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## About This Report

## About Your Engagement Indicators Report

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 themes as shown at right.

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

## Report sections

Overview (p. 3)

Theme Reports (pp. 4-13)

Comparisons with High-
Performing Institutions (p. 15)

Displays how average EI scores for your first-year and senior students compare with those of students at your comparison group institutions.

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.
Summary of Indicator Items
Responses to each item in a given EI are displayed for your institution and comparison groups.
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 current-year participating institutions.

Detailed information about EI score means, distributions, and tests of statistical significance.

Detailed Statistics (pp. 16-19)

## Interpreting comparisons

Mean comparisons report both statistical significance and effect size. Effect size indicates the practical importance of an observed difference. An effect size of .2 is generally considered small, .5 medium, and .8 large. Comparisons with an effect size of at least .3 in magnitude (before rounding) are highlighted in the Overview.

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 Institutional Report Builder 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 indicates responses at the top of the scale on every item.

For more information on EIs and their psychometric properties, refer to the NSSE Web site: nsse.iub.edu
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## Overview

University of South Carolina Columbia

## 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 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 ( $\mathrm{p}<.05$ ) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.
$\Delta$ Your students' average was significantly higher ( $\mathrm{p}<.05$ ) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
-- No significant difference.
$\nabla$ Your students' average was significantly lower ( $\mathrm{p}<.05$ ) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
$\nabla$ Your students' average was significantly lower ( $\mathrm{p}<.05$ ) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.

| First-Year (FY) Students |  | Your FY students compared with | Your FY students compared with | Your FY students compared with |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Theme | Engagement Indicator | Southeast Public | Carnegie Class | NSSE 2013 |
| AcademicChallenge | Higher-Order Learning | -- | -- | -- |
|  | Reflective and Integrative Learning | -- | -- | -- |
|  | Learning Strategies | -- | $\triangle$ | -- |
|  | Quantitative Reasoning | -- | -- | -- |
| Learning with Peers | Collaborative Learning | -- | $\nabla$ | -- |
|  | Discussions with Diverse Others | -- | -- | -- |
| Experiences with Faculty | Student-Faculty Interaction | -- | -- | -- |
|  | Effective Teaching Practices | -- | - | -- |
| Campus | Quality of Interactions | $\nabla$ | -- | $\nabla$ |
| Environment | Supportive Environment | -- | -- | -- |


| Seniors Theme | Engagement Indicator | Your seniors compared with Southeast Public | Your seniors compared with Carnegie Class | Your seniors compared with NSSE 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Higher-Order Learning | $\nabla$ | -- | $\nabla$ |
| Academic | Reflective and Integrative Learning | -- | -- | -- |
| Challenge | Learning Strategies | $\nabla$ | -- | -- |
|  | Quantitative Reasoning | -- | -- | -- |
| Learning with | Collaborative Learning | -- | -- | $\Delta$ |
| Peers | Discussions with Diverse Others | -- | - | $\Delta$ |
| Experiences | Student-Faculty Interaction | -- | $\Delta$ | $\Delta$ |
| with Faculty | Effective Teaching Practices | -- | $\Delta$ | -- |
| Campus | Quality of Interactions | $\nabla$ | -- | $\nabla$ |
| Environment | Supportive Environment | -- | $\Delta$ | $\Delta$ |
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## Academic Challenge

University of South Carolina Columbia

## Academic Challenge: First-year students

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

| Mean Comparisons | USC | Your first-year students compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Southeast Public |  | Carnegie Class |  | NSSE 2013 |  |
|  |  |  | Effect |  | Effect |  | Effect |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean | Mean | size | Mean | size | Mean | size |
| Higher-Order Learning | 37.4 | 39.2 | -. 13 | 38.5 | -. 08 | 39.1 | -. 12 |
| Reflective \& Integrative Learning | 35.4 | 35.2 | . 02 | 34.6 | . 07 | 35.7 | -. 02 |
| Learning Strategies | 40.1 | 40.4 | -. 02 | 38.2 * | . 13 | 39.8 | . 02 |
| Quantitative Reasoning | 28.6 | 28.0 | . 04 | 28.4 | . 01 | 27.3 | . 08 |

