



# NSSE Results by First Year Housing Status

---

The purpose of this report is to provide [National Survey of Student Engagement](#) (NSSE) results that relate to University Housing's residential learning outcomes for first year students. Results are reported by housing status to compare students who lived on campus their first year to those who lived off campus. While NSSE items are not a direct assessment of learning outcomes, they provide a useful comparison of how responses differ by housing status during students' first year at CSU. Items related to Housing's four learning domains (awareness, connection, learning, and thriving) are included in this report.

Results represent first year student responses from the two most recent general survey administrations (Spring 2016 and 2019) as well as relevant items from 2019 supplemental modules (Inclusiveness & Engagement with Diversity and First Year Experiences and Senior Transitions). National reference group data is provided for overall comparison tables, and includes other large land-grant institutions with an undergraduate enrollment greater than 10,000 who completed the survey in the same year. Results are also provided by structurally underserved identities (first generation, limited income, and racially minoritized); survey years are combined when possible due to small headcounts. CSU's overall NSSE results can be viewed [here](#).

## Key Findings

In general, first year students who live on campus reported higher levels of engagement across items in each of the four domains compared to off-campus students. In terms of diversity-related themes, students with structurally underserved identities reported higher engagement in diversity-related activities, but were less likely to feel part of the CSU community and reported a lower level of institutional emphasis around diversity. These findings are similar to the overall [Inclusiveness & Engagement with Diversity](#) module results.

In the awareness domain, on campus students were more likely to engage with students with identities different from their own, and to agree that engagement across identities was emphasized by the institution compared to off-campus students. Students with structurally underserved identities were more likely to be engaged with diverse others, and incorporate diverse perspectives in their learning compared to students with dominant identities. However, they were less likely to report institutional emphasis around diversity. In general, on-campus students reported a higher level of engagement in the awareness domain compared to off campus students with the same identity.

In the connection domain, on campus students were more likely to engage in activities related to diversity and feel part of the campus community, and to report a higher quality of interaction with others on campus (students, faculty, staff, etc.) compared to off campus students. Structurally underserved students were less likely to feel like part of the campus community and reported a lower quality of interaction with others. Ratings were generally higher among on-campus students compared to off-campus students with the same identity.

In the learning domain, on campus students reported a similar or lower frequency of using learning strategies, slightly less difficulty with time management, and were more likely to seek help with coursework. Across identities, structurally underserved students reported using learning strategies at a similar level compared to students with dominant identities, but levels were similar or lower compared to off campus students with the same identity. Few differences were observed between identities (first gen versus continuing gen, Pell versus non-Pell, etc.) for on-campus students in regards to institutional emphasis for learning support; on campus students generally felt more supported compared to off campus students with the same identity. On campus

structurally underserved students reported more difficulty with time management compared to non-underserved students and off campus students with the same identity, but were more likely to seek help with coursework.

In the thriving domain, on campus students felt more institutional support for their well-being, were more likely to finish something they started when encountering challenges, and just as likely to stay positive when faced with a poor grade compared to off campus students. On campus structurally undeserved students felt less supported in their well-being compared to non-underserved students, and were less likely to stay positive when they did poorly on an assignment. However, they generally felt more supported compared to off campus students with the same identity.

## Respondent Demographics

Table 1 displays respondent demographics by housing status and NSSE survey year.

**Table 1: NSSE Respondent Demographics by Survey Year and Housing Status**

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	Off Campus	On Campus	Off Campus	On Campus
Headcount	153	1585	155	1718
Percent	8.8%	91.2%	8.3%	91.7%
% First Gen	29.1%	25.9%	25.8%	21.8%
% Racially Minoritized	24.8%	23.2%	19.4%	26.8%
% Pell	21.2%	22.9%	27.7%	22.2%
% Female	55.6%	62.0%	47.1%	64.8%
% Resident	79.7%	66.9%	76.1%	63.5%
Avg HS GPA	3.62	3.68	3.60	3.75

Almost 9% of first year survey respondents in Spring 2016 lived off campus. These students were more likely to be first generation (3 PP), racially minoritized (2 PP), and residents (13 PP) compared to on-campus respondents. They were slightly less likely to be Pell recipients (2 PP) and female (6 PP), with a slightly lower high school GPA.

About 8% of survey respondents in Spring 2019 lived off campus. They were more likely to be first gen (4 PP), Pell recipients (6 PP), and residents (13 PP) compared to on-campus respondents, and less likely to be racially minoritized (7 PP) and female (18 PP). Average high school GPA was lower by .15 grade points.

## Awareness Domain

The overarching goal of the awareness domain is to develop an awareness of the personal, social, and educational advantages of a diversity of views and learn from others with different identities to encourage community engagement. The intent of engaging in awareness strategies is to enable students to contribute to the development of an inclusive community.

Table 2 compares the proportion of students who had regular discussions with others from backgrounds different from their own by housing status, as well as the national reference average. Tables 3 through 5 display results by structurally underserved identity, and survey years are combined due to low headcounts for off-campus students.

