

Office of
Institutional
Research and
Assessment

TEL 973.720.2379

FAX 973.720.3624

Executive Summary

During the spring 2008 semester William Paterson University faculty received e-mail invitations to participate in the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), the companion survey to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) that undergraduates were also completing. FSSE explores a number of areas including how faculty structure their time to meet the many aspects of teaching at a university and their views on educational practices that are known to engage students in their learning. The overall response rate was 39 percent.

Part 1 of this report places William Paterson faculty responses in the context of responses from faculty at colleges and universities with similar Carnegie classifications –comprehensive with a larger number of programs. On the whole the two groups reflect similar classroom experiences. An exception is the larger percent, 36, of William Paterson faculty teaching upper level courses that reported more than half of their classes talked to them about career plans. At other comprehensive universities the percent was 28. Faculty also reported that seniors here ask questions in class more frequently.

Close to sixty percent of William Paterson faculty teaching both lower and upper division courses report learning communities are important; comparable figures for faculty at comprehensive universities are close to 50 percent. A higher percent of our faculty also feel foreign language study is important for students.

Over half of faculty in both groups report the value and importance of students' participation in community service or volunteer work yet very few are reporting their courses include a community service component: less than 10 percent for lower division courses and less than 20 percent for upper level courses.

Faculty perceptions of relationships students have with various groups on campus substantiate findings from the NSSE (student) responses. However, William Paterson faculty perceive these relationships as being a bit less positive than our students do. As well, faculty at other comprehensive universities tend to report more positive relationships for their students with all three groups – other students, faculty, and administrative offices.

On average WPU faculty members report spending 36 percent of their class time lecturing, 16 percent on small group work, and 13 percent on experiential activities such as labs and field work. The remainder of the time is spent on a variety of other activities (e.g., instructor-led discussions, student presentations, etc.). Our overall figures mirror the overall percents of the other participating FSSE colleges and universities with all William Paterson faculty reporting slightly less time devoted to lecturing.

Part 2 presents responses for William Paterson by full- and part-time teaching status. To varying degrees full and part-time faculty feel differently about how much the University emphasizes certain activities and behaviors that loosely tap into a tone of academic concern and success and a caring environment. The two groups are closest in their feelings that the University emphasizes to students that it is very important to use computers in their academic work. While the majority of both groups also feel the University stresses the importance of providing students the support they need to help them succeed academically, more of the part-time faculty feel this to be the case.

Sometimes the gap between the two groups is quite large. For example, 63 percent of part-time faculty feel William Paterson does quite a lot to emphasize to students the importance of studying and academic work while only 47 percent of full-time faculty report this. Neither group thinks the University is doing a particularly good job in helping students cope with their non-academic responsibilities but this is especially so for full-time faculty (28 percent of full-time faculty and 42 percent of part-time faculty report the University emphasizes this very much). The same is true for providing students the support they need to thrive socially; 29 percent of full-time and 49 percent of part-time faculty feel the University emphasizes this to students.

April 2010

Introduction

Survey Administration and Sample Details

Last spring William Paterson University faculty received e-mail invitations to participate in the Web-based Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE), a companion survey to the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) which was concurrently administered to first-year and senior undergraduates. The survey is coordinated by the Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research. A copy of the survey is available at http://nsse.iub.edu/pdf/2008_Institutional_Report/FSSE%202008_CB.pdf.

William Paterson selected its sample from faculty who taught at least one undergraduate course during the academic year. The Institutional Research and Assessment Office provided the names and university e-mail address of faculty to be surveyed. All other aspects of the survey administration were handled by the Center's staff. Faculty responses to the survey remain anonymous to the institution. Since 2003, more than 120,000 faculty responded from 530 different institutions and in 2008 there were 23,385 faculty respondents from 160 institutions.

At William Paterson all full-time faculty and a 50 percent random sample of adjunct faculty were surveyed; all told, 711 faculty were asked to participate in FSSE with two being undeliverable, making the sample size 709. The overall response rate was 39 percent or 275 respondents. A quick demographic profile of those who responded is found in Table 1. Please note the discipline of the faculty is defined by FSSE and does not necessarily reflect how William Paterson would categorize these academic disciplines.

Table 1 Demographic Profile of Responding Faculty	
Characteristics	Respondents %
Discipline of faculty*	
Arts & humanities	34.0
Biological sciences	5.0
Business	6.0
Education	8.0
Physical Science	5.0
Professional	9.0
Social science	21.0
Other	12.0
Employment level	
Full-time	64.0
Part-time	36.0
Course level	
Lower division	33.0
Upper division	54.0
Other	13.0
Tenure status	
Tenured	48.0
Tenure track	17.0
Not on tenure track includes adjuncts	35.0
Gender	
Male	44.0
Female	56.0
Age	
34 or younger	6.0
35-44	19.0
45-54	26.0
Older than 54	49.0
(continued)	

Characteristics	Respondents %
Years of teaching experience	
4 or less	18.0
5-9	21.0
10-14	12.0
15 or more	49.0
Number of Respondents	275

* FSSE Discipline Descriptions (WPUNJ areas are highlighted)			
1=Arts and Humanities Art, fine and applied English (language and literature) History Journalism Language and literature (except English) Music Philosophy Speech Theater or drama Theology or religion Other arts & humanities	2=Biological Sciences Biology (general) Biochemistry or biophysics Botany Environmental science Marine (life) science Microbiology or bacteriology Zoology Other biological science	3=Business Accounting Business administration (general) Finance International business Marketing Management Other business	4=Education Business education Elementary/middle school education Music or art education Physical education or recreation Secondary education Special education Other education 5=Engineering
6=Physical Science Astronomy Atmospheric science (including meteorology) Chemistry Earth science (including geology) Mathematics Physics Statistics Other physical science	7=Professional Architecture Urban planning Health technology (medical, dental, laboratory) Law Library/archival science Medicine Dentistry Veterinarian Nursing Pharmacy Allied health/other medical Therapy (occupational, physical, speech) Other professional	8=Social Science Anthropology Economics Ethnic studies Geography Political science (including government, international relations) Psychology Social work Sociology Gender studies Other social science	9=Other Agriculture Communications Computer science Family studies Natural resources and conservation Kinesiology Criminal justice Military science Parks, recreation, leisure studies, sports management Public administration Other field Technical/vocational

Rational for FSSE

As early as 1997 Peter Ewell, vice president of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS), a research and development center founded to improve the management effectiveness of colleges and universities, wrote if student learning is to be improved, then it is important to study institutional and faculty engagement practices that promote student learning. The Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) is an important way of learning how faculty emphasize educational practices, including those that have become identified with active student participation in the learning process (small group work, internships, service learning, etc.). The faculty survey focuses on:

- Faculty perceptions of how often students engage in different activities
- The importance faculty place on various areas of learning and development
- The nature and frequency of faculty-student interactions
- How faculty members organize their time, both in and out of the classroom

Using both NSSE and FSSE data can help the campus community explore the relationship between faculty practices and student engagement and learning. Each of the NSSE summary reports included a comparison of NSSE and FSSE responses for the individual questions making up the particular benchmark under study in that report. Those particular findings will not be duplicated here; rather, additional comparisons will be presented.