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

## Score Distributions
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## Academic Challenge: First-year students (continued)

## Summary of Indicator Items

| Higher-Order Learning | USC | Southeast Public | Carnegie Class | NSSE 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much coursework emphasized... | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 4b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations | 76 | 74 | 76 | 74 |
| 4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts | 69 | 72 | 72 | 73 |
| 4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source | 63 | 69 | 65 | 70 |
| 4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information | 61 | 68 | 66 | 69 |
| Reflective \& Integrative Learning |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... |  |  |  |  |
| 2a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments | 56 | 54 | 55 | 56 |
| 2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues | 55 | 50 | 50 | 53 |
| 2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments | 51 | 49 | 46 | 51 |
| 2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue | 61 | 63 | 60 | 63 |
| 2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective | 62 | 66 | 63 | 66 |
| 2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept | 63 | 63 | 64 | 66 |
| 2 g . Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge | 76 | 76 | 77 | 78 |
| Learning Strategies |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... |  |  |  |  |
| 9a. Identified key information from reading assignments | 84 | 81 | 78 | 81 |
| 9b. Reviewed your notes after class | 63 | 68 | 62 | 66 |
| 9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials | 66 | 66 | 60 | 64 |
| Quantitative Reasoning |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... |  |  |  |  |
| 6a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.) | 53 | 54 | 55 | 51 |
| 6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.) | 40 | 39 | 39 | 38 |
| 6 c . Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information | 43 | 38 | 39 | 37 |
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## 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

| ean Comparisons | USC | Your first-year students compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Southeast Public |  | Carnegie Class |  | NSSE 2013 |  |
|  |  |  | Effect |  | Effect |  | Effect |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean | Mean | size | Mean | size | Mean | size |
| Higher-Order Learning | 38.6 | 41.3 *** | -. 19 | 39.5 | -. 06 | 41.3 | -. 19 |
| Reflective \& Integrative Learning | 37.9 | 38.3 | -. 03 | 37.5 | . 04 | 38.9 | -. 07 |
| Learning Strategies | 39.2 | 41.7 ** | -. 17 | 38.4 | . 05 | 40.7 | -. 10 |
| Quantitative Reasoning | 29.7 | 30.4 | -. 04 | 30.6 | -. 05 | 29.7 | . 00 |

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

## Score Distributions
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## Academic Challenge <br> University of South Carolina Columbia

## Academic Challenge: Seniors (continued)

## Summary of Indicator Items

| Higher-Order Learning | USC | Southeast Public | Carnegi Class | NSSE 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much coursework emphasized... | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 4b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations | 75 | 81 | 78 | 80 |
| 4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts | 73 | 77 | 75 | 78 |
| 4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source | 67 | 71 | 64 | 72 |
| 4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information | 66 | 71 | 67 | 73 |
| Reflective \& Integrative Learning |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... |  |  |  |  |
| 2a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments | 70 | 71 | 72 | 71 |
| 2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues | 62 | 62 | 59 | 64 |
| 2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments | 58 | 52 | 49 | 56 |
| 2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue | 66 | 65 | 61 | 67 |
| 2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective | 69 | 69 | 66 | 70 |
| 2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept | 64 | 68 | 68 | 70 |
| 2 g . Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge | 81 | 83 | 83 | 84 |
| Learning Strategies |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... |  |  |  |  |
| 9a. Identified key information from reading assignments | 83 | 84 | 80 | 84 |
| 9b. Reviewed your notes after class | 58 | 68 | 58 | 65 |
| 9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials | 62 | 68 | 60 | 66 |
| Quantitative Reasoning |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... |  |  |  |  |
| 6a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.) | 52 | 56 | 57 | 54 |
| 6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.) | 44 | 45 | 45 | 44 |
| 6 c . Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information | 45 | 45 | 46 | 44 |
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## Learning with Peers
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## 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

| ean Comparisons | USC | Your first-year students compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Southeast Public |  | Carnegie Class |  | NSSE 2013 |  |
|  |  |  | Effect |  | Effect |  | Effect |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean | Mean | size | Mean | size | Mean | size |
| Collaborative Learning | 31.2 | 32.1 | -. 06 | 33.5 ** | -. 16 | 31.4 | -. 02 |
| Discussions with Diverse Others | 42.3 | 41.3 | . 06 | 41.5 | . 05 | 40.7 | . 10 |