**Table 2: During the current school year, about how often have you had discussions with people from the following groups? (% Often/Very Often)**

	NSSE Year					
	2016			2019		
	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	153	1,585	13,636	155	1,718	15,103
Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	54.4%	70.6%	72.5%	66.2%	68.9%	69.3%
Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own	61.5%	74.2%	74.0%	68.3%	76.2%	73.3%
Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	64.0%	74.1%	71.3%	67.6%	74.1%	68.2%
Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	66.2%	73.0%	71.7%	64.7%	69.0%	68.8%

Across both survey years, on-campus respondents were more likely to have discussions with people of a different race/ethnicity, economic background, religious beliefs, and political views compared to first-year off campus students. Differences by housing status were larger in 2016; on-campus students were more likely to engage with diverse others by 7-16 percentage points (PP) across items; in 2019, this difference was between 3 and 8 PP. Compared to the reference group, on-campus students were similar to or slightly above the national reference group in 2016 and 2019; off-campus students were below the national reference group for both years.

Table 3 compares on and off-campus respondents by racially minoritized (RM) and non-racially minoritized (non-RM) status.

**Table 3: During the current school year, about how often have you had discussions with people from the following groups? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	240	68	2475	828
Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	57.1%	72.4%	67.1%	77.3%
Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own	65.3%	63.8%	74.4%	77.5%
Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	66.4%	63.8%	73.8%	74.9%
Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	67.3%	58.6%	71.6%	69.1%

On-campus RM students were more likely to engage in discussions with others across all identities with the exception of different political views compared to on-campus non-RM students. Both on-campus RM and non-RM students were more likely to engage in discussions across groups compared to their off-campus counterparts. Off-campus RM students were less likely to engage with others compared to off-campus non-RM students, with the exception of people of a different race or ethnicity. Regardless of housing status, RM students were at least 10 PP more likely to engage in discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than their own compared to non-RM students.

Table 4 compares on and off-campus respondents by Pell and non-Pell status.

**Table 4: During the current school year, about how often have you had discussions with people from the following groups? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	231	75	2558	745
Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	60.6%	59.1%	67.7%	76.3%
Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own	66.2%	60.6%	74.0%	79.3%
Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	67.8%	59.1%	73.2%	77.1%
Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	66.3%	62.1%	70.5%	72.5%

On-campus Pell recipients were more likely to have discussions across each group compared to on-campus, non-Pell students. Off-campus Pell students were less likely to have discussions compared to off-campus non-Pell students. Both on-campus Pell and non-Pell students were more likely to engage in discussions across groups compared to their off-campus counterparts.

Table 5 displays results by first gen status.

**Table 5: During the current school year, about how often have you had discussions with people from the following groups? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Cont Gen	FG	Cont Gen	FG
Headcount	222	84	2517	786
Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	56.9%	68.4%	68.5%	73.5%
Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own	63.1%	69.2%	74.8%	76.6%
Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	64.1%	69.6%	74.6%	72.6%
Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	64.6%	67.1%	70.9%	70.9%

On-campus first gen students reported a similar or higher frequency of discussions with diverse others, with the exception of those with different religious beliefs. Off-campus first gen students were more likely to engage in discussions across all groups. Both on-campus first gen and non-first gen students were more likely to engage in discussions across groups compared to their off-campus counterparts.

Table 6 displays overall institutional emphasis around diversity by housing status, including the national reference group. These items are from the 2019 Inclusiveness & Engagement with Diversity supplemental module, and the national reference data represent large doctoral granting universities that have a similar IPEDS’ undergraduate profile and setting. Tables 7 through 9 display item results by structurally underserved attributes; it is important to note that headcounts are small for each attribute, and results should be interpreted with caution.

**Table 6: How much does your institution emphasize the following? (% quite a bit/very much)**

	2019		
	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	155	1718	7,172
Institutional emphasis: Demonstrating a commitment to diversity (2019 Only)	77.5%	77.1%	68.4%
Institutional emphasis: Providing students with the resources needed for success in a multicultural world (2019 Only)	70.3%	74.5%	64.8%

	2019		
	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Institutional emphasis: Creating an overall sense of community among students (2019 Only)	72.7%	78.9%	71.9%

On-campus students were more likely to agree that CSU emphasizes providing students with resources to succeed in a multicultural world and creating an overall sense of community among students, with a similar level of agreement for demonstrating a commitment to diversity compared to off campus students. Both groups had higher levels of agreement compared to the national reference group.

Table 7 displays results by racially minoritized status.

**Table 7: How much does your institution emphasize the following? (% quite a bit/very much)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	125	30	1258	460
Institutional emphasis: Demonstrating a commitment to diversity (2019 Only)	80.0%	66.7%	78.3%	74.0%
Institutional emphasis: Providing students with the resources needed for success in a multicultural world (2019 Only)	73.1%	58.3%	75.7%	71.4%
Institutional emphasis: Creating an overall sense of community among students (2019 Only)	74.0%	66.7%	80.2%	75.4%

Both on-campus and off-campus RM students reported lower institutional emphasis for each item compared to non-RM students. The gap between RM and non-RM was smaller among on-campus students (4-5 PP per item) versus off-campus students (7-15 PP). On-campus RM students reported a higher level of emphasis compared to off-campus RM students.

Table 8 displays results by Pell recipient status.