Part 1: William Paterson Faculty and Faculty at Other Carnegie Comprehensive Institutions

This section places William Paterson faculty responses in the context of faculty at institutions with the same Carnegie classification as ours, Comprehensive L, comprehensive institutions with a larger number of programs.

For the experiences listed in Table 2, William Paterson faculty report having relatively similar classroom experiences with their students as faculty at other comprehensive universities. An exception is the larger percent, 36, of William Paterson faculty teaching upper-level courses who reported more than half of their classes talked to them about career plans. At other comprehensive universities the percent was 28. Faculty also reported that seniors here ask questions in class more frequently.

<i>FSSE Item</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>50% or Higher</i>	
		<i>Wm Paterson University</i>	<i>Comprehensive L Universities</i>
Frequently ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions	LD	27%	28%
	UD	48%	42%
Frequently come to class without completing readings or assignments	LD	26%	28%
	UD	20%	22%
Frequently work harder than they usually do to meet your standards	LD	23%	24%
	UD	39%	37%
Occasionally use e-mail to communicate with you	LD	32%	32%
	UD	49%	49%
Occasionally discuss grades or assignments with you	LD	28%	23%
	UD	39%	34%
At least once, talk about career plans with you	LD	17%	13%
	UD	36%	28%
At least once, discuss ideas from readings or classes with you outside of class	LD	16%	10%
	UD	24%	20%

Table 3 compares how faculty feel about what have become known as high-impact learning experiences. All faculty believe that it is important for students to participate in activities that engage them in their learning such as internships, community service, culminating senior experiences, etc. The degree to which faculty support these activities is of note; for all but one activity – studying abroad – more than 50 percent say it is important that students have these experiences. Over 80 percent support culminating senior experiences and almost three-quarters say practicum, internships, field experiences, co-op experiences, or clinical assignments are important. Of note is William Paterson faculty's support of participation in learning communities. Over half of our faculty teaching lower- and upper-division courses, 57 and 59 percent respectively, report learning communities are important; comparable figures for faculty at comprehensive L universities are 49 and 50 percent. A higher percent of our faculty also feel studying a foreign language is important for students.

<i>FSSE Item</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Wm Paterson</i>	<i>Comprehensive</i>
		<i>University</i>	<i>L Universities</i>
		<i>Very Important or Important</i>	
Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment	LD	74%	77%
	UD	81%	84%
Community service or volunteer work	LD	53%	56%
	UD	55%	59%
Participation in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together	LD	57%	49%
	UD	59%	50%
Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements	LD	59%	54%
	UD	57%	51%
Foreign language coursework	LD	67%	59%
	UD	67%	53%
Study abroad	LD	44%	41%
	UD	44%	41%
Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)	LD	84%	81%
	UD	89%	84%

The questions in Table 4 explore a few of the activities or experiences faculty report students have or do in their classrooms. William Paterson students have more frequent class discussions or assignments that require them to include diverse perspectives and have more opportunities for serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than their own. Also, based on faculty responses, our students have more opportunities for serious conversations in their courses with students who are very different from them in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values than the students in classrooms at other comprehensive universities.

While faculty certainly value and think it is important for students to participate in community service or volunteer work (Table 3), Table 4 responses show very few are reporting their courses include a community service component: less than 10 percent for lower-division courses and less than 20 percent for upper-level courses.

<i>FSSE Item</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Wm Paterson</i>	<i>Comprehensive</i>
		<i>University</i>	<i>L Universities</i>
		<i>Very Often or Often</i>	
Have class discussions or writing assignments that include diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.)	LD	56%	44%
	UD	62%	54%
Work with other students on projects during class	LD	55%	50%
	UD	61%	60%
Participate in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of your course	LD	9%	8%
	UD	16%	17%
Use an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment	LD	38%	41%
	UD	52%	52%
Receive prompt written or oral feedback from you on their academic performance	LD	90%	91%
	UD	95%	91%
Have serious conversations in your course with students of a different race or ethnicity than their own	LD	55%	33%
	UD	52%	44%
Have serious conversations in your course with students who are very different from them in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	LD	48%	33%
	UD	48%	41%

Again the two faculty groups are not vastly different in their responses to the questions in Table 5. More William Paterson faculty teaching upper-division courses, 63 percent, feel it is important for students to prepare two or more drafts of a paper or assignment than their counterparts at comprehensive L universities, 56 percent. Faculty feel working on a paper or project that requires integrating ideas or information from various sources is important for students to do early on in their academic careers but this is especially so for William Paterson: 77 percent of our lower-division faculty compared to 69 percent for those at other comprehensive universities report this.

<i>FSSE Item</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Wm Paterson</i>	<i>Comprehensive</i>
		<i>University</i>	<i>L Universities</i>
		<i>Very Important or Important</i>	
Prepare two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before turning it in	LD	46%	47%
	UD	63%	56%
Work on a paper or project that requires integrating ideas or information from various sources	LD	77%	69%
	UD	88%	85%
Work with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments	LD	40%	43%
	UD	50%	56%
Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions	LD	54%	50%
	UD	63%	68%
Discuss ideas or readings from class with others outside of class (other students, family members, coworkers, etc.)	LD	51%	51%
	UD	59%	58%
Tutor or teach other students (paid or voluntary)	LD	29%	30%
	UD	27%	29%
Examine the strengths and weaknesses of their views on a topic or issue	LD	76%	70%
	UD	80%	79%
Try to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from that person's perspective	LD	74%	68%
	UD	80%	75%
Learn something that changes the way they understand an issue or concept	LD	93%	89%
	UD	93%	92%

Again Table 6 confirms faculty at all institutions place a great deal of importance on higher order thinking skills. Less than a third think emphasizing memorizing facts in their lower or upper divisional courses is very important. Rather, all feel analyzing the basic elements of an idea, synthesizing and organizing ideas and information are what is important to emphasize in courses. William Paterson faculty report somewhat higher percents for these items in lower-division courses, perhaps emphasizing the importance of infusing these activities earlier on in a student's academic career -- 90 percent compared to 85 percent say they emphasize analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience or theory quite a bit; 87 percent vs 79 percent report the importance of synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences; and 71 percent vs 65 percent feel making judgments about the value of information, arguments or methods is important or very important to emphasize in courses.

