Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council -
-Online Archive

National Collegiate Honors Council

2009

Assessing Student Learning in Community College Honors Programs Using the CCCSE Course Feedback Form

Laura O. Ross
Seminole Community College

Marcia A. Roman
Seminole Community College

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nchcjournal

Assessing Student Learning in Community College Honors Programs Using the CCCSE Course Feedback Form

LAURA O. ROSS AND MARCIA A. ROMAN

SEMINOLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

INTRODUCTION

Academically talented students with impressive placement scores are enrolling at community colleges in increasing numbers. The economy has certainly played a role in this migration to two-year institutions, where students can commute from home and pay lower tuition rates, but other factors have also contributed to the change. Community colleges have expanded their mission to meet the academic needs of this population (Marklei; Boulard), and articulation agreements between community colleges and universities have improved over the years (Kane).

More two-year institutions are offering honors programs for the academically gifted students who will eventually transfer to four-year universities (Beck). The benefits to community colleges of developing and sustaining honors programs are many; according to Bulakowski and Townsend, they include: (a) greater learning potential for strong academic students; (b) higher retention of well-prepared students; (c) higher transfer rates for honors students; (d) enhancement of the institution's public image; and (e) increased respect from four-year institutions (Beck; Bulakowski and Townsend; Boulard).

However, not all community college administrators and faculty approve of honors programs in the community college setting. Opponents claim honors programs are elitist, diverting resources and the best professors to the academically gifted students. They argue that community colleges—known for open and equal-access education—should be identifying methods and resources to help all students learn better, not just a few (Boulard; Evelyn; Outcalt; Selingo). While these arguments may always exist, as budgetary pressures become increasingly difficult, these voices become louder and often more persuasive.

Community College Honors Programs
and Accountability

Enrollments have increased at community colleges during the economic downturn. Unfortunately, this increase has occurred at the same time that states such as Florida, New Mexico, Rhode Island, and many others have reduced their financial support for higher education; even though their enrollments are up, community colleges have been forced to cut expenses and eliminate programs (Bushong). Now more than ever it is important to have valid and concrete methods of assessment for honors programs (Lanier).

In *Assessing and Evaluating Honors Programs and Honors Colleges: A Practical Handbook*, Otero and Spurrier state, "Evaluation and assessment provide an opportunity for Honors Programs and Honors Colleges to demonstrate their strengths, address their weaknesses, generate institutional support, and gain outside validation of their accomplishments and goals" (p. 5). They suggest a two-phase evaluation process: a self-study and then an external study by a team of NCHC-recommended Site Visitors. In the self-study report, Otero and Spurrier recommend that the honors program or honors college develop goals and objectives, gather evidence of accomplishing those objectives, and identify strategies for improvement. For many programs, the gathering of evidence is a precarious part of the self-study. Whipple encouraged well-conducted self-assessment of programs but cautioned, "Assessment, poorly planned and executed, wastes time and money, and may misinform, leading to faulty conclusions" (p.41).

The Art and Phyllis Grindle Honors Institute at Seminole Community College (SCC) in Florida has more than doubled in size over the last four years. The program has enhanced its curriculum, expanded to two campuses, hosted the Florida Collegiate Honors Council Conference, and had four consecutive Jack Kent Cooke Scholars and one All-USA Community College Academic Team Member. Despite its impressive record, the SCC Honors Program is scrambling, along with every other worthy program, to develop measurable student-learning outcomes, gather evidence, and assess student learning for accreditation self-study requirements and for its administration. The program has written goals, objectives, and methods of assessment in place, but had to search for a valid and relevant assessment tool to understand how students are learning in the honors classes compared to traditional classes. By knowing this information, the program could better document evidence of student learning, determine curricular or pedagogical changes, improve or maintain strong retention rates, and perhaps justify the budget resources directed to honors.