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

## 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.

## Summary of Indicator Items

| Collaborative Learning | USC | Southeast Public | Carnegi Class | NSSE 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 1e. Asked another student to help you understand course material | 49 | 49 | 55 | 48 |
| 1f. Explained course material to one or more students | 59 | 58 | 61 | 56 |
| 1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students | 50 | 49 | 53 | 48 |
| 1h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments | 44 | 49 | 52 | 50 |
| 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 | 70 | 72 | 70 | 71 |
| 8b. People from an economic background other than your own | 75 | 74 | 74 | 73 |
| 8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own | 71 | 68 | 72 | 68 |
| 8d. People with political views other than your own | 76 | 71 | 72 | 70 |
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## Learning with Peers

University of South Carolina Columbia

## Learning with Peers: Seniors

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 | USC | Your seniors compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Southeast Public |  | Carnegie Class |  | NSSE 2013 |  |
|  |  | Mean | Effect size | Mean | Effect size | Mean | Effect size |
| Collaborative Learning | 33.6 | 33.0 | . 04 | 33.2 | . 02 | 31.7 | . 13 |
| Discussions with Diverse Others | 44.5 | 42.9 | . 10 | 42.1 | . 15 | 41.8 | . 17 |

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

## 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.

## Summary of Indicator Items
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## Experiences with Faculty: First-year students

Students learn firsthand how experts think about and solve problems by interacting with faculty members inside and outside of instructional settings. As a result, faculty become role models, mentors, and guides for lifelong learning. In addition, effective teaching requires that faculty deliver course material and provide feedback in student-centered ways. Two Engagement Indicators investigate this theme: Student-Faculty Interaction and Effective Teaching Practices. Below are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.

Mean Comparisons

| and | USC | Your first-year students compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Southeast Public |  | Carnegie Class |  | NSSE 2013 |  |
|  | Mean | Mean | Effect | Mean | Effect | Mean | Effect |
| Student-Faculty Interaction | 19.5 | 19.9 | -. 02 | 19.2 | . 02 | 20.0 | -. 03 |
| Effective Teaching Practices | 40.3 | 40.2 | . 01 | 38.3 ** | . 16 | 40.4 | -. 01 |

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

## 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.

## Summary of Indicator Items

| Student-Faculty Interaction | USC | Carnegie |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... | \% | \% | \% | \% |
| 3a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member | 29 | 32 | 30 | 32 |
| 3b. Worked w/faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.) | 16 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| 3c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class | 20 | 24 | 23 | 24 |
| 3d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member | 25 | 28 | 24 | 28 |
| Effective Teaching Practices |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much instructors have... |  |  |  |  |
| 5 L . Clearly explained course goals and requirements | 85 | 81 | 80 | 82 |
| 5b. Taught course sessions in an organized way | 84 | 79 | 79 | 80 |
| 5c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points | 81 | 78 | 78 | 78 |
| 5d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress | 59 | 64 | 56 | 65 |
| 5e. Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments | 57 | 61 | 56 | 63 |
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## Experiences with Faculty

University of South Carolina Columbia

## Experiences with Faculty: Seniors

Students learn firsthand how experts think about and solve problems by interacting with faculty members inside and outside of instructional settings. As a result, faculty become role models, mentors, and guides for lifelong learning. In addition, effective teaching requires that faculty deliver course material and provide feedback in student-centered ways. Two Engagement Indicators investigate this theme: Student-Faculty Interaction and Effective Teaching Practices. Below are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.