Table 6 Percentage of Faculty Reporting They Place *Quite a Bit* or *Very Much* Emphasis on the Following in Their Courses

<i>FSSE Item</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Wm Paterson</i>	<i>Comprehensive</i>
		<i>University</i>	<i>L Universities</i>
		<i>Very Much or Quite a Bit</i>	
Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your course and readings	LD	30%	30%
	UD	24%	23%
Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience or theory	LD	90%	85%
	UD	92%	91%
Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences	LD	87%	79%
	UD	88%	89%
Making judgments about the value of information, arguments or methods	LD	71%	65%
	UD	84%	81%
Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations	LD	75%	75%
	UD	85%	87%

Many of the skills or attributes listed in Table 7 mirror earlier and current student learning outcomes faculty feel are requirements for students graduating from William Paterson. They certainly overlap with the new University Core Curriculum learning outcomes. Faculty were asked how much they structured their courses so that students were able to achieve the listed learning outcomes. For one skill, speaking clearly and effectively, William Paterson faculty reported greater efforts to structure their courses so that students could learn these skills. The difference between the two groups was especially pronounced in lower-division courses, 61 and 47 percents, respectively.

While not significantly different from each other it seems worth noting in general as higher education faculty who prepare students for the 21st century and in particular for our University as we begin to implement a new general education curriculum, that less than 40 percent of the faculty structured their lower-division courses in such a way as to enable frequent use of computing and information technology and only 47 percent of our faculty and 51 percent of faculty at comprehensive universities structured their upper-division courses quite a bit so that students could learn these skills. The same is true for analyzing quantitative problems. While William Paterson faculty teaching lower-division courses were the group that did this the most, less than half of all faculty reported they structured their course quite a bit so that students have the opportunity to learn these skills.

Table 7 Percentage of Faculty Who Structured Their Courses *Quite a Bit* or *Very Much* so That Students Learn and Develop in the Following Areas

<i>FSSE Item</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Wm Paterson</i>	<i>Comprehensive</i>
		<i>University</i>	<i>L Universities</i>
		<i>Very Much or Quite a Bit</i>	
Writing clearly and effectively	LD	59%	60%
	UD	76%	73%
Speaking clearly and effectively	LD	61%	47%
	UD	66%	58%
Thinking critically and analytically	LD	93%	91%
	UD	93%	95%
Analyzing quantitative problems	LD	48%	42%
	UD	41%	44%
Using computing and information technology	LD	38%	36%
	UD	47%	51%
Working effectively with others	LD	61%	54%
	UD	65%	64%
Learning effectively on their own	LD	87%	85%
	UD	86%	87%

Questions in Table 8 continue to review how faculty structure their courses to give students opportunities to develop certain personal or social attributes. For several items such as understanding themselves or others from different races and social backgrounds than their own, more William Paterson faculty report they structure their courses quite a bit so students have the opportunities to develop these attributes and skills.

<i>FSSE Item</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Wm Paterson</i>	<i>Comprehensive</i>
		<i>University</i>	<i>L Universities</i>
		<i>Very Much or Quite a Bit</i>	
Understanding themselves	LD	68%	53%
	UD	67%	55%
Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	LD	61%	47%
	UD	59%	49%
Solving complex real-world problems	LD	63%	55%
	UD	68%	71%
Developing a personal code of values and ethics	LD	58%	49%
	UD	56%	57%
Developing a deepening sense of spirituality	LD	16%	14%
	UD	23%	15%
Acquiring a broad general education	LD	74%	69%
	UD	61%	55%
Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	LD	61%	60%
	UD	72%	76%

Faculty perceptions of relationships students have with various groups on campus substantiate findings from the NSSE (student) responses. However, William Paterson faculty perceive these relationships as being a bit less positive than our students do. As well, faculty at other comprehensive universities tend to report more positive relationships for their students for all three categories (Table 9).

<i>FSSE Item</i>	<i>Class</i>	<i>Wm Paterson</i>	<i>Comprehensive</i>
		<i>University</i>	<i>L Universities</i>
		<i>Positive Quality</i>	
With other students	LD	63%	76%
	UD	67%	82%
With faculty members	LD	72%	75%
	UD	75%	81%
With administrative personnel and offices	LD	27%	42%
	UD	30%	45%

Note: Faculty responded to the items above on 7-point scales (e.g., 1 = Unfriendly, Unsupportive, Sense of Alienation to 7 = Friendly, Supportive, Sense of Belonging). Responses of 5, 6, or 7 are coded as positive quality

The final table in this section, Table 10, reports how faculty spend their time in various academic-related activities in a typical week. For the most part figures for the two groups -- William Paterson and other comprehensive L institutions—mirror each other and show the many types of activities including many outside of the classroom that are part of teaching. A few selected examples follow.

For faculty teaching lower-division courses, William Paterson has a somewhat larger percent teaching 5-8 hours a week and a somewhat smaller percent spending 9-12 hours teaching undergraduates than those at comprehensive institutions. This makes sense since many of our lower-division courses are taught by part-time faculty and they were included in the sample design.

Almost all faculty at both course levels spend some time during the week in research and scholarly activities. As many as 40 percent of lower division and 38 percent of upper division William Paterson faculty spend 9 or more hours a week pursuing this type of activity. The comparable figures for faculty at larger comprehensive institutions are 28 percent and 34 percent, respectively.

Faculty spend additional time working with undergraduates on research projects especially those in upper division courses. The majority, 48 percent, spend a few hours a week, less than 5, working with students on research projects and an additional 8 percent report spending between 5-8 hours a week doing this. Comparable percents for other comprehensive institutions are 41 and 9, respectively.