**Table 8: How much does your institution emphasize the following? (% quite a bit/very much)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	112	43	1336	382
Institutional emphasis: Demonstrating a commitment to diversity (2019 Only)	80.2%	69.7%	77.4%	76.1%
Institutional emphasis: Providing students with the resources needed for success in a multicultural world (2019 Only)	71.6%	66.7%	74.2%	75.8%
Institutional emphasis: Creating an overall sense of community among students (2019 Only)	74.7%	66.7%	79.1%	78.3%

On-campus Pell recipients reported similar levels of institutional emphasis around diversity compared to on-campus non-Pell recipients. Off-campus Pell recipients reported lower levels of emphasis compared to off-campus non-Pell recipients. On-campus Pell recipients reported higher levels of emphasis compared to off-campus Pell recipients.

Table 9 displays results by first gen status.

**Table 9: How much does your institution emphasize the following? (% quite a bit/very much)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Cont Gen	FG	Cont Gen	FG
Headcount	115	40	1343	375
Institutional emphasis: Demonstrating a commitment to diversity (2019 Only)	82.7%	61.3%	78.2%	73.5%
Institutional emphasis: Providing students with the resources needed for success in a multicultural world (2019 Only)	73.2%	61.3%	75.1%	72.5%
Institutional emphasis: Creating an overall sense of community among students (2019 Only)	73.2%	71.0%	80.4%	73.6%

Both on-campus and off-campus first gen students reported lower levels of institutional emphasis around diversity compared to continuing gen students with the same housing status. On-campus first-gen students reported higher levels of emphasis across items compared to off-campus first gen students; on campus continuing gen students reported higher levels of emphasis with the exception of demonstrating a commitment to diversity.

Tables 10 displays overall results for items related to incorporating other worldviews both in and outside the classroom by survey year and housing status. Tables 11 through 13 combine survey years and display results by attribute group.

**Table 10: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	NSSE Year					
	2016			2019		
	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	153	1585	13,636	155	1718	15,103
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	45.8%	54.0%	46.6%	54.3%	54.8%	48.1%
Tried to better understand someone else	67.8%	70.4%	65.2%	79.7%	77.0%	68.7%
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	56.3%	59.0%	50.3%	55.0%	58.7%	49.3%

In 2016, on-campus students were more likely to include diverse perspectives in coursework, try to understand others, and connect their learning to broader societal issues compared to off-campus students and the national reference group. In 2019, on-campus students reported a similar level of including diverse perspectives, a lower level of understanding, and a slightly higher level of connecting learning to societal problems. Both on and off-campus students reported doing these activities at a higher level compared to the national reference level.

Table 11 displays results by racially minoritized status.

**Table 11: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	240	68	2475	828
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	52.2%	42.9%	53.9%	55.7%
Tried to better understand someone else	74.2%	72.6%	73.0%	76.3%
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	53.7%	62.5%	58.7%	59.3%

On-campus RM students were slightly more likely to engage in these activities compared to on-campus non-RM students, and more likely to include diverse perspectives in coursework and understanding others compared to off-campus RM students. On-campus, non-RM students reported similar frequency of including diverse perspectives and trying to better understand others, and a slightly higher frequency of connecting learning to societal problems compared to off-campus non-RM students.

Table 12 displays results by Pell recipient status.

**Table 12: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	231	75	2558	745
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	52.1%	45.2%	53.7%	56.8%
Tried to better understand someone else	72.5%	77.8%	73.3%	75.6%
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	58.0%	49.3%	58.1%	61.4%

On-campus Pell recipients were slightly more likely to engage in each activity compared to on-campus non-Pell recipients; this gap is between 2-3 PP. On-campus Pell recipients were also more likely to include diverse perspectives in their learning and connect learning to societal problems compared to off-campus Pell recipients, and slightly less likely to try to better understand others. On-campus non-Pell recipients reported a similar level of engagement compared to off-campus non-Pell students.

Table 13 displays results by first gen status.

**Table 13: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Cont Gen	FG	Cont Gen	FG
Headcount	222	84	2517	786
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	51.7%	47.0%	54.0%	55.5%
Tried to better understand someone else	71.6%	79.3%	74.1%	73.2%
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	57.1%	52.4%	58.3%	60.4%

On-campus FG students reported similar levels of engagement compared to on-campus continuing gen students. They were more likely to include diverse perspectives in coursework and connect learning to societal problems compared to off-campus FG students, and less likely to try to better understand others (6 PP). On-campus continuing gen students reported higher levels of engagement across items compared to off-campus continuing gen students.

Table 14 displays overall results by survey year and housing status for items related to institutional emphasis for encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds, and attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues. Tables 15 through 17 combine survey years and display item results by attribute.

**Table 14: How much does your institution emphasize the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	NSSE Year					
	2016			2019		
	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	153	1585	13,636	155	1718	15,103
Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	54.3%	64.0%	59.5%	60.7%	66.2%	60.6%
Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	49.2%	58.4%	52.6%	42.2%	51.5%	47.8%

Across both survey years, on-campus students reported a higher level of institutional emphasis compared to off-campus students for both items. On-campus respondents also exceeded the national reference average for both survey years.

Table 15 displays results by racially minoritized status.

**Table 15: How much does your institution emphasize the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	240	68	2475	828
Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	59.0%	51.9%	65.4%	64.4%
Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	48.8%	33.9%	54.8%	55.0%

On-campus RM students reported a similar level of institutional emphasis compared to on-campus non-RM students; off-campus RM students reported lower levels for both items. Both RM and non-RM on-campus students reported a higher level of emphasis compared to their off-campus counterparts.