Mean Comparisons

| Your seniors compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southeast Public |  | Carnegie Class |  | NSSE 2013 |  |
| Mean | Effect size | Mean | Effect size | Mean | Effect size |
| 24.3 | . 09 | $22.1{ }^{* * *}$ | . 24 | 23.2 ** | . 16 |
| 41.5 | -. 04 | 39.1 ** | . 14 | 41.1 | -. 01 |

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

## 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.

## Summary of Indicator Items
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## Campus Environment <br> University of South Carolina Columbia

## Campus Environment: First-year students

Students benefit and are more satisfied in supportive settings that cultivate positive relationships among students, faculty, and staff. Two Engagement Indicators investigate this theme: Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment. Below are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.

| Mean Comparisons | USC | Your first-year students compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Southeast Public |  | Carnegie Class |  | NSSE 2013 |  |
|  |  |  | Effect |  | Effect |  | Effect |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean | Mean | size | Mean | size | Mean | size |
| Quality of Interactions | 39.3 | 41.0 * | -. 13 | 41.0 | -. 14 | 41.7 ** | -. 19 |
| Supportive Environment | 38.3 | 38.0 | . 02 | 37.4 | . 07 | 37.2 | . 08 |

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

## 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.
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## Campus Environment <br> University of South Carolina Columbia

## Campus Environment: Seniors

Students benefit and are more satisfied in supportive settings that cultivate positive relationships among students, faculty, and staff. Two Engagement Indicators investigate this theme: Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment. Below are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.

| Mean Comparisons | USC | Your seniors compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Southeast Public |  | Carnegie Class |  | NSSE 2013 |  |
|  |  |  | Effect |  | Effect |  | Effect |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean | Mean | size | Mean | size | Mean | size |
| Quality of Interactions | 40.5 | 42.4 ** | -. 16 | 41.2 | -. 06 | 42.8 | -. 19 |
| Supportive Environment | 36.0 | 34.5 | . 10 | 32.9 | . 22 | 33.0 | . 20 |

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

## 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.
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# NSSE 2013 Engagement Indicators 

## Comparisons with High-Performing Institutions University of South Carolina Columbia

## Comparisons with Top 50\% and Top 10\% Institutions

The results below compare the engagement of your first-year and senior students with those attending two groups of institutions identified by NSSE for their high average levels of student engagement:
(a) institutions with average scores placing them in the top $50 \%$ of all current-year NSSE institutions, and
(b) institutions with average scores placing them in the top $10 \%$ of all current-year NSSE institutions.

While the average scores for most institutions are below the mean for the top $50 \%$ or top $10 \%$, your institution may show areas of distinction where your average student was as engaged as (or even more engaged than) the typical student at high-performing institutions. A check mark $(\checkmark)$ signifies those comparisons where your average score was at least comparable to that of the highperforming group. However, the absence of a significant difference between your score and that of the high-performing group does not mean that your institution was a member of that group.

It should be noted that most of the variability in student engagement is within, not between, institutions. Even "high-performing" institutions have students with engagement levels below the average for all institutions.