Table 10 Percent Faculty Reporting Spending This Number of Hours Doing Various Activities in a Typical 7-Day Week

Activity	Class	Class	% Spending Hours per Week in this Activity					
			None	less than 5	5-8	9-12	13-16	17+
Teaching undergraduate students in class	WPU	LD	1%	22%	38%	29%	8%	2%
		UD	1%	15%	36%	32%	8%	7%
	Comp-L	LD	1%	14%	24%	38%	15%	7%
		UD	2%	17%	28%	35%	12%	6%
Grading papers and exams	WPU	LD	2%	47%	29%	13%	7%	2%
		UD	1%	46%	33%	11%	4%	5%
	Comp-L	LD	2%	39%	34%	14%	7%	4%
		UD	1%	38%	34%	16%	6%	5%
Giving other forms of written and oral feedback to students	WPU	LD	2%	71%	17%	4%	4%	1%
		UD	2%	58%	27%	8%	1%	5%
	Comp-L	LD	2%	62%	24%	7%	2%	2%
		UD	2%	57%	27%	9%	3%	3%
Preparing for class	WPU	LD	0%	46%	26%	13%	8%	7%
		UD	0%	25%	45%	17%	5%	7%
	Comp-L	LD	1%	27%	38%	19%	8%	7%
		UD	0%	26%	39%	20%	9%	6%
Reflecting on ways to improve my teaching	WPU	LD	0%	73%	12%	10%	2%	2%
		UD	1%	57%	29%	5%	3%	5%
	Comp-L	LD	2%	69%	20%	4%	2%	2%
		UD	2%	69%	18%	5%	2%	3%
Research and scholarly activities	WPU	LD	9%	34%	19%	12%	8%	18%
		UD	4%	32%	24%	16%	9%	13%
	Comp-L	LD	12%	38%	22%	13%	6%	9%
		UD	7%	36%	24%	16%	8%	10%
Working with undergraduates on research	WPU	LD	53%	39%	4%	0%	1%	2%
		UD	37%	48%	8%	2%	1%	4%
	Comp-L	LD	50%	37%	8%	3%	1%	1%
		UD	44%	41%	9%	3%	1%	2%
Advising undergraduate students	WPU	LD	37%	48%	6%	3%	3%	2%
		UD	20%	56%	16%	5%	2%	1%
	Comp-L	LD	29%	51%	13%	4%	2%	1%
		UD	19%	53%	18%	6%	2%	3%
Supervising internships or other field experiences	WPU	LD	82%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%
		UD	55%	24%	11%	7%	0%	1%
	Comp-L	LD	69%	22%	5%	2%	1%	1%
		UD	55%	29%	8%	4%	2%	1%

Table 10 Percent Faculty Reporting Spending This Number of Hours Doing Various Activities in a Typical 7-Day Week

Activity	Class	% Spending Hours per Week in this Activity						
		None	less than 5	5-8	9-12	13-16	17+	
Working with students on activities other than course work (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)	WPU	LD	45%	44%	7%	1%	0%	1%
		UD	45%	45%	8%	1%	1%	1%
	Comp-L	LD	42%	47%	7%	3%	0%	1%
		UD	37%	50%	10%	2%	1%	0%
Other interactions with students outside of the classroom	WPU	LD	24%	61%	11%	2%	1%	1%
		UD	23%	61%	12%	2%	1%	2%
	Comp-L	LD	21%	61%	13%	3%	1%	2%
		UD	20%	60%	14%	4%	1%	1%
Conducting service activities	WPU	LD	47%	25%	18%	6%	0%	4%
		UD	35%	34%	18%	5%	5%	2%
	Comp-L	LD	42%	39%	13%	3%	1%	3%
		UD	34%	39%	17%	6%	2%	2%

Part 2: Selected Comparisons of Full- and Part-Time Faculty Responses to FSSE Questions

FSSE typically presents findings for all responding faculty with some breakouts by discipline. William Paterson commissioned a special analysis which reports responses by full-time and part-time teaching status. The following tables present the FSSE questions for the two groups. Tables in this section are based upon the responses of 156 full-time and 87 adjunct or part-time faculty. The following tables summarize the responses for the two groups.

Table 11 shows most faculty teach on-campus but this is particularly true for full-time faculty, 95 percent, and 87 percent for part-time faculty. More than two-thirds of part-time faculty are teaching a general education course and that is probably why classes taught by part-time faculty tend to have more students enrolled in the course; 69 percent of part-time faculty report having between 20-49 students in their sections compared to 54 percent of full-time faculty who report this. In addition, 43 percent of full-time and 31 percent of part-time faculty reported having fewer than 20 students enrolled in their classes.

Table 11 Course Description Questions			
	Response Options	Full-Time	Part-Time
In what format do you teach your selected course section?	Classroom, on-campus	95%	87%
	Classroom, auxiliary location	3%	8%
	Distance education	2%	5%
	Total	100%	100%
Does your selected course section fulfill a general education requirement on your campus?	No	68%	31%
	Yes	32%	69%
	Total	100%	100%
How many students are enrolled in your selected course section?	9 or less	5%	5%
	10 to 19	38%	26%
	20 to 29	30%	37%
	30 to 49	24%	32%
	50 to 99	3%	0%
	100 or more	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	

Full-time and part-time faculty both feel culminating senior experiences, internships, community service and learning communities are important activities for students to participate in at the University. For foreign language study, independent study, and study abroad, a bit more of our full-time than our part-time faculty feel it is important for students to participate in these activities (Table 12).

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Culminating senior experience such as capstone courses, senior project, thesis, etc.	91%	88%
Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment	78%	79%
Community service or volunteer work	55%	56%
Participation in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together	60%	58%
Work on a research project with a faculty member outside of course or program requirements	59%	55%
Foreign language course work	72%	61%
Study abroad	50%	43%
Independent study or self-designed major	46%	53%

Table 13 shows that to varying degrees, full- and part-time faculty feel differently about how much the University emphasizes certain activities and behaviors that loosely tap into a tone of academic concern and success and a caring environment. The two groups are closest in their feelings that the University emphasizes to students that it is very important to use computers in their academic work (88 percent of full-time and 83 percent of part-time faculty feel this way). While the majority of both groups feel the University stresses the importance of providing students the support they need to help them succeed academically more of the part-time faculty feel this to be the case (71 percent of full-time and 83 percent of part-time faculty report this). On the whole, part-time or adjunct faculty feel the University emphasizes certain practices more so than full-time faculty do. Sometimes the gap is quite large: 63 percent of part-time faculty feel William Paterson does quite a lot to emphasize to students the importance of studying and academic work while only 47 percent of full-time faculty report this. Helping students cope with their non-academic responsibilities has a similar gap. Neither group thinks the University is doing a particularly good job in this area but this is especially so for full-time faculty (42 percent of part-time faculty report the University emphasizes this very much while 28 percent of full-time faculty feel this way). The same is true for providing students the support they need to thrive socially; 29 percent of full-time and 49 percent of part-time faculty feel the University emphasizes this to students.