Table 16 displays results by Pell recipient status.

**Table 16: How much does your institution emphasize the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	231	75	2558	745
Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	58.1%	55.7%	65.5%	64.0%
Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	47.1%	41.7%	54.2%	56.9%

On-campus Pell students reported a similar level of institutional emphasis around encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds, and a slightly higher level of emphasis for attending events compared to on-campus non-Pell students. Compared to off-campus Pell recipients, on-campus Pell recipients reported a higher level of emphasis for both items. This is also true for on-campus non-Pell compared to off-campus non-Pell recipients.

Table 17 displays results by first gen status.



**Table 17: How much does your institution emphasize the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Cont Gen	FG	Cont Gen	FG
Headcount	222	84	2517	786
Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	57.1%	58.7%	65.4%	64.2%
Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	46.3%	44.7%	54.5%	56.0%

Both on and off-campus first gen students reported similar levels of institutional emphasis compared to continuing gen students with the same housing status. Both first gen and continuing gen students reported a higher level of emphasis compared to their off-campus counterparts.

## Connection Domain

Connection describes the development of cooperative and mutually beneficial relationships with others; residents who intentionally engage in their community will develop a sense of belonging at CSU. The following NSSE items reflect students’ overall sense of community, engagement in diversity-related activities and organizations, and quality of interactions with others on campus.

Table 18 displays the overall proportion of students by housing status who reported feeling like part of the CSU community, and levels of engagement in diversity-related events and organizations. These items are included in the 2019 Inclusiveness & Engagement with Diversity supplemental module.

**Table 18: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	NSSE Year		
	2019		
	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	155	1718	7,145
Agree/Disagree: I feel like part of the community at this institution (2019 Only)	65.6%	83.9%	81.4%
Attended events, activities, or presentations that reflect an appreciation for diverse groups of people (2019 Only)	24.2%	38.1%	38.7%
Participated in the activities of centers related to specific groups (racial-ethnic, cultural, religious, gender, LGBT, etc.) (2019 Only)	15.6%	22.9%	23.8%
Participated in a diversity-related club or organization (2019 Only)	15.0%	18.7%	18.6%
Participated in a demonstration for a diversity-related cause (rally, protest, etc.) (2019 Only)	10.9%	11.7%	11.0%

On-campus students were much more likely to agree that they felt like a part of the CSU community compared to off-campus students (18 PP) and the national reference group (3 PP). On-campus students were also more likely to attend diversity-related activities and participate in events compared to off-campus students. Compared to the reference group, on-campus students participated at about the same level.

Table 19 displays results by RM status.

**Table 19: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	125	30	1258	460
Agree/Disagree: I feel like part of the community at this institution (2019 Only)	68.3%	54.2%	85.1%	80.6%
Attended events, activities, or presentations that reflect an appreciation for diverse groups of people (2019 Only)	23.1%	29.2%	35.3%	45.7%
Participated in the activities of centers related to specific groups (racial-ethnic, cultural, religious, gender, LGBT, etc.) (2019 Only)	17.3%	8.3%	20.2%	30.2%
Participated in a diversity-related club or organization (2019 Only)	16.5%	8.3%	14.3%	30.7%
Participated in a demonstration for a diversity-related cause (rally, protest, etc.) (2019 Only)	10.6%	12.5%	10.1%	16.0%

On campus RM students were more likely to participate in diversity-related events compared any other group, but less likely to feel like a part of the community compared to on campus non-RM students. Off campus RM students were also less likely to feel like part of the community compared to off campus non-RM students. While they were more likely to attend events or activities that reflect an appreciation for diverse groups, they were less likely to participate in activities related to specific groups or diversity-related clubs or organizations.

Table 20 displays results by Pell recipient status.

**Table 20: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	112	43	1336	382
Agree/Disagree: I feel like part of the community at this institution (2019 Only)	68.4%	57.6%	84.4%	82.2%
Attended events, activities, or presentations that reflect an appreciation for diverse groups of people (2019 Only)	27.4%	15.2%	36.1%	45.0%
Participated in the activities of centers related to specific groups (racial-ethnic, cultural, religious, gender, LGBT, etc.) (2019 Only)	16.8%	12.1%	21.5%	27.6%
Participated in a diversity-related club or organization (2019 Only)	17.0%	9.1%	17.3%	23.5%
Participated in a demonstration for a diversity-related cause (rally, protest, etc.) (2019 Only)	12.6%	6.1%	10.4%	15.9%

On campus Pell recipients were slightly less likely to feel like a part of the CSU community (2 PP), but more likely to participate in diversity-related activities, events, student organizations, and demonstrations compared to all other groups. Off campus Pell recipients were less likely to feel like part of the community (11 PP), and less likely to participate compared to off-campus non-Pell recipients.

Table 21 displays results by first gen status.