For several reasons, the SCC Honors Institute decided to adopt the Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCCSE) Course Feedback Form as an assessment tool. First, the CCCSE Course Feedback Form was cost-effective (free) and could be downloaded from the CCCSE website. Second, our college already recognized the CCCSE Community College Student Report (CCSR) as a valid instrument and used it as an assessment tool, and the CCCSE Course Feedback Form was based on questions from the CCCSE Community College Student Report (CCSR). Finally, the questions on the CCCSE Course Feedback Form solicited responses from students about their learning experiences and engagement in the classroom.

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Research has shown that the more actively engaged students are—with faculty, staff, other students, and the subject matter—the more likely they are to learn and to achieve their academic goals (CCSSE *Institutional Report*, 2004; Astin; Pace, as noted in Kuh; Pascarella and Terenzini).

The Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCCSE) was launched in 2001 under the name of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) as a project of the Community College Leadership Program based at The University of Texas at Austin. Grants from The Pew Charitable Trusts, the Lumina Foundation for Education, the MetLife Foundation, and Houston Endowment supported the effort. The purpose was to stimulate dialogue about how quality is defined and measured, to provide an appropriate assessment tool, and to raise public awareness about the work of community colleges.

Considered the "daughter" of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), which is used by four-year institutions to obtain information about learning practices and student engagement, the CCSSE addresses the unique mission and student characteristics of community colleges (Ouimet, p. 8). The purpose of the instruments is to provide information about effective educational practices and promote practices demonstrated to improve student learning and retention (McClenney, p. 138).

The CCCSE and NSSE survey instruments are based on the work of many researchers, including Pace's seminal 1984 work on student effort, Astin's work (1984, 1993, 1999) on student involvement, and Chickering and Gamson's 1987 landmark publication on good practices of undergraduate education (Kuh, p. 2). The seven principles of good practice were developed by a task force of scholars of policy, organizational, and economic issues in higher education as well as others who had conducted research on the college experience (Chickering and Gamson, 1999, p. 76). The principles or "engagement indicators" (Kuh, p.1) include: encouraging student-faculty contact;

reciprocity and cooperation among students; active learning; prompt feedback; time on task; communication of high expectations; and respect for diverse talents and ways of knowing (Chickering and Gamson, 1987, p. 3).

The CCCSE survey instrument, the *Community College Student Report* (CCSR), is a research-based tool that can be useful for benchmarking performance and monitoring progress of improvement efforts by comparing results not only to other institutions but within an institution from one administration to another (Ouimet, p. 8). CCCSE cautions institutions in their use of data and advises that comparison for purposes of ranking is inappropriate.

While CCSR results provide institutional assessment data that can be disaggregated by demographic factors such as ethnic groups, first-generation college students, and developmental or college-preparatory students, CCCSE's Course Feedback Form provides a vehicle for individual course and program-level assessment. The Course Feedback Form was developed in response to requests from community colleges with the assistance of a CCSSE advisory group and is closely aligned with the CCSR (McClenney, pp. 140–41). The Course Feedback Form is password protected and available free of charge to any former or current CCCSE-member college in the Toolkit found under Resources on CCSSE's web site at <http://ccsse.org>. The University of Alabama has collaborated with NSSE to develop a classroom-level adaptation of their survey instrument, called the Classroom Survey of Student Engagement (CLASSE) for use by four-year institutions. It also is available free of charge to past and current participants of the NSSE. Information is available at <http://assessment.ua.edu/CLASSE/Overview>.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A key question is what assessment resources are available to improve curricular programs, including honors programs, that strive to improve student learning. A growing body of research shows that student engagement is related to improved student learning and persistence. An exploratory study conducted by Long and Lange demonstrated statistically significant differences between honors and non-honors students in academic focus, student interaction, and student activity. But while these students may already be more engaged and exhibit higher retention rates than non-honors students (Long and Lange), the question remains how to assess and improve the educational practices of these students and honors programs.