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Requiring students to spend significant amounts of time studying and on academic work	47%	63%
Providing students the support they need to help them succeed academically	71%	83%
Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social and racial or ethnic backgrounds	58%	68%
Helping students cope with their non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	28%	42%
Providing students the support they need to thrive socially	29%	49%
Encouraging students to participate in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.)	46%	56%
Encouraging students to attend campus events and activities (special speakers, cultural performances, athletic events, etc.)	50%	58%
Encouraging students to use computers in their academic work	88%	83%

Table 14 displays a set of seven classroom activities in which students might be able to engage. Of the seven items in the set only one has any significant percentage difference for the two groups. Slightly over half, 53 percent, of full-time faculty reported that students frequently (often or very often) used an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) in their classes to discuss or complete an assignment while 38 percent of part-time faculty reported that students frequently did this in their class sections. The reasons for this are not explored in the survey but with so many of the general education courses taught by adjuncts and the new University Core Curriculum incorporating technology across the curriculum this may be an area the University wishes to explore further.

	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Have class discussions or writing assignments that include diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.)	59%	59%
Work with other students on projects during class	63%	57%
Participate in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of your course	12%	12%
Use an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment	53%	38%
Receive prompt written or oral feedback from you on their academic performance	94%	93%
Have serious conversations in your course with students of a different race or ethnicity than their own	50%	53%
Have serious conversations in your course with students who are very different from them in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	45%	50%

Table 15 explores some additional class activities in which students may participate. Again for this set of questions full- and part-time faculty responses have more similarities than differences and the differences are a matter of degree. From the faculty's point of view students are not really putting sufficient effort into their studies. For example, 83 percent of full-time faculty report that almost half of their students frequently come to class without completing assignments while 73 percent of part-time faculty say this. As well, 69 percent of full-time faculty point out that in almost half of their classes students had to work harder than usual to meet their standards and 85 percent of part-time faculty said this was the case in almost three-quarters of their classes.

Activity		% Frequently Doing This Activity					Total
		none	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75% or higher	
Frequently ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions	Full-Time	0%	28%	30%	18%	24%	100%
	Part-Time	0%	25%	32%	25%	17%	100%
Frequently come to class without completing readings or assignments	Full-Time	3%	61%	22%	9%	5%	100%
	Part-Time	3%	42%	29%	20%	6%	100%
Frequently work harder than they usually do to meet your standards	Full-Time	3%	43%	26%	21%	7%	100%
	Part-Time	11%	26%	26%	33%	5%	100%
Occasionally use e-mail to communicate with you	Full-Time	0%	41%	16%	20%	23%	100%
	Part-Time	2%	30%	26%	22%	21%	100%
Occasionally discuss grades or assignments with you	Full-Time	0%	41%	18%	28%	13%	100%
	Part-Time	0%	42%	28%	17%	13%	100%
At least once, talk about career plans with you	Full-Time	11%	44%	16%	13%	16%	100%
	Part-Time	8%	49%	15%	15%	13%	100%
At least once, discuss ideas from readings or classes with you outside of class	Full-Time	15%	41%	17%	15%	11%	100%
	Part-Time	11%	53%	18%	13%	5%	100%

Table 16 explores how much time faculty spend in various teaching practices in the classroom. Both groups spend approximately the same amount of time lecturing and leading discussions in their classes; 42 percent of full-time and 38 percent of part-time faculty report spending 40 percent or more of their class time lecturing and 30 percent of full-time and 29 percent of part-time faculty spend 40 percent of their class time in teacher-led discussions.

A somewhat larger percent of part-time faculty, 21 percent, report that they spend over 40 percent of class time in teacher-student shared responsibilities such as seminars, discussion, etc. compared to 13 percent of full-time faculty.

Both groups have their students spend time in small group activities: 59 percent of full-time faculty report students spend about one-fifth of class time in such activities and an additional 16 percent report having their students spend almost two-fifths of class time participating in this activity. Forty-three percent of students in courses taught by part-time faculty spend about one-fifth of their time in small group activities and 29 percent of part-time faculty report having students spending almost two-fifths of class time this way.

Half of both full- and part-time faculty report that no in-class time is set aside for students to use computers. Thirty-one percent of full-time and 22 percent of part-time faculty report spending no class time on student presentations. For those that do, 46 percent of full-time and 52 percent of part-time faculty report that between 1 and 19 percent of class time is spent in student presentations. A sizeable percent of faculty, 39 percent of full-time and 46 percent of part-time, report they spend no time on in-class writing assignments. For those that do, 48 percent of full-time and 41 percent of part-time faculty report spending anywhere from 1-19 percent of class time on this type of activity. Again as we incorporate writing intensive courses into the new UCC curriculum these practices may need to be revisited.

Both groups spend some in-class time, 1-19 percent, testing and evaluating students; 64 percent of full-time faculty and 59 percent of part-time faculty.