**Table 21: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Cont Gen	FG	Cont Gen	FG
Headcount	115	40	1343	375
Agree/Disagree: I feel like part of the community at this institution (2019 Only)	64.9%	67.7%	85.1%	79.8%
Attended events, activities, or presentations that reflect an appreciation for diverse groups of people (2019 Only)	26.8%	16.1%	37.6%	40.1%
Participated in the activities of centers related to specific groups (racial-ethnic, cultural, religious, gender, LGBT, etc.) (2019 Only)	18.6%	6.5%	22.0%	25.9%
Participated in a diversity-related club or organization (2019 Only)	19.8%	0.0%	17.6%	22.6%
Participated in a demonstration for a diversity-related cause (rally, protest, etc.) (2019 Only)	11.3%	9.7%	10.8%	14.9%

Similar to other underserved identities, on campus FG students were less likely to feel like part of the community compared to on-campus continuing gen students (5 PP), and more involved in diversity-related activities, clubs, and events. Conversely, off campus first gen students were slightly more likely to feel like part of the community, and were less involved in activities compared to off campus continuing gen students. Both continuing gen and first gen students who lived on campus were more likely to feel part of the community and engage in activities compared to their off-campus counterparts.

Table 22 displays results for overall quality of interactions with others on campus by housing status compared to the national reference group. Tables 23 through 25 combine survey years and display results by structurally underserved identities.

**Table 22: Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution: (% Good/Very Good/Excellent)**

	NSSE Year					
	2016			2019		
	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	153	1585	13,636	155	1718	15,103
Quality of interactions with students	75.0%	84.0%	81.8%	73.5%	83.3%	81.4%
Quality of interactions with academic advisors	79.5%	80.6%	70.0%	62.5%	80.3%	74.4%
Quality of interactions with faculty	74.2%	74.1%	71.5%	77.5%	81.3%	75.7%
Quality of interactions with student services staff	61.9%	72.8%	63.1%	70.2%	75.9%	67.5%
Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	64.8%	66.7%	56.9%	75.9%	74.3%	62.1%

In 2016, on campus students reported a higher quality of interactions with other students and student services staff, and a similar quality with academic advisors, faculty, and other administrative staff and offices compared to off-campus students. In 2019, on campus students were more likely to report high-quality interactions compared to off campus students across all groups except other administrative staff and offices, for which ratings were similar. Across both survey years, on campus students exceeded the national reference group average.

Table 23 displays results by racially minoritized status.

**Table 23: Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution: (% Good/Very Good/Excellent)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	240	68	2475	828
Quality of interactions with students	75.8%	68.4%	85.0%	79.8%
Quality of interactions with academic advisors	76.0%	61.5%	79.6%	82.9%
Quality of interactions with faculty	78.5%	66.1%	79.2%	73.7%
Quality of interactions with student services staff	64.3%	71.4%	74.1%	75.1%
Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	69.1%	73.6%	70.9%	69.9%

On-campus RM students reported a lower quality of interactions with other students and faculty, and a slightly higher quality with academic advisors, and a similar level with student services staff and other administrative staff and offices compared to on campus non-RM students. Off campus RM students reported a lower quality of interactions across all groups except student services staff and other administrative staff. On campus RM and non-RM students reported a higher quality of interaction with others across most groups compared to their off-campus counterparts.

Table 24 displays results by Pell recipient status.

**Table 24: Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution: (% Good/Very Good/Excellent)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	231	75	2558	745
Quality of interactions with students	75.2%	72.1%	85.5%	77.5%
Quality of interactions with academic advisors	77.1%	60.0%	78.5%	86.0%
Quality of interactions with faculty	75.6%	76.3%	78.5%	75.3%
Quality of interactions with student services staff	63.1%	76.2%	74.9%	72.7%
Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	68.5%	75.0%	71.5%	68.0%

Compared to on-campus non-Pell recipients, on-campus Pell recipients reported a lower quality of interaction across all groups, with the exception of academic advisors. Off campus Pell recipients reported a lower quality of interaction with students and academic advisors, similar quality with faculty, and a higher quality of interactions with student services staff and other administrative staff. While on campus non-Pell students reported higher quality of interactions compared to off-campus non-Pell students across all groups, on campus Pell students reported a higher quality for two of the five (other students and academic advisors) compared to off campus Pell students.

Table 25 displays results by first generation status.

**Table 25: Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution: (% Good/Very Good/Excellent)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Cont Gen	FG	Cont Gen	FG
Headcount	222	84	2517	786
Quality of interactions with students	74.7%	74.0%	85.0%	79.4%
Quality of interactions with academic advisors	73.8%	71.4%	79.0%	84.5%
Quality of interactions with faculty	79.5%	66.7%	78.7%	75.0%
Quality of interactions with student services staff	68.3%	60.0%	75.1%	72.1%
Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	74.7%	59.5%	72.0%	66.4%

On-campus first gen students’ results are similar to on campus Pell recipients, in that they rate interactions with academic advisors more positively compared to on-campus continuing gen students, but rate all other groups less positively. However, they are more likely to positively rate their interactions with each group compared to off campus FG students.

## Learning Domain

Learning describes the ability to apply knowledge and skills to real world problems. Through engaging in learning strategies as defined by the residential learning curriculum, students will be able to develop academic skills to support their classroom experience. Domain outcomes focus on time management skills, knowledge of TILT resources, and how to become involved in service-learning and civic engagement.

Table 26 displays overall results for time management among first-year students who responded to the 2019 First Year Experiences and Senior Transitions supplemental module. Tables 27 through 29 display results by structurally underserved attributes.

**Table 26: During the current school year, how difficult has it been to manage your time? (% Difficult/Very difficult)**

	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	155	1718	7,610
How difficult: Managing your time (2019 Only)	58.8%	56.1%	57.3%

On-campus students were slightly less likely to rate time management as difficult compared to off campus students and students nationally.