Anchored in research, and with our institution already examining the CCCSE data in order to make improvements in student learning and retention, the SCC Honors Program believed that the CCCSE survey and the CCCSE Course Feedback Form could be used to specifically target assessment and improvement of honors classes. Although the SCC Physical

Therapy Assistant program used the CCCSE Course Feedback Form in its self-study in preparation for re-accreditation by the Commission on Accreditation in Physical Therapy Education, it has not been widely adopted across the College.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study was guided by two research questions:

1. How do SCC honors students' responses on the CCCSE Course Feedback Form compare to the general SCC college-credit-student population's responses to the institution-level *Community College Student Report*?

2. Based on aggregated student responses to the CCCSE Course Feedback Form, what areas might the honors program consider addressing to improve student engagement and therefore the student learning and retention of its honors students?

DEFINITION OF TERMS

- *CCSR* is the *Community College Student Report*, which is the survey instrument used by CCCSE for institutional assessment.

- *CCCSE* is the Center for Community College Student Engagement. It was launched in 2001 under the name Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE).

- *CCSSE* is the Community College Survey of Student Engagement and was launched in 2001 as a project of the Community College Leadership Program at The University of Texas at Austin. The name was officially changed to the Center for Community College Student Engagement (CCCSE) in spring 2009.

- *CCCSE's Course Feedback Form* is an end-of-course evaluation instrument developed with the assistance of an advisory panel to provide a tool for course-level and program-level assessment. The instrument shares thirty-nine questions with the *Community College Student Report* and contains additional questions that pertain to the specific course. It is intended for local administration and analysis (Retrieved 6/7/08 from <http://www.ccsse.org/publications/toolkit.cfm>).

- *Engagement* is the quality of effort students devote to "educationally purposeful activities that contribute directly to desired outcomes" (Hu and Kuh, p. 555).

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The CCCSE survey, the CCSR, was administered according to survey protocols in spring 2007. The surveys were sent to CCSSE for data compilation, and Seminole Community College received its results by fall 2007. CCCSE provides participating colleges with an extensive dataset of their institution's results, including the mean scores of student responses to each survey item.

The Course Feedback Form was administered in all honors courses at Seminole Community College in summer 2007, fall 2007, and spring 2008, totaling seventeen sections. The honors courses cut across various disciplines including composition and literature, economics, psychology, sociology, speech, humanities, history, and biology. The college's Institutional Research Office compiled the data and provided mean scores of student responses to each survey item for each honors course as well as an overall mean score of all honors courses for each survey item.

The authors developed a cross-walk between the CCSR and the Course Feedback Form in order to identify the survey items that were the same and those that were unique to the Course Feedback Form. Thirty-nine survey items were found to be the same, including five questions pertaining to College Experience and Demographics. These five questions were not examined in this study, so the study consisted of examining mean scores from thirty-four of the survey items.

In order to establish whether the honors students were similar as a group across semesters, the mean scores (by semester) of each item on the Course Feedback Form were examined to determine if there were statistically significant differences in student responses to each item between terms. Few or no statistically significant differences between terms on the thirty-four items examined would imply that honors students across all terms were similar and would support the plan to examine all honors students' responses to the Course Feedback Form in this time period as a group.

The mean scores of students' responses to each item for each of the honors classes, as well as the overall honors mean score on each item, were compared to the mean scores of student responses to the institutionally-administered CCSR. Although the student population in honors courses is different from the population of students who responded to the CCSR, it seemed a valid comparison conducted in a cursory manner to determine if the data did, in fact, show honors students to be more engaged in honors classes than students in other courses. The mean scores of the individual items on the Course

Feedback Form used in the honors courses were also compared to the overall mean score for all honors courses as part of the honors program assessment.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

CCCSE's instrument, the *Community College Student Report*, has its genesis in NSSE's instrument, the *College Student Report*, and shares a number of common survey questions. The score reliability and validity of the NSSE have been extensively explored and demonstrated (Kuh, 2002, as noted in Marti, 2004, P. 1).

The score reliability of the CCSR and its component benchmarks were measured through use of Cronbach's alpha (Marti, 2004, p. 14). Cronbach's alpha values for the five survey benchmarks are strong despite not all exceeding the "gold standard of .70" (Marti, 2009, p. 11).

