
NSSE 2017
Engagement Indicators
Lamar University

NSSE 2017 Engagement Indicators

About This Report

About Your

Engagement Indicators (EIs) provide a useful summary of the detailed information contained in your students' NSSE responses. By combining responses to related NSSE questions, each EI offers valuable information about a distinct aspect of student engagement. Ten indicators, based on three to eight survey questions each (a total of 47 survey questions), are organized into four broad themes as shown at right.

Report

Theme	Engagement Indicator
<i>Academic Challenge</i>	Higher-Order Learning
	Reflective & Integrative Learning
	Learning Strategies
	Quantitative Reasoning
<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning
	Discussions with Diverse Others
<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Student-Faculty Interaction
	Effective Teaching Practices
<i>Campus Environment</i>	Quality of Interactions
	Supportive Environment

Report Sections

Overview (p. 3)

Displays how average EI scores for your students compare with those of students at your comparison group institutions.

Theme Reports (pp. 4-13)

Detailed views of EI scores within the four themes for your students and those at comparison group institutions. Three views offer varied insights into your EI scores:

Mean Comparisons

Straightforward comparisons of average scores between your students and those at comparison group institutions, with tests of significance and effect sizes (see below).

Score Distributions

Box-and-whisker charts show the variation in scores *within* your institution and comparison groups.

Performance on Indicator Items

Responses to each item in a given EI are summarized for your institution and comparison groups.

Comparisons with High-Performing Institutions (p. 15)

Comparisons of your students' average scores on each EI with those of students at institutions whose average scores were in the top 50% and top 10% of 2016 and 2017 participating institutions.

Interpreting Comparisons

Mean comparisons report both statistical significance and effect size. Effect size indicates the practical importance of an observed difference. For EI comparisons, NSSE research has concluded that an effect size of about .1 may be considered small, .3 medium, and .5 large (Rocconi & Gonyea, 2015). Comparisons with an effect size of at least .3 in magnitude (before rounding) are highlighted in the Overview (p. 3).

EIs vary more among students within an institution than between institutions, like many experiences and outcomes in higher education. As a result, focusing attention on average scores alone amounts to examining the tip of the iceberg. It's equally important to understand how student engagement varies within your institution. Score distributions indicate how EI scores vary among your students and those in your comparison groups. The Report Builder—Institution Version and your *Major Field Report* (both to be released in the fall) offer valuable perspectives on internal variation and help you investigate your students' engagement in depth.

How Engagement Indicators are Computed

Each EI is scored on a 60-point scale. To produce an indicator score, the response set for each item is converted to a 60-point scale (e.g., Never = 0; Sometimes = 20; Often = 40; Very often = 60), and the rescaled items are averaged. Thus a score of zero means a student responded at the bottom of the scale for every item in the EI, while a score of 60 means a student responded at the top of the scale for every item in the EI.

NSSE 2017 Engagement Indicators

Overview

Lamar University

Engagement Indicators: Overview

Engagement Indicators are summary measures based on sets of NSSE questions examining key dimensions of student engagement. The ten indicators are organized within four broad themes: Academic Challenge, Learning with Peers, Experiences with Faculty, and Campus Environment. The tables below compare average scores for your students with those in your comparison groups.

Use the following key:

Your students' average was significantly higher ($p < .05$) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.

Your students' average was significantly higher ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.

-- No significant difference.

Your students' average was significantly lower ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.

Your students' average was significantly lower ($p < .05$) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.

First-Year Students

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Engagement Indicator</i>	Your first-year students compared with Texas Public Peers	Your first-year students compared with Carnegie Class	Your first-year students compared with NSSE 2016 & 2017
	Higher-Order Learning			
<i>Academic Challenge</i>	Reflective & Integrative Learning			
	Learning Strategies	--	--	--
	Quantitative Reasoning	--		
<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning	--	--	--
	Discussions with Diverse Others	--	--	--
<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Student-Faculty Interaction		--	
	Effective Teaching Practices	--	--	--
<i>Campus Environment</i>	Quality of Interactions		--	
	Supportive Environment		--	--


Seniors

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Engagement Indicator</i>	Your seniors compared with Texas Public Peers	Your seniors compared with Carnegie Class	Your seniors compared with NSSE 2016 & 2017
	Higher-Order Learning	--	--	--
<i>Academic Challenge</i>	Reflective & Integrative Learning			
	Learning Strategies	--	--	--
	Quantitative Reasoning	--	--	--
<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning		--	
	Discussions with Diverse Others	--	--	--
<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Student-Faculty Interaction		--	
	Effective Teaching Practices		--	--
<i>Campus Environment</i>	Quality of Interactions	--	--	
	Supportive Environment		--	--

Academic Challenge: First-year students

Mean Comparisons


Engagement Indicator
Higher-Order Learning



*

**

*



1. 2. 3. 4.