| First-Year Students |  | USC Mean | Your first-year students compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Theme | Engagement Indicator |  | NSSE 2013 Top 50\% |  |  | NSSE 2013 Top 10\% |  |  |
|  |  |  | Mean | Effect size | $\checkmark$ | Mean | Effect size | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Higher-Order Learning | 37.4 | 40.9 *** | -. 25 |  | 42.7 *** | -. 39 |  |
| Academic | Reflective and Integrative Learning | 35.4 | 37.6 ** | -. 17 |  | 39.4 *** | -. 32 |  |
| Challenge | Learning Strategies | 40.1 | 41.9 * | -. 13 |  | 44.3 *** | -. 30 |  |
|  | Quantitative Reasoning | 28.6 | 28.8 | -. 01 | $\checkmark$ | 30.6 | -. 12 | $\checkmark$ |
| Learning | Collaborative Learning | 31.2 | $34.5{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 24 |  | 37.1 *** | -. 43 |  |
| with Peers | Discussions with Diverse Others | 42.3 | 43.2 | -. 06 | $\checkmark$ | 45.7 *** | -. 22 |  |
| Experiences | Student-Faculty Interaction | 19.5 | $23.4{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 26 |  | $26.7{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 44 |  |
| with Faculty | Effective Teaching Practices | 40.3 | 42.8 *** | -. 19 |  | 44.7 *** | -. 32 |  |
| Campus | Quality of Interactions | 39.3 | 44.3 *** | -. 43 |  | 46.3 *** | -. 57 |  |
| Environment | Supportive Environment | 38.3 | 39.6 | -. 10 | $\checkmark$ | 41.4 *** | -. 24 |  |
| Seniors |  | usc | Your seniors compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NSSE 2013 Top 50\% |  | NSSE 2013 Top 10\% |  |  |
| Theme | Engagement Indicator |  |  | Mean | Effect size | $\checkmark$ | Mean | Effect size | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Higher-Order Learning | 38.6 | 43.5 *** | -. 36 |  | 45.3 *** | -. 49 |  |
| Academic | Reflective and Integrative Learning | 37.9 | $41.1{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 25 |  | 43.1 *** | -. 41 |  |
| Challenge | Learning Strategies | 39.2 | 43.2 *** | -. 28 |  | 45.4 *** | -. 44 |  |
|  | Quantitative Reasoning | 29.7 | 31.2 | -. 08 | $\checkmark$ | 32.5 ** | -. 17 |  |
| Learning | Collaborative Learning | 33.6 | 35.0 * | -. 10 |  | 37.5 *** | -. 29 |  |
| with Peers | Discussions with Diverse Others | 44.5 | 44.1 | . 02 | $\checkmark$ | 45.9 | -. 09 | $\checkmark$ |
| Experiences | Student-Faculty Interaction | 25.8 | 29.7 *** | -. 24 |  | 34.6 *** | -. 55 |  |
| with Faculty | Effective Teaching Practices | 41.0 | 43.3 *** | -. 17 |  | 45.3 *** | -. 32 |  |
| Campus | Quality of Interactions | 40.5 | $45.8{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 46 |  | 47.6 *** | -. 62 |  |
| Environment | Supportive Environment | 36.0 | 36.2 | -. 02 | $\checkmark$ | 39.5 *** | -. 27 |  |