Table 27 displays results by racially minoritized status.

**Table 27: During the current school year, how difficult has it been to manage your time? (% Difficult/Very difficult)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	125	30	1258	460
How difficult: Managing your time (2019 Only)	59.4%	56.0%	54.2%	61.3%

On campus RM students were more likely to express difficulty with managing their time compared to on campus non-RM students (7 PP); off campus RM students were less likely to rate time management as difficult compared to off campus non-RM students (3 PP). Across groups, on campus RM students were the most likely to express difficulty with time management.

Table 28 displays results by Pell recipient status.

**Table 28: During the current school year, how difficult has it been to manage your time? (% Difficult/Very difficult)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	112	43	1336	382
How difficult: Managing your time (2019 Only)	60.2%	54.5%	53.8%	63.8%

On campus Pell students were more likely to struggle with time management compared to on campus non-Pell recipients as well as off campus students, both Pell and non-Pell. Compared to off campus non-Pell recipients, on campus non-Pell recipients were less likely to struggle with time management.

Table 29 displays results by first gen status.

**Table 29: During the current school year, how difficult has it been to manage your time? (% Difficult/Very difficult)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Cont Gen	FG	Cont Gen	FG
Headcount	115	40	1343	375
How difficult: Managing your time (2019 Only)	58.2%	60.6%	54.3%	62.4%

On campus first gen students were more likely to struggle with time management compared to any other group; off campus first gen students also reported slightly more difficulty compared to off campus continuing gen students. The gap between on campus continuing and first gen students is larger (8 PP) compared to the gap between off campus first and continuing gen students (2 PP).

Table 30 displays overall results from the 2019 First Year Experiences and Senior Transitions Survey related to academic help-seeking by housing status. Tables 35 through 37 display results by structurally underserved attribute.

**Table 30: During the current school year, about how often have you sought help with coursework from the following sources? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	155	1718	7,604
Sought help from: Learning support services (tutoring, writing center, success coaching, etc.) (2019 Only)	19.1%	25.7%	24.9%
Sought help from: Academic advisors (2019 Only)	16.0%	19.6%	16.8%
Sought help from: Faculty members (2019 Only)	24.4%	27.5%	28.1%

On campus students were more likely to seek help from learning support services, academic advisors, and faculty members compared to off campus students. Help-seeking behavior was similar for on campus students compared to the national reference group for learning support services and faculty members, and higher for academic advisors.

Table 31 displays results by RM status.

**Table 31: During the current school year, about how often have you sought help with coursework from the following sources? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	125	30	1258	460
Sought help from: Learning support services (tutoring, writing center, success coaching, etc.) (2019 Only)	17.0%	28.0%	24.0%	30.1%
Sought help from: Academic advisors (2019 Only)	15.1%	20.0%	18.6%	22.6%
Sought help from: Faculty members (2019 Only)	21.7%	36.0%	26.9%	29.0%

RM students were more likely to seek help from each of the listed sources compared to non-RM students, regardless of housing status. On campus RM students were slightly more likely to seek help from learning support services and academic advisors compared to off campus RM students, and less likely to seek help from faculty members. On campus non-RM students were more likely to engage in help seeking compared to off campus non-RM students.

Table 32 displays results by Pell recipient status.

**Table 32: During the current school year, about how often have you sought help with coursework from the following sources? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	112	43	1336	382
Sought help from: Learning support services (tutoring, writing center, success coaching, etc.) (2019 Only)	20.4%	15.2%	24.6%	29.3%
Sought help from: Academic advisors (2019 Only)	16.3%	15.2%	17.8%	26.0%
Sought help from: Faculty members (2019 Only)	25.5%	21.2%	26.1%	32.1%

On campus Pell recipients were more likely to seek help from on campus resources compared to all other groups; off campus Pell recipients were less likely to seek help compared to off campus non-Pell students. On-campus non-Pell recipients were slightly more likely to seek help compared to off campus non-Pell students.

Table 37 displays results by first gen status.

**Table 26: During the current school year, about how often have you sought help with coursework from the following sources? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	CG	FG	CG	FG
Headcount	115	40	1343	375
Sought help from: Learning support services (tutoring, writing center, success coaching, etc.) (2019 Only)	17.3%	24.2%	26.5%	22.6%
Sought help from: Academic advisors (2019 Only)	12.2%	27.3%	18.9%	22.3%
Sought help from: Faculty members (2019 Only)	24.5%	24.2%	27.3%	28.0%

On campus first gen students were less likely to seek help from learning support services compared to on campus continuing gen students, but more likely to seek help from academic advisors. Help-seeking from faculty members was roughly the same for both groups. Off campus first gen students were more likely to seek help

from learning support services and academic advisors compared to off campus continuing gen students, and equally likely to seek help from faculty members.

Table 38 displays results from the 2016 and 2019 general NSSE survey related to learning strategies; tables 39 through 41 display combined year results by structurally underserved attribute.