	Response Options	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Lecture	0%	3%	8%
	1-9%	15%	12%
	10-19%	14%	14%
	20-29%	17%	15%
	30-39%	10%	13%
	40-49%	16%	8%
	50-74%	15%	22%
	75% or more	11%	8%
	Total	100%	100%
Teacher-led discussion	0%	0%	4%
	1-9%	13%	11%
	10-19%	24%	24%
	20-29%	23%	18%
	30-39%	11%	13%
	40-49%	13%	8%
	50-74%	13%	13%
	75% or more	4%	8%
	Total	100%	100%
Teacher-student shared responsibility (seminar, discussion, etc.)	0%	19%	19%
	1-9%	21%	22%
	10-19%	25%	15%
	20-29%	13%	10%
	30-39%	9%	13%
	40-49%	5%	10%
	50-74%	6%	10%
	75% or more	2%	1%
	Total	100%	100%
Student computer use	0%	51%	53%
	1-9%	24%	11%
	10-19%	9%	6%
	20-29%	4%	10%
	30-39%	3%	9%
	40-49%	3%	4%
	50-74%	2%	3%
	75% or more	3%	5%
	Total	100%	100%
Small group activities	0%	20%	16%
	1-9%	35%	23%
	10-19%	24%	20%
	20-29%	8%	14%
	30-39%	8%	15%
	40-49%	0%	4%
	50-74%	3%	4%
	75% or more	2%	5%
	Total	100%	100%

	Response Options	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Student presentations	0%	31%	22%
	1-9%	26%	30%
	10-19%	20%	22%
	20-29%	8%	8%
	30-39%	5%	5%
	40-49%	3%	3%
	50-74%	1%	4%
	75% or more	5%	5%
	Total	100%	100%
In-class writing	0%	39%	46%
	1-9%	40%	21%
	10-19%	8%	20%
	20-29%	6%	5%
	30-39%	5%	1%
	40-49%	0%	4%
	50-74%	2%	2%
	75% or more	1%	1%
	Total	100%	100%
Testing and evaluation	0%	15%	11%
	1-9%	41%	29%
	10-19%	23%	30%
	20-29%	10%	12%
	30-39%	5%	8%
	40-49%	3%	1%
	50-74%	1%	4%
	75% or more	2%	5%
	Total	100%	100%
Performances in applied and fine arts (e.g., dance, drama, music)	0%	78%	70%
	1-9%	7%	11%
	10-19%	3%	5%
	20-29%	1%	5%
	30-39%	1%	1%
	40-49%	1%	0%
	50-74%	1%	6%
	75% or more	7%	2%
	Total	100%	100%
Experiential (labs, field work, art exhibits, etc.)	0%	55%	54%
	1-9%	12%	17%
	10-19%	8%	6%
	20-29%	9%	4%
	30-39%	4%	2%
	40-49%	2%	4%
	50-74%	6%	5%
	75% or more	4%	10%
	Total	100%	100%

Table 17 shows full-time faculty expect students to spend more time preparing for their courses than do part-time faculty but both groups also report they think students actually spend less time per week on preparing for classes. More than half of both groups report they think their students spend less than three hours a week preparing for class; 59 percent of full-time faculty and 72 percent of part-time faculty report this.

Table 17 Percent of Faculty Reporting the Time Students Spend Preparing for Their Course

	Response Options	Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
In a typical week about how many hours do you expect your students to spend preparing for your class	Less than 3	5%	20%
	3-4	39%	53%
	5-6	35%	19%
	7-8	9%	2%
	9-10	7%	3%
	More than 10	5%	2%
	Total	100%	100%
In a typical week about how many hours do you think your students actually spend preparing for your class	Less than 3	59%	72%
	3-4	28%	20%
	5-6	9%	3%
	7-8	2%	3%
	9-10	1%	1%
	More than 10	1%	0%
	Total	100%	100%

Table 18 reviews the frequency of certain types of traditional assignments that faculty give to students. About half of full-time and 55 percent of part-time faculty assign one textbook in their courses. Full-time faculty, 48 percent, are somewhat more likely to assign multiple readings than part-time faculty, 35 percent.

Both groups, 76 percent of full-time and 85 percent of part-time faculty, report they do not assign 20-page written papers. Written papers or reports between 5-19 pages are more likely to be assigned by full-time faculty, 71 percent, than part-time faculty, 57 percent. Over 80 percent of faculty report assigning at least one writing assignment of 5 or fewer pages; and 36 percent of full-time faculty and 43 percent of part-time faculty report assigning 4 or more of this type of writing assignment in their courses.

About a third of faculty report they make no assignments with problem sets that take students more than an hour to complete. For those who do, 53 percent of part-time faculty report assigning 1-2 sets and 35 percent of full-time faculty report this. An additional third of full-time faculty report assigning between 3 and 6 or more of these problem sets and 16 percent of part-time faculty report doing this. More part-time faculty, 65 percent, than full-time faculty, 56 percent, assign problem sets that take students less than an hour to complete.

Table 18 Faculty Reading, Writing and Problem Solving Assignments

		Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book length packs of course readings	None	3%	9%
	1	49%	55%
	2-3	37%	29%
	More than 3	11%	6%
	Total	100%	100%
Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more	None	76%	85%
	1	16%	8%
	2-3	6%	6%
	More than 3	2%	1%
	Total	100%	100%
Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages	None	29%	43%
	1	29%	30%
	2-3	35%	23%
	More than 3	8%	4%
	Total	100%	100%

		Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages	None	21%	14%
	1	16%	16%
	2-3	27%	27%
	4-6	18%	20%
	More than 6	18%	23%
	Total	100%	100%
Number of problem sets that take your students more than one hour to complete	None	33%	31%
	1-2	35%	53%
	3-4	15%	11%
	5-6	3%	1%
	More than 6	15%	4%
	Total	100%	100%
Number of problem sets that take your students less than one hour to complete	None	44%	35%
	1-2	39%	42%
	3-4	4%	11%
	5-6	5%	5%
	More than 6	8%	7%
	Total	100%	100%

The last table in this section again shows the similarity between full- and part-time faculty in the percents they report for how frequently, often or very often, students in their courses are able to: include diverse perspectives in their assignments, work with other students on projects during class, receive prompt written or oral feedback on their academic performance, have serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than their own and have serious conversations with students who are very different from them in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values.

		Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Have class discussions or writing assignments that include diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.)	Never	13%	20%
	Sometimes	28%	22%
	Often	23%	28%
	Very often	36%	31%
	Total	100%	100%
Work with other students on projects during class	Never	7%	13%
	Sometimes	31%	31%
	Often	30%	31%
	Very often	33%	26%
	Total	100%	100%
Participate in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of your course	Never	68%	64%
	Sometimes	20%	23%
	Often	6%	9%
	Very often	6%	3%
	Total	100%	100%
Use an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment	Never	15%	25%
	Sometimes	32%	38%
	Often	21%	19%
	Very often	32%	19%
	Total	100%	100%

		Full-Time Faculty	Part-Time Faculty
Receive prompt written or oral feedback from you on their academic performance	Never	0%	1%
	Sometimes	7%	6%
	Often	35%	50%
	Very often	59%	43%
	Total	100%	100%
Have serious conversations in your course with students of a different race or ethnicity than their own	Never	9%	16%
	Sometimes	41%	31%
	Often	27%	27%
	Very often	23%	26%
	Total	100%	100%
Have serious conversations in your course w/students who are very different from them in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	Never	12%	17%
	Sometimes	43%	33%
	Often	25%	24%
	Very often	20%	26%
	Total	100%	100%

Almost two-thirds of both groups say that there is no participation in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of their course. Part-time faculty (38 percent) report having students use an electronic medium (listserv, chat group, Internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete an assignment somewhat less frequently than full-time faculty (53 percent) have them do this.