Test-retest reliability was evaluated by comparing students' responses to the survey administered in more than one of their classes although only one survey from each individual was included in overall analyses (Marti, 2009, p. 11). Year-to-year comparisons between 2003, 2004, and 2005 indicate that the instrument is measuring the same constructs across time and that differences between subgroups are due to real differences in means, variances, and co-variances as opposed to problems associated with the instrument (Marti, 2009, p. 14). A major validation research study of CCCSE's survey was recently completed that demonstrated a relationship between student responses to survey items and student outcomes (McClenney, p. 140).

Nearly seventy percent of the survey items on the CCCSE Course Feedback Form are the same as items on the CCCSE *Community College Student Report*. The reliability and validity of NSSE and CCCSE institutional surveys lend credence to the reliability and validity of the CCCSE Course Feedback Form.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The CCCSE Course Feedback Form provides a means of research-based course-level and program-level assessment. By collecting data through CCCSE's Course Feedback Form across all honors classes in summer 2007, fall 2007 and spring 2008, the authors were able to examine not only course- but program-level data for the honors courses. The CCCSE Course Feedback Form provides a research-based means to assess individual classes and a program to provide a basis for continued improvement and gains in student learning.

Using CCCSE's CCSR and the Course Feedback Forms together, an institution can assess student engagement and thereby student learning at the institutional level as well as by individual course or program.

79

RESULTS

Frequencies were conducted on both the *Community College Student Report* and the CCCSE Course Feedback Form. The CCSR had n=829 with 447 female and 294 male responses. There were 72 Black students, 127 Hispanic students, 461 White students, and 73 students who reported other race and ethnicities. Course Feedback Form frequencies indicated 260 responses from honors students across the 17 sections surveyed. For the students who included demographic information, 161 were female, 80 male, 15 Black, 22 Hispanic, 112 White, and 71 students who reported other races and ethnicities. The "other" category was large for the Course Feedback Form because the summer session forms failed to include a category for Hispanics. All survey results were included in the analysis of Course Feedback Forms and no attempt was made to use only one survey per student across all 17 sections.

In order to establish whether the honors students were similar as a group across semesters, the mean scores (by semester) of each item on the Course Feedback Form were examined through an analysis of variance conducted by the authors to determine if there were statistically significant differences in student responses to each item between terms (see Appendix). Statistically significant differences were found through the omnibus F –test in 9 of the 34 survey items, or 26% of the items examined. Multiple Comparison Procedures indicated that there were more differences between the responses of honors students from summer 2007 to fall 2007 than there were between other groups examined. Despite these differences in their initial examination of CCCSE Course Feedback Form data, the authors chose to examine the honors student responses from all three semesters as a group in the comparison with institutional CCSR results. The authors also included all Course Feedback Form responses. Since a number of honors students were in several different honors classes in which the survey was administered, more than on Course Feedback Form per student is included in the results. The CCSR survey protocol requires that only one survey per student is included in institutional results.

Although the student population in honors courses is different from the population of students who responded to the CCSR, we could make a rough determination if the data showed honors students to be more engaged in honors courses than non-honors students in other classes. The results would also show if and how honors students were less engaged than the larger student population at the college. Such information could serve as the basis for improvement of the honors program.

One of the research questions guiding this study was: How do SCC honors students' responses on the CCCSE Course Feedback Form compare to the

general SCC college-credit-student population's responses to the institution-level *Community College Student Report*?

To answer this question, the researchers examined 34 questions on the CCCSE Course Feedback Form that are the same as questions on the institution-level *Community College Student Report*. The mean scores of SCC honors students' responses to the CCCSE Course Feedback Form (n=260) as compared with SCC students' responses to the CCCSE *Community College Student Report* (n=829) indicated more engagement with faculty, students, and learning activities on 29 of 34 identical questions from the CCCSE Course Feedback form and the *Community College Survey Report*. The survey items are categorized by CCCSE into three groups, which are presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3.

In order to answer the second research question, the researchers more closely examined the survey items in which honors students' responses to questions on the CCCSE Course Feedback Form indicated less engagement than other students' responses to the same question on the CCSR. Five items indicated less engagement by honors students surveyed in the honors courses (see Table 4).