1. 2. 3. 4.

1. 2. 3. 4.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8.

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8.


1. 2. 3. 4.

1. 2. 3. 4.

1. 2. 3. 4.


1.

Academic Challenge: Seniors



Academic Challenge: Seniors (continued)

Performance^a



NSSE 2017 Engagement Indicators

Learning with Peers

Lamar University

Learning with Peers: First-year students


Collaborating with others in mastering difficult material and developing interpersonal and social competence prepare students to deal with complex, unscripted problems they will encounter during and after college. Two Engagement Indicators make up this theme: *Collaborative Learning* and *Discussions with Diverse Others*. Below are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.

Mean Comparisons

Engagement Indicator	Lamar Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		Texas Public Peers		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2016 & 2017	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Collaborative Learning	32.3	32.0	.02	30.1	.14	32.2	.01
Discussions with Diverse Others	40.4	42.6	-.14	39.3	.07	39.7	.05

Notes: Results weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); Effect size: Mean difference divided by pooled standard deviation; Symbols on the Overview page are based on effect size and p before rounding; * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ (2-tailed).

Score Distributions



Notes: Each box-and-whiskers chart plots the 5th (bottom of lower bar), 25th (bottom of box), 50th (middle line), 75th (top of box), and 95th (top of upper bar) percentile scores. The dot represents the mean score. Refer to Detailed Statistics for your institution's sample sizes.



Performance^a on Indicator Items



The table below displays how your students responded to each EI item, and the difference, in percentage points, between your students and those of your comparison group. Blue bars indicate how much higher your institution's percentage is from that of the comparison group. Dark red bars indicate how much lower your institution's percentage is from that of the comparison group.

Collaborative Learning	Lamar %	Percentage point difference between your FY students and		
		Texas Public Peers	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2016 & 2017
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
1e. Asked another student to help you understand course material	55	+3	+8	+2
1f. Explained course material to one or more students	58	+0	+6	+1
1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	47	-3	+2	-3
1h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	50	-1	-1	-4
<i>Discussions with Diverse Others</i>				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often" had discussions with...</i>				
8a. People from a race or ethnicity other than your own	73	-7	+2	+2
8b. People from an economic background other than your own	74	-4	+4	+3
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own	66	-6	+1	-1
8d. People with political views other than your own	70	-5	+4	+3



Notes: Refer to your *Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons* report for full distributions and significance tests. Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile included in your *Institutional Report* and available on the NSSE website.

a. Percentage point difference = Institution percentage – Comparison group percentage. Because results are rounded to whole numbers, differences of less than 1 point may or may not display a bar. Small, but nonzero differences may be represented as +0 or -0.





Campus Environment: First-year students




— —

Campus Environment: Seniors

Mean Comparisons

Engagement Indicator

Quality of InteractionsQ



This page intentionally left blank.

Comparisons with Top 50% and Top 10% Institutions

While NSSE's policy is not to rank institutions (see nsse.indiana.edu/html/position_policies.cfm), the results below are designed to compare the engagement of your students with those attending two groups of institutions identified by NSSE^a

nsse.indiana.edu/html/position_policies.cfm

First-Year Students

Higher-Order Learning	***	***
Reflective and Integrative Learning	***	***
Learning Strategies		**
Quantitative Reasoning	***	***
Collaborative Learning	*	***
Discussions with Diverse Others		*
Student-Faculty Interaction	***	***
Effective Teaching Practices	*	***
Quality of Interactions	***	***
Supportive Environment	*	***

Seniors

Higher-Order Learning		*
Reflective and Integrative Learning	***	***
Learning Strategies		***
Quantitative Reasoning		***
Collaborative Learning	***	***
Discussions with Diverse Others		*
Student-Faculty Interaction	***	***
Effective Teaching Practices	***	***
Quality of Interactions		***
Supportive Environment	***	***

