%
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish	5%	5%	2%
Other	3%	2%	1%
<b>Employment Status</b>			
Full-Time	59%	33%	82%
Part-Time	41%	67%	18%

#### **Academic Rank**

<sup>2</sup> U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF:04)

<sup>3</sup> 2004 NCES data do not include the category "Native Hawaiian."

Table 3 Illustrates the percentage of all faculty respondents by academic rank as compared to national data. As shown, *CCFSSE* respondents report much higher percentages—40% altogether—of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor ranks than those reported in national findings (19%), while the national data show 31% of all two-year faculty hold some "other" rank than those listed, much higher than the 6% reported by *CCFSSE* respondents. RWC responses show even higher percentages of faculty with ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor. Eighty-three percent of RWC respondents indicated having one of those ranks. This can probably be attributed to the fact that such a high percentage of RWC respondents were full-time faculty. Only 3% of RWC respondents reported a rank of "other".

There are also significant differences in the responses of part-time and full-time faculty. Seventy-seven percent of part-time respondents hold the rank of instructor or lecturer, as opposed to 39% of full-time faculty. RWC part-time faculty respondents indicated that 63% held the rank of instructor or lecturer versus 3% of RWC full-time faculty respondents. Only 13% of part-time participants hold any rank of professor—assistant, associate, or full—while 57% of full-time faculty have these titles. Again, RWC respondents differ considerably with 37% of part-time respondents holding the rank of full, associate, or assistant professor, and 94% of participating full-time faculty have these ranks.

**Table 3. Academic Rank** 

	2008 <i>CCFSSE</i> Cohort	National Population	Raymond Walters College
Rank			
Professor	19%	10%	18%
Associate Professor	11%	5%	29%
Assistant Professor	10%	4%	36%
Instructor or Lecturer	55%	50%	14%
Other	6%	31%	3%

#### Selected Findings

This section of the overview features selected findings from the 2008 *CCFSSE* Cohort and Raymond Walters College results.

#### Class Size as Compared to College Size

The largest percentage (40%) of faculty at large and extra-large colleges report that between 20 and 29 students were enrolled in their classes, which is comparable to the 44% RWC faculty reported. RWC falls in the small college comparison group, however, at other small colleges, only 29% of faculty report teaching classes this size, and 33% of medium sized college faculty reported teaching classes this size. Forty-one percent of small college faculty teach classes that are 10-19 students in size, but a substantial percentage of faculty from the other sized colleges reported these classes enrollments as well. According to RWC faculty respondents, only 30% of their classes have 10 – 19 students. Interestingly, all faculty who responded to the survey reported teaching quite low percentages of large classes, which include those over 39 students.

Table 4. Class Sizes across Colleges by Size

	<b>Class Size</b>					
	<10	10-19	20-29	30-39	40-69	70>
College Size						
Extra-Large (15,000+)	6%	34%	40%	14%	5%	1%
Large (8,000-14,999)	9%	36%	37%	13%	4%	1%
Medium (4,500-7,999)	14%	39%	33%	9%	3%	1%
Small (up to 4,499)	20%	41%	29%	6%	3%	1%
Raymond Walters College	12%	30%	44%	9%	4%	2%

#### **How Faculty Spend Their Time: Professional Activities**

Table 5 highlights the teaching-related and other professional activities on which full- and part-time faculty reported spending their time in a typical 7-day week.<sup>4</sup> As expected, full-time faculty reported spending more hours teaching students than their part-time counterparts. RWC results differ somewhat from the CCFSSE cohort on this item. Thirty-Eight percent of RWC full-time faculty respondents versus 66% of CCFSSE Cohort full-time faculty indicate spending 13+ hours per week on teaching. Interestingly, though, roughly equal percentages of both groups spend 1 and 12 hours a week on other teaching-related activities, with the exception of RWC full-time faculty preparing for class. On this item, 22% spend 13+ hours per week compared to 15% for CCFSSE Cohort full-time faculty, smaller percentages for both part-time faculty groups. However, a significantly larger percentage of full-time faculty spent between 1 and 12 hours on other professional activities such as advising students, working with students on activities other than coursework, and conducting service activities. It appears that RWC full-time faculty participants spend less time advising than the CCFSSE Cohort full-time faculty. According to the results, 66% of full-time RWC faculty spend 1 – 20 hours per week advising, compared to 88% by the CCFSSE Cohort full-time faculty. However, RWC full-time faculty reported spending more time on research and scholarly activities (94% spent 1 – 20 hrs/wk) and on conducting service activities (54% spent 1 – 20 hrs/wk) than their CCFSSE Cohort counterparts, of whom 84% said they spent 1 – 20 hours per week on research/scholarly activities and 43% spent 1 – 20 hours per week on service activities. Notably, RWC part-time faculty reported spending more time having other interactions with students outside the classroom and conducting service activities than the CCFSSE Cohort part-time faculty.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Percentages will not total to 100 in all cases because data from the "None" category has been excluded.