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Despite the following types of limitations of this study, the CCCSE Course Feedback Form, used in conjunction with the CCCSE *Community College Student Report*, seems a promising tool for assessing courses and programs given its ability to measure learning gains made after curriculum adjustments based on assessment data. Limitations include:

1. CCCSE's survey, the *Community College Student Report*, asked students to consider their experience over an entire academic year and across all of their classes while the Course Feedback Form requested feedback on a specific course within a given term.

2. Only one survey per student is used in analyses of the *Community College Student Report* while all student responses to the CCCSE Course Feedback Form administered to different honors classes, including those by the same student in different classes, were used in the analyses of the Course Feedback Form.

3. Data from CCCSE's *Community College Student Report* and the CCCSE Course Feedback Form are self-reported.

4. Honors students applied and were selected for admission into the honors program while students who responded to the institution-level *Community College Student Report* are subject to open admissions policies and not selected according to academic performance.

Table 1: Mean Scores of Academic, Intellectual and Social Experiences (CCSSE, 2007) for Honors Students and Non-Honors Students

CCSR 2005–2007 Question #	Course Feed-back Form	During the current semester, how often did you do the following?	SCC Mean 2007 (CCSR)	SCC Honors Mean (Course Feedback Form)
4a	1a	Ask questions in class	2.89	3.05
4b	1b	Make a class presentation	2.25	2.31
4c	1c	Prepare two or more drafts of an assignment	2.53	2.64
4d	1d	Worked on papers that require integrating ideas or information from various sources	2.90	3.29
4f	1e	Work with other students on projects during class	2.34	2.75
4g	1f	Work with classmates outside of class to complete an assignment	1.82	2.41
4i	1g	Participate in a community-based project as part of coursework	1.26	1.68
4j	1h	Use the Internet to complete an assignment	2.89	3.45
4k	1i	Used e-mail to communicate with your instructor	2.52	2.40
4l	1j	Discussed grades or assignments with your instructor	2.54	2.42
4m	1k	Talked about career plans with your instructor	2.05	1.76
4n	1l	Discussed ideas from your readings or class with your instructor outside of class	1.77	2.18
4p	1m	Worked harder than you thought you could to meet your instructors standards or expectations	2.43	2.70
4r	1n	Discussed ideas from the readings or class with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers)	2.54	2.85
4u	1o	Skipped class	1.69	1.15
4o	1p	Received prompt feedback from your instructor about your performance	2.63	2.95

Scale: 1 = Very little; 2= Some; 3= Quite a bit; 4=Very much

Table 2: Mean Scores of Character of Mental Activities (CCSSE, 2007) for Honors and Non-Honors

CCSR 2005–2007 Question #	Course Feed-back Form	During the semester, how much have your courses emphasized the following?	SCC Mean 2007 (CCSR)	SCC Honors Mean (Course Feedback Form)
5a	2a	Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and reading so that you can repeat them in pretty much the same form	2.76	2.36
5b	2b	Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory	2.84	3.22
5c	2c	Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in new ways	2.72	3.21
5d	2d	Making judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods	2.62	3.21
5e	2e	Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations	2.65	2.90
5f	2f	Using information you have read or heard to perform a new skill	2.65	2.69

Scale: 1 = Very little; 2= Some; 3= Quite a bit; 4=Very much

Table 3: Mean scores of items pertaining to Knowledge, Skills and Personal Development (CCSSE, 2007) for Honors and Non-Honors Students

CCSR 2005–2007 Question #	Course Feedback Form	During the current semester, to what extent did this course help you develop in the following areas?	SCC Mean 2007 (CCSR)	SCC Honors Mean (Course Feedback Form)
12c	3a	Writing clearly and effectively	2.66	2.70
12d	3b	Speaking clearly and effectively	2.60	2.74
12e	3c	Thinking critically and analytically	2.86	3.23
12f	3d	Solving numerical problems	2.62	2.17
12g	3e	Using computing information technology	2.58	2.62
12h	3f	Working effectively with others	2.55	2.87
12i	3g	Learning effectively on my own	2.83	2.89
12j	3h	Understanding myself	2.53	2.68
12k	3i	Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	2.29	2.84
12l	3j	Developing a personal code of values and ethics	2.27	2.59
12m	3k	Contributing to the welfare of the community	1.88	2.52
12n	3l	Developing clearer career goals	2.49	2.39