Detailed Statistics: First-year students

Mean

Detailed Statistics: Seniors

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD^b</i>	<i>SEM^c</i>	<i>5th</i>	<i>25th</i>	<i>50th</i>	<i>75th</i>	<i>95th</i>	<i>Deg. of freedom^e</i>	<i>Mean diff.</i>	<i>Sig.^f</i>	<i>Effect size^g</i>
Academic Challenge												
Higher-Order Learning												
Lamar (N = 259)	41.1	13.6	.85	20	30	40	55	60				
Texas Public Peers	40.4	13.6	.34	20	30	40	50	60	1,869	.8	.411	.055
Carnegie Class	40.6	14.0	.11	20	30	40	50	60	16,296	.5	.541	.038
NSSE 2016 & 2017	40.0	13.7	.04	20	30	40	50	60	122,755	1.1	.204	.079
Top 50%	41.8	13.5	.06	20	35	40	55	60	48,698	-.7	.398	-.053
Top 10%	43.3	13.4	.11	20	35	40	55	60	14,654	-2.1	.012	-.158
Reflective & Integrative Learning												
Lamar (N = 268)	36.0	13.0	.80	17	26	37	43	60				
Texas Public Peers	38.9	12.3	.30	20	31	40	49	60	1,934	-2.8	.001	-.229
Carnegie Class	38.4	12.7	.10	17	29	37	49	60	16,861	-2.4	.003	-.186

NSSE 2017 Engagement Indicators

Detailed Statistics^a

Lamar University

Detailed Statistics: Seniors

	Mean statistics			Percentile ^d scores					Comparison results			
	Mean	SD ^b	SEM ^c	5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	Deg. of freedom ^e	Mean diff.	Sig. ^f	Effect size ^g
Experiences with Faculty												
Student-Faculty Interaction												
Lamar (N = 264)	21.2	17.9	1.10	0	5	15	35	60				
Texas Public Peers	24.8	16.5	.41	0	10	25	35	60	1,896	-3.6	.001	-.213
Carnegie Class	21.2	16.0	.13	0	10	20	30	55	269	.0	.974	.002
NSSE 2016 & 2017	23.6	15.9	.05	0	10	20	35	55	263	-2.4	.031	-.149
Top 50%	29.2	15.7	.09	5	20	30	40	60	266	-8.0	.000	-.511
Top 10%	33.0	16.0	.24	10	20	30	45	60	287	-11.8	.000	-.732
Effective Teaching Practices												
Lamar (N = 260)	38.6	14.9	.92	8	28	40	48	60				
Texas Public Peers	41.3	13.8	.34	16	32	40	52	60	1,896	-2.7	.004	-.194
Carnegie Class	39.6	14.2	.11	16	30	40	52	60	16,529	-1.0	.262	-.070
NSSE 2016 & 2017	39.6	13.7	.04	16	32	40	52	60	124,150	-1.0	.222	-.076
Top 50%	41.8	13.5	.07	20	32	40	52	60	42,778	-3.2	.000	-.236
Top 10%	43.8	13.4	.15	20	36	44	56	60	8,713	-5.2	.000	-.389
Campus Environment												
Quality of Interactions												
Lamar (N = 203)	43.9	12.9	.90	18	36	44	56	60				
Texas Public Peers	43.5	11.9	.32	20	36	45	52	60	255	.4	.672	.034
Carnegie Class	42.4	12.7	.11	18	34	44	52	60	13,684	1.6	.079	.124
NSSE 2016 & 2017	42.2	12.1	.04	20	35	44	50	60	105,268	1.7	.048	.139
Top 50%	44.8	11.6	.06	23	38	46	54	60	204	-.9	.342	-.074
Top 10%	46.9	12.1	.11	23	40	50	58	60	11,359	-2.9	.001	-.243
Supportive Environment												
Lamar (N = 217)	31.0	15.4	1.04	8	20	30	40	60				
Texas Public Peers	34.7	14.0	.38	10	25	35	45	60	276	-3.7	.001	-.260
Carnegie Class	31.5	14.8	.13	8	20	33	40	60	14,038	-.5	.594	-.036