Part 3: Selected Perceptions of the William Paterson Learning Experience

FSSE presents some of its findings at the discipline level and allows participating institutions to duplicate these findings using their own data. The FSSE categorization of disciplines is at times different from how William Paterson would group these areas so the usefulness of the results at the individual discipline level may be limited and best used at the summary or 'all' level. The FSSE categories are once again included here.

1=Arts and Humanities Art, fine and applied English (language and literature) History Journalism Language and literature (except English) Music Philosophy Speech Theater or drama Theology or religion Other arts & humanities	2=Biological Sciences Biology (general) Biochemistry or biophysics Botany Environmental science Marine (life) science Microbiology or bacteriology Zoology Other biological science	3=Business Accounting Business administration (general) Finance International business Marketing Management Other business	4=Education Business education Elementary/middle school education Music or art education Physical education or recreation Secondary education Special education Other education 5=Engineering
6=Physical Science Astronomy Atmospheric science (including meteorology) Chemistry Earth science (including geology) Mathematics Physics Statistics Other physical science	7=Professional Architecture Urban planning Health technology (medical, dental, laboratory) Law Library/archival science Medicine Dentistry Veterinarian Nursing Pharmacy Allied health/other medical Therapy (occupational, physical, speech) Other professional	8=Social Science Anthropology Economics Ethnic studies Geography Political science (including government, international relations) Psychology Social work Sociology Gender studies Other social science	9=Other Agriculture Communications Computer science Family studies Natural resources and conservation Kinesiology Criminal justice Military science Parks, recreation, leisure studies, sports management Public administration Other field Technical/vocational

As we saw earlier FSSE asked faculty members how much time they *expected* students to spend preparing for their selected course and how much they believe students *actually* spend preparing for their course. As well the NSSE survey asked students a similar question about how much time they spend preparing for classes. NSSE and FSSE results confirm a gap between how much time faculty members *expect* students to spend preparing for classes and how much time students actually report spending preparing for class. On average, faculty members expect students to study about five hours per week for a single class, but students tend to report a little less than three hours per week per class. Although faculty members have higher expectations, their estimation of the actual time students spend preparing for class is close to students' self-reported data.

Table 20 reveals there are fluctuations in expectations when disciplinary area is considered. Again the disciplinary areas are defined by FSSE but the figures are based on William Paterson faculty responses. Faculty members in the physical sciences expect more per-class study time than any other subject area. For a number of areas -- biological sciences, arts and humanities, professional, education -- faculty somewhat underestimate how much time students report they spend per week preparing for class. Overall our summary figures are lower than the reported FSSE summary averages.

Disciplinary Area	Faculty Expectations	Faculty Estimate of Actual	Student Reported
Arts and Humanities	4.7	2.7	3.3
Biological Sciences	4.6	2.1	2.4
Business	4.7	2.7	2.6
Education	4.9	2.4	3.1
Physical Sciences	9.3	3.7	3.5
Professional	4.4	3.0	3.3
Social Sciences	4.9	2.2	2.2
Other	4.3	2.6	2.7
All Disciplines	4.9	2.6	2.8
FSSE All Disciplines	6.8	3.9	3.5

Note 1: Disciplinary area represents students' reported major and courses taught by faculty member
 Note 2: Results in this table based on student and faculty responses at institutions that used NSSE and the Course-Based FSSE survey option

On average WPU faculty members report spending 36 percent of their class time lecturing, 16 percent on small group work, and 13 percent on experiential activities such as labs and field work. The remainder of the time is spent on a variety of other activities (e.g., instructor-led discussions, student presentations, etc.) not reported as part of this table. Our overall figures mirror the overall percents of the other participating FSSE colleges and universities with all William Paterson faculty reporting slightly less time devoted to lecturing. Some interesting findings emerge when the figures are presented by discipline (Table 21).

Disciplinary Area	Lecturing		Small Group Work		Experiential Activities	
	WPU	FSSE	WPU	FSSE	WPU	FSSE
Arts and Humanities	31.0%	30.0%	16.0%	16.0%	8.0%	8.0%
Biological Sciences	57.0%	55.0%	17.0%	13.0%	51.0%	25.0%
Business	52.0%	37.0%	13.0%	14.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Education	17.0%	23.0%	28.0%	26.0%	19.0%	16.0%
Physical Sciences	69.0%	55.0%	7.0%	12.0%	23.0%	13.0%
Professional	33.0%	39.0%	14.0%	15.0%	19.0%	19.0%
Social Sciences	36.0%	45.0%	12.0%	11.0%	7.0%	6.0%
Other	35.0%	35.0%	20.0%	16.0%	14.0%	14.0%
All Disciplines	36.0%	39.0%	16.0%	15.0%	13.0%	11.0%

William Paterson faculty in the physical sciences and business area allocate over half of class time to lecturing somewhat more than found at the other FSSE participating institutions. Conversely, a smaller percent of our social science and professional faculty devote class time to lectures than those at the other FSSE institutions.

Faculty teaching Education courses are most likely to have their students spend class time on small group work and those in the physical sciences the least. Students in William Paterson biological science courses are somewhat more likely to have small group experiences than those at other FSSE colleges.

Faculty teaching in arts and humanities, business and the social science fields allocate the smallest percentage of class time to experiential work whereas faculty in the biological sciences devote the largest percentage of time; this is especially so for William Paterson faculty.

Table 22 presents how William Paterson faculty in various disciplines along with other FSSE institutions and faculty nationally spend their time in several professional activities.