Scale: 1 = Very little; 2= Some; 3= Quite a bit; 4=Very much

Table 4: Mean Scores Indicating Less Engagement for SCC Honors Students

CCSR 2005–2007 Question #	Course Feed-back Form	During the current semester, how often did you do the following?	SCC Mean 2007 (CCSR)	SCC Honors Mean (Course Feedback Form)
4k	1i	Used e-mail to communicate with your instructor	2.52	2.40
4l	1j	Discussed grades or assignments with your instructor	2.54	2.42
4m	1k	Talked about career plans with your instructor	2.05	1.76
12f	3d	Solving numerical problems	2.62	2.17
12n	3l	Developing clearer career goals	2.49	2.39

Scale: 1 = Very little; 2= Some; 3= Quite a bit; 4=Very much

5. Honors students are required to take a one-credit orientation course that is a modified type of First-Year Experience while the general college population does not take such a course.

6. Data analyses of the CCCSE Course Feedback Forms were conducted by the College's Institutional Research Office and the authors.

National CCCSE data show that honors students are already reaping some of the greatest benefits of what community colleges have to offer and are highly engaged (Arnspargar, Slide 25). Honors students' responses to 29 of 34 questions on the CCCSE Course Feedback Form administered in this study indicated that they were more engaged in honors courses than non-honors students in general courses. Honors students responded that they asked more questions in class, prepared more drafts of papers, worked harder than they thought they could, and discussed ideas from the class with others outside of class. Honors students also indicated through the Course Feedback Form that their honors courses emphasized critical thinking skills, such as analysis, synthesis, argumentation, and problem solving, much more than the traditional courses. This evidence from the Course Feedback Form will help the SCC Honors Program to document the high-level learning that is occurring in honors classrooms. The data will also help to assess the program's new student learning outcomes, which coordinate with the Course Feedback Form's critical thinking questions 2b, 2c, 2d, and 2e (see Table 2).

The mean scores of honors students' responses on two items are noteworthy because a lower mean indicates a higher level of engagement. A lower mean score of honors students' responses to item 1o on the Course Feedback Form, which pertains to skipping class, indicates a higher level of engagement. Likewise, a lower mean score of honors students' responses to item 2a on the Course Feedback Form, which pertains to mental activities involving critical thinking, compared to all student responses to item 5a on the CCSR, indicates a higher level of engagement. Responses are based on a 4-point scale (see Tables 1, 2 and 3).

However, there were five responses on the Course Feedback Form indicating less engagement for SCC honors students. The authors chose to focus initially on two of the five items for program improvement. These were items 1k and 3l on the Course Feedback Form which pertain to career plans and goals (see Table 4). These items were given priority because of the important association of career decision and persistence (Sandler, p. 564).

Honors students reported on item 1k of the Course Feedback Form that they discussed career plans with instructors less frequently than the general population reported in the CCSR. While the general population responding to the CCSR included students in career and technical programs, such as

nursing, criminal justice, and computer technology, the honors students' responses were still of concern.

A second item indicating less engagement by honors students according to the CCCSE Course Feedback Form pertained to whether the course helped students develop clearer career goals. Honors students indicated that honors classes were not helping them develop clear career goals to the extent that the general population experienced in their classes. That there were two items pertaining to career plans and goals in which honors students seem less engaged was noteworthy. Because honors courses often provide opportunities for exploration, careers may be an area where SCC honors could work to improve engagement. While professors certainly are not the only source of career information, they may find ways to connect their subjects with various disciplines or careers. Students can also be encouraged, perhaps in the honors orientation class, to seek advice from faculty about academic paths and career choices. The Program is also considering a series of one-hour seminars for honors students to spend time with guest speakers from different professional careers.