**Table 27: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	NSSE Year					
	2016			2019		
	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	153	1585	13,636	155	1718	15,103
Identified key information from reading assignments	74.3%	77.1%	76.1%	77.0%	77.5%	72.6%
Reviewed your notes after class	62.5%	63.9%	63.5%	71.7%	64.5%	64.4%
Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	55.1%	60.0%	60.1%	64.0%	60.8%	61.6%

In 2016, on campus students were more likely to report identifying key information from reading assignments, reviewing notes after class, and summarizing what they learned compared to off campus students; rates were similar to the national reference group. In 2019, results were similar (identifying key information) or lower (reviewing notes, summarizing material) compared to off campus students. Compared to students nationally, results were similar (reviewing notes, summarizing material) or lower (identifying key information).

Table 39 displays results by racially minoritized status.

**Table 28: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	240	68	2475	828
Identified key information from reading assignments	74.2%	81.0%	77.4%	76.9%
Reviewed your notes after class	64.4%	77.6%	63.8%	65.4%
Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	59.4%	60.3%	60.6%	59.8%

On campus RM students reported using each learning strategy at a similar level compared to on campus non-RM students. Among off campus students, RM students were more likely to identify key information from reading and review notes after class. On campus RM students were less likely to report identifying key information and reviewing notes after class compared to off campus RM students. Compared to off campus non-RM students, on campus non-RM students were more likely to identify key information, and reported similar engagement with the remaining strategies.

Table 40 displays results by Pell recipient status.

**Table 29: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	231	75	2558	745
Identified key information from reading assignments	74.0%	80.3%	76.6%	79.7%
Reviewed your notes after class	67.6%	65.2%	63.7%	66.0%
Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	61.5%	54.5%	59.7%	62.8%



On campus Pell students were slightly more likely to report using each learning strategy compared to on campus non-Pell students. They reported engaging in strategies at a similar level compared to off campus Pell students, with the exception of summarizing learning (on campus Pell was 8 PP higher).

Table 41 displays results by first gen status.

**Table 30: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Cont Gen	FG	Cont Gen	FG
Headcount	222	84	2517	786
Identified key information from reading assignments	73.8%	79.7%	77.0%	78.1%
Reviewed your notes after class	64.9%	72.2%	64.3%	63.8%
Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	57.9%	64.6%	60.8%	59.2%

On campus first gen students reported similar levels of learning strategy engagement compared to on campus continuing gen students, and lower levels of engagement compared to off campus first gen students. On campus continuing gen students reported similar (reviewing notes) or slightly higher levels of engagement (identifying key information, summarizing what you learned) compared to off campus continuing gen students.

Table 42 displays overall results from the general 2016 and 2019 NSSE survey for items that assess institutional emphasis for a supportive learning environment. Tables 43 through 45 combine survey years and display results by structurally underserved attributes.

**Table 31: How much does your institution emphasize the following: (% Quite a bit/very much)**

	NSSE Year					
	2016			2019		
	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	153	1585	13,636	155	1718	15,103
Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	80.6%	80.7%	78.9%	71.1%	80.4%	79.7%
Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically	77.0%	82.4%	78.8%	74.1%	80.5%	74.7%
Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	43.4%	50.3%	43.0%	34.6%	47.2%	41.2%

In 2016, on campus students reported a similar level of institutional emphasis for using learning support services, and higher levels of emphasis for providing support to help students succeed and manage non-academic responsibilities. In 2019, on campus students reported higher levels of emphasis across all items. Across both survey years, on campus students reported higher emphasis across items compared to the national reference group.

Table 43 displays results by racially minoritized status.

**Table 32: How much does your institution emphasize the following: (% Quite a bit/very much)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	240	68	2475	828
Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	76.9%	71.4%	80.5%	80.8%
Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically	75.4%	75.9%	81.6%	80.7%
Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	38.3%	41.1%	48.4%	49.5%

Minimal differences exist between RM and non-RM students on campus; however, on campus RM students reported a higher level of emphasis across items compared to off campus RM students. Off campus RM students reported a lower level of emphasis for using learning support services, a similar level for providing support to help students succeed, and a slightly higher level of emphasis for helping students manage non-academic responsibilities compared to off campus non-RM students.

Table 44 displays results by Pell recipient status.

**Table 33: How much does your institution emphasize the following: (% Quite a bit/very much)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	231	75	2558	745
Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	75.7%	75.4%	80.1%	82.2%
Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically	75.9%	75.4%	80.9%	83.0%
Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	40.0%	36.1%	49.4%	46.5%

On campus Pell students reported a slightly higher level of institutional emphasis for using learning support services and providing support for academic success, and a lower level of support for managing non-academic responsibilities compared to on campus non-Pell students. This pattern also held for off campus Pell students. On campus Pell recipients reported a higher level of institutional emphasis compared to off campus Pell recipients.

Table 45 displays results by first gen status.

**Table 34: How much does your institution emphasize the following: (% Quite a bit/very much)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Cont Gen	FG	Cont Gen	FG
Headcount	222	84	2517	786
Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	74.6%	78.4%	81.2%	78.8%
Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically	74.9%	78.1%	81.9%	79.9%
Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	37.1%	44.0%	48.3%	49.9%

On campus first gen students reported a slightly lower level of emphasis around using learning support services and providing support for academic success, and slightly higher emphasis for managing other responsibilities. On

campus first gen and off campus first gen students rated the first two items similarly, while on campus first gen students reported a higher level of support for managing non-academic responsibilities.