Table 5. Hours Spent on Selected Activities during 7-day Week

		E Cohort ne Facul			RWC Part-Time Faculty			CCFSSE Cohort Full- Time Faculty			RWC Full-Time Faculty			
Teaching-Related Activities	1-12	13-20	21+	1-12	13-20	21+	1-12	13-20	21+	1-12	13-20	21+		
Teaching students in class	85%	11%	3%	94%	0%	5%	34%	51%	15%	62%	35%	3%		
Grading papers	92%	5%	1%	100%	0%	0%	83%	12%	3%	85%	14%	1%		
Giving other forms of written and oral feedback to students	94%	2%	<1%	89%	0%	5%	91%	6%	2%	97%	2%	0%		
Preparing for class	92%	6%	1%	95%	5%	0%	85%	12%	3%	77%	18%	4%		
Reflecting and working on ways to improve my teaching  Other professional activities	94%	3%	1%	90%	5%	0%	92%	5%	2%	95%	3%	1%		
Research and scholarly activities	71%	5%	2%	73%	6%	0%	77%	5%	2%	85%	9%	0%		
Working with honors projects	8%	<1%	<1%	5%	0%	0%	16%	<1%	<1%	7%	1%	0%		
Advising students	57%	1%	<1%	58%	0%	0%	83%	3%	2%	61%	5%	0%		
Supervising internships or other field experiences	10%	<1%	<1%	10%	0%	0%	25%	3%	1%	22%	2%	0%		
Working with students on activities other than course work (committees, organization, student life activities, orientation, intramurals, etc.)	17%	<1%	<1%	16%	0%	0%	50%	2%	<1%	30%	1%	0%		
Other interactions with students outside the classroom	47%	1%	<1%	53%	5%	5%	75%	2%	1%	79%	1%	2%		
Conducting service activities	16%	<1%	<1%	23%	0%	0%	42%	1%	<1%	51%	2%	1%		

## How Faculty Spend Their Time: Class Time

Question #16 asks faculty to report the percentage of class time spent on activities such as lecture, student computer use, and in-class writing. Almost a third of all faculty respondents revealed spending 50-100% of their class time lecturing. On the other hand, 89% of CCFSSE cohort and 95% of RWC participants reported spending less than 20% of their class time on in-class writing. Similarly, 50% of CCFSSE Cohort faculty and 58% of RWC faculty conveyed spending no class time on student computer use, and over half of respondents

reported devoting less than 10% of their class time to small group activities. Table 6. provides additional information about how faculty spend class time.

Table 6. Percent of Class Time Spent on Various Activities (All Faculty)

	0	%	1-9	9%	10-	19%	20-	29%	30-	39%	40-4	49%	50-	74%	75-1	L <b>00</b> %
	CCFSSE		CCFSSE	RWC	CCFSSE		CCFSSE		CCFSSE	RWC	CCFSSE	RWC	CCFSSE		CCFSSE	
	Cohort	Faculty														
Lecture	2%	3%	13%	16%	14%	10%	13%	14%	12%	5%	14%	21%	22%	26%	9%	5%
Teacher-led discussion	4%	3%	22%	27%	25%	30%	18%	19%	10%	9%	8%	6%	8%	6%	3%	2%
Teacher-student shared																
responsibility	25%	26%	27%	33%	18%	11%	12%	17%	6%	4%	5%	7%	5%	0%	2%	2%
Student computer use	50%	58%	23%	17%	9%	6%	5%	6%	3%	3%	3%	4%	4%	5%	4%	3%
·																
Small group activities	21%	21%	32%	28%	21%	16%	11%	19%	6%	7%	4%	4%	4%	3%	1%	2%
-																
Student presentations	40%	46%	35%	32%	13%	12%	5%	6%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	0%	1%	0%
·																
In-class writing	50%	60%	29%	24%	10%	11%	4%	3%	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%
5				-		-			-						-	
Testing and evaluation	5%	7%	46%	50%	31%	35%	10%	6%	4%	1%	2%	0%	2%	1%	1%	0%
Performances in applied and fine																
arts	92%	99%	4%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	<1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%
Experiential	65%	61%	11%	6%	6%	12%	5%	4%	3%	7%	3%	4%	4%	6%	2%	2%
Hands-on practice	27%	28%	19%	18%	15%	17%	10%	8%	6%	9%	6%	7%	9%	7%	8%	6%

## **Faculty Perceptions about Student Engagement**

On the *CCFSSE* survey, faculty members are asked how often students interact with them, in and out of class. Table 8 presents the percentage of faculty who reported that students interacted with them often or very often; the table also indicated how the 2008 *CCSSE* Cohort responded to the same items. As the table highlights, on every item listed, faculty reported higher rates of interaction than students, most notably with respect to receiving prompt feedback (written and oral) and discussing grades or assignments.

Table 8. Student-Faculty Interactions (Response of "Often" or "Very Often")

	CCFSSE Cohort Faculty Responses	RWC Faculty Responses	CCSSE Cohort Student Responses	RWC Student Responses
Use e-mail to communicate with you	61%	85%	48%	72%
Discuss grades or assignments with you	71%	77%	46%	53%
Talk about career plans with you	39%	39%	24%	25%
Discuss ideas from your readings or classes with you outside of class	30%	29%	15%	14%
Receive prompt feedback (written or oral) from you about their performance	93%	94%	55%	65%

**Table 9. CCFSSE Cohort Participating Ohio Institutions** 

Institution	City	Year of most recent CCFSSE participation
Cuyahoga Community College	Cleveland	2008
James A. Rhodes State College	Lima	2008
Lakeland Community College	Kirtland	2008
Lorain County Community College	Elyria	2006
North Central State College	Mansfield	2006
Sinclair Community College	Dayton	2007
Stark State College of Technology	North Canton	2008
UC – Clermont College	Batavia	2006
UC – Raymond Walters College	Cincinnati	2008
Washington State Community College	Marietta	2007

 $<sup>^{5}</sup>$  These student responses only include data from colleges that are members of the 2008 CCFSSE Cohort.