While the SCC Honors Program will continue to examine a variety of data on honors students and courses, including demographics, course completion rates, grade point averages, retention rates, and graduation rates, the Course Feedback Form is helpful because it addresses the learning occurring in the classroom. In addition, the Course Feedback Form provides a way to compare the honors students' responses with the responses of the general population in the college. The data can also be benchmarked with aggregated data from the state and national levels.

Of course, the data from the Course Feedback Form are student-reported; therefore, the Course Feedback Form results need to be examined in conjunction with the many assessment methods used by faculty and the data collected by the SCC Institutional Research Department. These assessment methods assist in determining student engagement and student success, but they also document the added value of an honors program and provide justification for the budget resources allocated to honors, which is especially important during a difficult economic time.

REFERENCES

Arnspargar, A. (November 2007). Act on fact: Using data to improve student success. Presentation to the Florida Community Colleges, Orlando, FL.

Astin, A.W. (1984). Student involvement: A developmental theory for higher education. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 24,* 297–308.

Astin, A.W. (1993). *What matters in college: Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Astin, A.W. (1999). Involvement in learning revisited: Lessons we have learned. *Journal of College Student Development, 40*, 587–598.

Beck, E. (2003). It's an honor. *Community College Week, 15*, 4–5.

Bulakowski, C. and Townsend, K. (1995). Evaluation of a community college honor program: Problems and possibilities. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 6,* 485–99. Abstract obtained from The H.H. Wilson Company/Wilson Web, 1995, Abstract No. 199530503789001.

Boulard, G. (2003, January 6). The honorable thing to do? *Community College Week, 15,* 6–9.

Bushong, S. (2009, January 23). Community-College Enrollments Are Up, but Institutions Struggle to Pay for Them. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 55,* A24.

Chickering, A.W. and Gamson, Z.F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin, 39*, 3–7.

Chickering, A.W. and Gamson, Z.F. (1999). Development and adaptations of the seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *New Directions for Teaching & Learning, 80,* 75–81.

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (2004b). *Institutional Report 2004.* Austin: TX. University of Texas at Austin.

Community College Survey of Student Engagement (2006d). *Why focus on student engagement?* Retrieved 4/9/06 from <http://www.ccsse.org/aboutccsse/engage.cfm>.

Evelyn, J. (2002, October 4). An elite vision. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 49,* A31–32.

Hu, S., and Kuh, G.D. (2002). Being (Dis)engaged in educational purposeful activities: The influences of student and institutional characteristics. *Research in Higher Education, 43,* 555–575.

Kane, H. (2001). Honors programs: A case study of transfer preparation. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 114,* 25–38.

Kuh, G.D. (2003). *The National Survey of Student Engagement: Conceptual framework and overview of psychometric properties*. Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research and Planning. Retrieved 2/18/06 from <http://www.nsse.iub.edu/pdf/conceptual_framework.2003.pdf>.

Lanier, G.W. (2008). Towards reliable honors assessment. *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council, 9,* 81–149.

Long, E.C.J and Lange, S. (2002). An exploratory study: A comparison of Honors & non-honors students. *The National Honors Report*, *23*, 20–30.

Marklein, M. B. (2003, June 10). Two-year schools aim high. *USA Today,* p. 10.

Marti, C.N. (2004). Overview of the CCSSE instrument and psychometric properties. Community College Survey of Student Engagement website.

Retrieved 1/29/05 from <http://www.ccsse.org/aboutsurvey/psychometrics.pdf>.

Marti, C.N. (2009). Dimensions of student engagement in American community colleges: Using the Community College Student Report in research and practice. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 33,* 1–24.

McClenney, K.M. (2007). The Community College Survey of Student Engagement. *Community College Review, 35,* 137–146.

Oiumet, J.A. (Nov-Dec 2001). Assessment measures: The community college survey of student engagement. *Assessment Update, 13*, 8–9.