## Thriving Domain

The Thriving domain aims to support students in their development of positive well-being. Through utilizing well-being campus resources and self-reflecting on their ability to change, students will foster confidence and resilience. Outcomes include identifying Health Network strategies that contribute to positive well-being, engaging in the ‘Rams Fail Forward’ pledge to overcome challenges, and identifying vulnerability as confidence and an opportunity to grow through hardships in community.

Table 46 displays results from the 2016 and 2019 general NSSE survey around institutional support for overall well-being. Tables 47 through 49 display the combined results for this item by each structurally underserved identity.

**Table 35: How much does your institution emphasize the following: (% Quite a bit/very much)**

	NSSE Year					
	2016			2019		
	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl FY	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	153	1585	13,636	155	1718	15,103
Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	66.9%	80.0%	75.2%	64.9%	79.0%	74.7%

In both 2016 and 2019, on campus students reported a higher level of institutional emphasis for supporting their overall well-being compared to off campus students. Their ratings also exceeded the national reference for both years.

Table 47 displays results by RM status.

**Table 36: How much does your institution emphasize the following: (% Quite a bit/very much)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	240	68	2475	828
Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	66.8%	62.5%	80.4%	76.8%

Both on campus and off campus RM students reported lower levels of institutional emphasis for their well-being compared to non-RM students with the same housing status. However, on campus RM students reported a higher level of emphasis compared to off campus RM students; non-RM on campus students also reported a higher level of emphasis compared to non-RM off campus students.

Table 48 displays results by Pell recipient status.

**Table 37: How much does your institution emphasize the following: (% Quite a bit/very much)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	231	75	2558	745
Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	65.8%	65.6%	79.8%	78.4%

While minimal differences exist by Pell status for on campus and off campus students, both on campus Pell and non-Pell students reported a higher level of institutional emphasis compared to their off campus counterparts.

Table 49 displays results by first gen status.

**Table 38: How much does your institution emphasize the following: (% Quite a bit/very much)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Cont Gen	FG	Cont Gen	FG
Headcount	222	84	2517	786
Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	65.8%	65.8%	80.1%	77.7%

On campus first gen students reported a slightly lower level of well-being emphasis compared to on campus continuing gen students, but a higher level compared to off campus first gen students. Off campus students' ratings of institutional well-being emphasis do not differ by first gen status.

Table 50 displays results from the 2019 First Year Experiences and Senior Transitions supplemental module, comparing on and off campus students' responses to growth mindset items. Tables 51 through 53 display results by structurally underserved populations.

**Table 39: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	NSSE Year		
	2019		
	Off Campus	On Campus	Natl Ref
Headcount	155	1718	7,607
Finished something you had started when you encountered challenges (2019 Only)	80.9%	84.4%	82.9%
Stayed positive, even when you did poorly on a test or assignment (2019 Only)	67.9%	67.8%	63.9%

On campus students were more likely to report finishing something they had started when encountering challenges compared to off campus students, and reported a similar frequency of remaining positive when they did poorly on a test or assignment. On campus students responded more positively compared to the national reference average.

Table 51 displays results by racially minoritized status.

**Table 40: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-RM	RM	Non-RM	RM
Headcount	125	30	1258	460
Finished something you had started when you encountered challenges (2019 Only)	82.1%	76.0%	85.7%	80.9%
Stayed positive, even when you did poorly on a test or assignment (2019 Only)	65.1%	80.0%	68.8%	65.1%

On campus RM students reported a lower frequency for both items compared to on campus non-RM students. Compared to off campus RM students, on campus RM students reported a higher frequency of finishing something when encountering challenges, but a much lower level of staying positive when they did poorly on a test or assignment.

Table 52 displays results by Pell recipient status.

**Table 41: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Non-Pell	Pell	Non-Pell	Pell
Headcount	112	43	1336	382
Finished something you had started when you encountered challenges (2019 Only)	82.7%	75.8%	84.7%	83.5%
Stayed positive, even when you did poorly on a test or assignment (2019 Only)	66.3%	72.7%	68.5%	65.6%

On campus Pell recipients reported slightly lower levels of growth mindset behaviors compared to on campus non-Pell recipients. Compared to off campus Pell recipients, on campus Pell recipients were more likely to report finishing something they had started, but less likely to stay positive when receiving a lower grade on a test or assignment. On campus non-Pell recipients were slightly more likely to report these behaviors compared to off campus non-Pell recipients.

Table 53 displays results by first gen status.

**Table 42: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often)**

	Off Campus		On Campus	
	Cont Gen	FG	Cont Gen	FG
Headcount	115	40	1343	375
Finished something you had started when you encountered challenges (2019 Only)	81.6%	78.8%	85.2%	81.7%
Stayed positive, even when you did poorly on a test or assignment (2019 Only)	66.3%	72.7%	68.6%	64.9%

On campus first gen students reported lower levels of growth mindset behaviors compared to continuing gen students. They were more likely to finish something they had started compared to off campus first gen students, but less likely to stay positive when they did poorly on a test or assignment. On campus continuing gen students were slightly more likely to report these behaviors compared to off campus continuing gen students.

## Conclusions

In general, first year students who live on campus reported higher levels of engagement across items in each of the four domains compared to off-campus students. Similar to overall NSSE results, students with structurally underserved identities reported higher engagement in diversity-related activities, but were less likely to feel part of the CSU community and felt less supported by the institution, regardless of housing status. Compared to off

campus students with the same identity, on campus students with underserved identities reported higher levels of engagement and support.