NSSE 2016
Engagement Indicators
Lamar University

About Your Engagement Indicators Report

Engagement Indicators: Overview

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 sie less than .3 in magnitude.

-- No significant difference.

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

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

NSSE 2016 Engagement Indicators

Academic Challenge

Lamar University1 Tf TJ61d(4)-5(n n)(2)ca100 Td (0

Academic Challenge: First-year students

Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. Colleges and universities pro mote student learning by challenging and supporting them to engage in various forms of deep learning. Four Engagement Indicators are part of this theme:*Higher-Order Learning, Reflective & Integrative Learning, Learning Strategies,* and *Quantitative Reasoning.* Below and on the next page are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.

Mean Comparisons

Engagement Indicator	Lamar	*Your first-year students compared with*		
		Southwest Public	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2015 & 2016
Higher-Order Learning		**	***	***
Reflective & Integrative Learning		***	***	***
Learning Strategies			***	**
Quantitative Reasoning				

Score Distributions

Academic Challenge: Seniors

Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. Colleges and universities promote student learning by challenging and supporting them to engage in various forms of deep learning. Four Engagement Indicators are part of this theme: *Higher-Order Learning, Reflective & Integrative Learning, Learning Strategies,* and *Quantitative Reasoning.*
Below and on the next page are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.

Mean Comparisons

| | Lamar | Your seniors compared with | | | | | |
| | | Southwest Public | | Carnegie Class | | NSSE 2015 & 2016 | |
Engagement Indicator	Mean	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Higher-Order Learning	41.2	40.4	.06	41.7	-.03	40.9	.03
Reflective & Integrative Learning	35.5	37.6 **	-.16	39.4 ***	-.30	38.7 ***	-.25
Learning Strategies	40.9	40.1	.06	41.2	-.02	39.9	.07
Quantitative Reasoning	31.3	30.1	.07	29.9	.08	30.3	.06

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

Score Distributions

Higher-Order Learning

Reflective & Integrative Learning

Learning Strategies

Quantitative Reasoning

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.

NSSE 2016 Engagement Indicators
## Learning with Peers
Lamar University

Learning with Peers: First-year students

Mean Comparisons

Engagement Indicator		Mean
Collaborative Learning	***	***
Discussions with Diverse Others		

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

p

Performance 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. Orange bars indicate how much **lower** your institution's percentage is from that of the comparison group.

| | Lamar % | Percentage point difference[a] between your FY students and | | |
		Southwest Public	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2015 & 2016
Collaborative Learning				
1e. Asked another student to help you understand course material	46	-8		-5
1f. Explained course material to one or more students	51			
1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	39	-12		
1h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	45		-7	
Discussions with Diverse Others				
Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often" had discussions with...				
8a. People from a race or ethnicity other than your own	72	+1		+1
8b. People from an economic background other than your own	66		-5	-6
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own	61	-8	-5	-7
8d. People with political views other than your own	61	-8	-5	-7

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.

Experiences with Faculty: Seniors

Mean Comparisons

Engagement Indicator

Student-Faculty Interaction   ***

Effective Teaching Practices   *   **   **

Score Distributions

Performance on Indicator Items

Student-Faculty Interaction

Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...   %

3a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member   35

3b. Worked w/faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)   25

3c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class   25

3d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member   30

Effective Teaching Practices

5a. Clearly explained course goals and requirements   76

5b. Taught course sessions in an organized way   73

5c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points   71

5d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress   52

5e. Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments   60

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*

Campus Environment: Seniors

Mean Comparisons

Engagement Indicator

Quality of Interactions 42.4 .07 43.2

Supportive Environment ** 32.0 *

Score Distributions

Performance on Indicator Items

Quality of Interactions

Percentage rating their interactions a 6 or 7 (on a scale from 1="Poor" to 7="Excellent") with... %

13a. Students 59

13b. Academic advisors 63

13c. Faculty 56

13d. Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.) 41

13e. Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.) 44

Supportive Environment

Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much the institution emphasized...

14b. Providing support to help students succeed academically 68

14c. Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.) 65 -2 -4 -2

14d. Encouraging contact among students from diff. backgrounds (soc., racial/eth., relig., etc.) 54 -2 -3 -0

14e. Providing opportunities to be involved socially 61

14f. Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.) 53

14g. Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.) 33 -0 +1

14h. Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.) 46 -12 -2 -10

14i. Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues 40 -4 +0 -4

This page intentionally left blank.

Comparisons with Top 50% and Top 10% Institutions

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

Detailed Statistics: First-Year Students

	Mean	SD[b]	SEM[c]	5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	Deg. of freedom[e]	Mean diff.	Sig.[f]	Effect size[g]
Academic Challenge												
Higher-Order Learning												
Lamar (N = 296)	36.0	14.4	.84	15	25	35	45	60				
Southwest Public	38.3	13.9	.13	15	30	40	50	60	11,656	-2.4	.004	-.169
Carnegie Class	39.2	14.2	.10	15	30	40	50	60	18,626	-3.2	.000	-.227
NSSE 2015 & 2016	38.8	13.7	.04	20	30	40	50	60	127,904	-2.8	.000	-.205
Top 50%	40.5	13.6	.06	20	30	40	50	60	60,178	-4.6	.000	-.335
Top 10%	42.7	13.7	.12	20	35	40	55	60	13,043	-6.7	.000	-.490
Reflective & Integrative Learning												
Lamar (N = 308)	31.9	12.9	.73	11	23	31	40	57				
Southwest Public	34.9	12.6	.12	17	26	34	43	60	12,206	-3.0	.000	-.239
Carnegie Class	36.3	12.8	.09	17	29	37	46	60	19,515	-4.3	.000	-.340
NSSE 2015 & 2016	35.6	12.5	.03	17	26	34	43	60	133,777	-3.7	.000	-.296
Top 50%	37.4	12.5	.05	17	29	37	46	60	63,260	-5.5	.000	-.438
Top 10%	39.5	12.8	.12	20	31	40	49	60	12,284	-7.6	.000	-.596
Learning Strategies												
Lamar (N = 253)	36.1	15.7	.98	13	27	33	47	60				
Southwest Public	38.1	14.3	.14	13	27	40	47	60	262	-1.9	.055	-.134
Carnegie Class	40.3	14.5	.11	20	27	40	53	60	259	-4.1	.000	-.284
NSSE 2015 & 2016	39.2	14.1	.04	20	27	40	53	60	253	-3.0	.002	-.215

NSSE 2016 Engagement Indicators
Detailed Statistics[a]
Lamar University

Detailed Statistics: First-Year Students

	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												
SD Lamar (N = 299)	18.4	14.9	.86	0	5	15	25	50				
Southwest Public	20.9	15.2	.14	0	10	20	30	50	11,902	-2.4	.007	-.158
Carnegie Class	19.4	15.0	.11	0	10	15	30	50	19,034	-1.0	.253	-.067
NSSE 2015 & 2016	20.5	14.7	.04	0	10	20	30	50	130,612	-2.0	.016	-.139

Detailed Statistics: Seniors

	Mean	SD [b]	SEM [c]		5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	Deg. of freedom [e]	Mean diff.	Sig. [f]	Effect size [g]
Academic Challenge													

NSSE 2016 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												