Otero, R. and Spurrier, R. (2005). *Assessing and evaluating honors programs and honors colleges: A practical handbook.* Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, National Collegiate Honors Council.

Outcalt, C. (1999). The importance of community college honors programs. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 108,* 59–68.

Pace, C.R. (1984). *Measuring the quality of college student experiences*. Los Angeles: University of California, Higher Education Research Institute.

Pascarella, E.T. and Terenzini, P.T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sandler, M.E. (2000). Career decision-making, self-efficacy, perceived stress, and an integrated model of student persistence: A structural model of finances, attitudes, behavior and career development. *Research in Higher Education, 41,* 537–582.

Selingo, J. (2002, May 31). Mission creep? *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 48,* A19–21.

Whipple, W. (2003). Using assessment properly. *The National Honors Report, 23,* 41.

****

The authors may be contacted at

RossL@scc-fl.edu.

APPENDIX

MEAN SCORES TO DETERMINE IF HONORS STUDENTS IN SUMMER, FALL, AND SPRING TERMS WERE SIMILAR AS A GROUP

ANOVA results of CCCSE Course Feedback Form mean scores between Summer, Fall and Spring results for Honors students.

CCSR 2005–2007	Course Feedback Form	Question	*F* Test
College Activities: Academic, Intellectual and Social Experiences			
1. In your experiences *with this class* during the current semester, how often did you do the following?			
4a	1a	Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussion	.310*
4b	1b	Made a class presentation	.000
4c	1c	Prepared two or more drafts of an assignment b4 turning it in	.002
4d	1d	Worked on papers that require integrating ideas or information. . . .	.003
4f	1e	Worked with other students on projects during class	.002
4g	1f	Worked with classmates outside of class to complete the assignment.	.004
4i	1g	Participated in a community-based project as part of your coursework	.020
4j	1h	Used the internet to work on an assignment	.000
4k	1i	Used e-mail to communicate with your instructor	.000
4l	1j	Discussed grades or assignments with your instructor	.200 *
4m	1k	Talked about career plans with your instructor	.339 *
4n	1l	Discussed ideas from your readings or class with your instructor outside of class	.289 *
4p	1m	Worked harder than you thought you could to meet the instructor's standards or expectations	.120 *

* Indicates statistically significant with *p* > .05

CCSR 2005–2007	Course Feed-back Form	Question	*F* Test
College Activities: Academic, Intellectual and Social Experiences			
1. In your experiences *with this class* during the current semester, how often did you do the following?			
4r	1n	Discussed ideas from the readings or class with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)	.010
4u	1o	Skipped class	.016
4o	1p	Received prompt feedback from your instructor about your performance	.267 *

* Indicates statistically significant with *p* > .05

CCSR 2005–2007	Course Feed-back Form	Question	*F* Test
Character of Mental Activities			
2. During this current semester, how much has this course emphasized the following?			
5a	2a	Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and reading so that you can repeat them in pretty much the same form	.000
5c	2c	Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences in new ways	.013
5d	2d	Making judgments about the value or soundness of information, arguments, or methods	.000
5e	2e	Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations	.003
5f	2f	Using information you have read or heard to perform a new skill	.008

* Indicates statistically significant with *p* > .05

CCSR 2005–2007	Course Feed-back Form	Question	F Test
Educational and Personal Growth: Knowledge, Skills and Personal Development			
3. During this current semester, to what extent did this course help you develop in the following areas?			
4a12c	3a	Writing clearly and effectively	.153*
12d	3b	Speaking clearly and effectively	.002
12e	3c	Thinking critically and analytically	.000
12f	3d	Solving numerical problems	.047
12g	3e	Using computing information technology	.557
12h	3f	Working effectively with others	.043
12i	3g	Learning effectively on my own	.048
12j	3h	Understanding myself	.008
12k	3i	Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	.000
12l	3j	Developing a personal code of values and ethics	.045
12m	3k	Contributing to the welfare of the community	.589*
12n	3l	Developing clearer career goals	.555*

* Indicates statistically significant with $p > .05$