Disciplinary Area	Teaching			Research			Other		
	WPU	FSSE	National	WPU	FSSE	National	WPU	FSSE	National
Arts and Humanities	62.0%	63.0%	64.0%	18.0%	14.0%	17.0%	20.0%	23.0%	19.0%
Biological Sciences	54.0%	55.0%	39.0%	17.0%	20.0%	44.0%	29.0%	25.0%	17.0%
Business	57.0%	58.0%	60.0%	12.0%	16.0%	22.0%	31.0%	26.0%	19.0%
Education	63.0%	58.0%	58.0%	14.0%	12.0%	15.0%	23.0%	30.0%	27.0%
Physical Sciences	61.0%	60.0%	58.0%	15.0%	18.0%	26.0%	24.0%	23.0%	16.0%
Professional	65.0%	57.0%	47.0%	12.0%	12.0%	21.0%	22.0%	31.0%	32.0%
Social Sciences	61.0%	55.0%	54.0%	15.0%	18.0%	27.0%	24.0%	27.0%	20.0%
Other	58.0%	56.0%	54.0%	12.0%	16.0%	20.0%	30.0%	26.0%	27.0%
All Disciplines	61.0%	56.0%	54.0%	15.0%	16.0%	24.0%	24.0%	26.0%	23.0%

*Source: National percentages are based on the 2004 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty
Notes: National percentages are based on faculty at US public and private four-year institutions

According to FSSE 2008 and NSOPF 2004 results, the average full-time faculty member spends over half of his or her time on teaching-related activities (e.g. time in class, grading), one-sixth of his or her time on research and scholarly work, and a quarter of the time on “other” activities (e.g., advising, service). A slightly larger percent, 61, of William Paterson faculty spend the majority of their time teaching compared to 56 percent for FSSE institutions and 54 percent nationally.

Emphasis on deep learning practices is a trademark of NSSE. For FSSE deep learning is operationally defined by combining 3 sub-scales (reflective learning, integrative learning, and higher-order learning) that measure the extent to which a particular course emphasized activities that promote higher level thinking, reflecting on one’s own learning, and incorporating information and ideas from multiple sources into one’s own thinking and work. Table 23 presents the level of emphasis on these deep learning approaches by subject area for the FSSE course-based survey option (which we followed).

Discipline Area	Reflective Learning		Integrative Learning		Higher Order Learning		Deep Learning	
	WPU	FSSE	WPU	FSSE	WPU	FSSE	WPU	FSSE
Arts and Humanities	3.5	3.5	2.8	2.8	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2
Biological Sciences	3.0	2.9	2.5	2.5	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.8
Business	3.1	3.1	2.7	2.7	2.9	3.3	2.9	3.0
Education	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.0	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3
Physical Sciences	2.5	2.5	2.2	2.1	3.3	3.1	2.7	2.6
Professional	3.1	3.3	2.9	2.9	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.2
Social Sciences	3.5	3.4	3.1	2.8	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.2
Other	3.3	3.1	2.9	2.7	3.5	3.3	3.2	3.0
All Disciplines	3.3	3.2	2.8	2.7	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.0

William Paterson's overall and discipline-specific scores very closely mirror the overall FSSE scores. FSSE points out that faculty tend to emphasize deep learning (last columns) and its sub-components to various degrees across academic disciplines. For example faculty who teach courses in the arts and humanities emphasize deep learning more often than their colleagues in the physical sciences where it is harder to incorporate the reflective and integrative learning components into this discipline's teaching practices.

The FSSE survey also asked faculty members how much they emphasized student-led instruction in their selected course section. Those reporting quite a bit or very much are included in Table 24. Across all discipline areas, 58 percent of the faculty at all FSSE institutions reported that they frequently allowed students to identify course learning goals, 36 percent frequently assigned team-based projects, 22 percent let students chose the course topics, and 15 percent permitted students to determine the course's activities and assignments. William Paterson's percents are higher for all four categories: 63 percent reported that they frequently allowed students to identify course learning goals, 39 percent frequently assigned team-based projects, 32 percent let students chose the course topics, and 23 percent permitted students to determine the course's activities and assignments.

Variations by discipline are found in both the national and William Paterson figures, although the differences are not necessarily the same for both groups. At the national level FSSE points to the 69 percent of faculty in education who report frequently allowing students to identify course learning goals whereas 50 percent of faculty teaching in the physical sciences report doing this. They also point to the 56 percent of business faculty who report using team-based assignments while only 27 percent of arts and humanities report this as being done frequently. Only a small percentage of physical science faculty, 12 percent, allow students to chose course topics. One in four education faculty permit students to determine activities and assignments in their courses while only 7 percent of faculty in the physical sciences report doing so.

At William Paterson 67 percent of the business faculty reported that their students had frequent opportunities to identify learning goals and another 64 percent said their students frequently participated in team-based assignments; both percents are highest within the University and significantly higher than the FSSE percents. Students in education, biological sciences and the physical sciences had fewer opportunities to choose course topics than those in other disciplines. A third of business faculty reported that students frequently were able to determine class activities and assignments.

Table 24 Percent of Faculty Reporting Students Frequently Have the Opportunity to Participate in Student-Led Approaches to Learning by Academic Discipline

Discipline Area	Students Identify Learning Goals		Team-based Assignments		Students Choose Course Topics		Students Determine Activities & Assignments	
	WPU	FSSE	WPU	FSSE	WPU	FSSE	WPU	FSSE
Arts and Humanities	62%	63%	31%	27%	35%	29%	24%	18%
Biological Sciences	56%	53%	33%	35%	11%	12%	11%	11%
Business	67%	55%	64%	56%	33%	19%	33%	13%
Education	57%	69%	50%	50%	7%	33%	14%	25%
Physical Sciences	58%	50%	36%	27%	8%	9%	17%	7%
Professional	64%	69%	50%	37%	41%	21%	32%	16%
Social Sciences	61%	50%	27%	27%	36%	20%	21%	13%
Other	74%	62%	57%	40%	46%	24%	22%	16%
All Disciplines	63%	58%	39%	36%	32%	22%	23%	15%

In summary, the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) gives us insight into what educational practices faculty emphasize including those identified with active student participation in the learning process such as small group work, internships, service learning, etc. As the NSSE Task Force, convened by the Provost this academic year, meets these and the NSSE findings inform the committee as it works through a wide range of points such as what activities help to encourage students to take ownership of their learning; or how can effective teaching strategies such as learning communities, student participation in faculty research etc. be fostered on campus; what types of professional development activities would be helpful; what can other areas such as student affairs, facilities and instructional technology play in helping to encourage student learning and teaching on campus.