[^11]
## Detailed Statistics: First-year students

|  | Mean statistics |  |  | Percentile ${ }^{\text {d }}$ scores |  |  |  |  | Comparison results |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | $S D^{b}$ | SEM ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 5th | 25th | 50th | 75th | 95th | Deg. of freedom ${ }^{e}$ | Mean diff. | Sig. ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effect } \\ \text { size }^{g} \end{gathered}$ |
| Academic Challenge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Higher-Order Learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=254$ ) | 37.4 | 14.0 | . 88 | 15 | 25 | 40 | 45 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 39.2 | 14.3 | . 21 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 5,049 | -1.8 | . 052 | -. 125 |
| Carnegie Class | 38.5 | 13.5 | . 21 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 4,496 | -1.1 | . 225 | -. 078 |
| NSSE 2013 | 39.1 | 13.8 | . 08 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 31,116 | -1.7 | . 050 | -. 123 |
| Top 50\% | 40.9 | 13.6 | . 11 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 14,311 | -3.4 | . 000 | -. 251 |
| Top 10\% | 42.7 | 13.7 | . 24 | 20 | 35 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 3,497 | -5.3 | . 000 | -. 387 |
| Reflective and Integrative Learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=263$ ) | 35.4 | 13.4 | . 83 | 17 | 26 | 34 | 43 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 35.2 | 12.9 | . 18 | 14 | 26 | 34 | 43 | 60 | 5,261 | . 3 | . 749 | . 020 |
| Carnegie Class | 34.6 | 12.3 | . 18 | 17 | 26 | 34 | 43 | 57 | 289 | . 8 | . 337 | . 066 |
| NSSE 2013 | 35.7 | 12.6 | . 07 | 17 | 26 | 34 | 43 | 60 | 266 | -. 3 | . 751 | -. 021 |
| Top 50\% | 37.6 | 12.5 | . 11 | 17 | 29 | 37 | 46 | 60 | 271 | -2.2 | . 010 | -. 174 |
| Top 10\% | 39.4 | 12.5 | . 21 | 20 | 31 | 40 | 49 | 60 | 3,724 | -4.0 | . 000 | -. 317 |
| Learning Strategies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=242$ ) | 40.1 | 13.5 | . 87 | 20 | 33 | 40 | 53 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 40.4 | 14.3 | . 22 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 53 | 60 | 272 | -. 3 | . 715 | -. 023 |
| Carnegie Class | 38.2 | 14.1 | . 23 | 13 | 27 | 40 | 47 | 60 | 275 | 1.9 | . 035 | . 135 |
| NSSE 2013 | 39.8 | 14.2 | . 08 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 53 | 60 | 28,974 | . 3 | . 719 | . 023 |
| Top 50\% | 41.9 | 14.1 | . 13 | 20 | 33 | 40 | 53 | 60 | 252 | -1.8 | . 043 | -. 126 |
| Top 10\% | 44.3 | 14.2 | . 27 | 20 | 33 | 47 | 60 | 60 | 290 | -4.2 | . 000 | -. 299 |
| Quantitative Reasoning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=260$ ) | 28.6 | 17.3 | 1.07 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 28.0 | 16.7 | . 24 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 5,112 | . 6 | . 571 | . 036 |
| Carnegie Class | 28.4 | 15.8 | . 24 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 286 | . 2 | . 835 | . 014 |
| NSSE 2013 | 27.3 | 16.4 | . 09 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 263 | 1.4 | . 206 | . 083 |
| Top 50\% | 28.8 | 16.3 | . 12 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 17,790 | -. 2 | . 845 | -. 012 |
| Top 10\% | 30.6 | 16.1 | . 27 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 293 | -2.0 | . 071 | -. 124 |
| Learning with Peers |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collaborative Learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=269$ ) | 31.2 | 14.2 | . 87 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 32.1 | 14.2 | . 20 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 60 | 5,429 | -. 9 | . 332 | -. 061 |
| Carnegie Class | 33.5 | 13.9 | . 21 | 10 | 25 | 35 | 40 | 60 | 4,818 | -2.3 | . 009 | -. 163 |
| NSSE 2013 | 31.4 | 14.2 | . 08 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 60 | 33,152 | -. 2 | . 775 | -. 018 |
| Top 50\% | 34.5 | 13.7 | . 11 | 15 | 25 | 35 | 45 | 60 | 14,906 | -3.3 | . 000 | -. 237 |
| Top 10\% | 37.1 | 13.6 | . 25 | 15 | 25 | 35 | 45 | 60 | 3,227 | -5.9 | . 000 | -. 431 |
| Discussions with Diverse Others |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=244$ ) | 42.3 | 15.6 | 1.00 | 20 | 30 | 45 | 60 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 41.3 | 16.2 | . 24 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 60 | 60 | 4,666 | 1.0 | . 364 | . 060 |
| Carnegie Class | 41.5 | 15.4 | . 24 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 4,215 | . 8 | . 412 | . 054 |
| NSSE 2013 | 40.7 | 16.0 | . 09 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 29,316 | 1.6 | . 125 | . 098 |
| Top 50\% | 43.2 | 15.4 | . 13 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 60 | 60 | 14,302 | -. 9 | . 361 | -. 059 |
| Top 10\% | 45.7 | 15.0 | . 28 | 20 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 60 | 3,149 | -3.4 | . 001 | -. 225 |
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## Detailed Statistics: First-year students

|  | Mean statistics |  |  | Percentile ${ }^{\text {d }}$ scores |  |  |  |  | Comparison results |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | $S D^{\text {b }}$ | SEM ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 5th | 25th | 50th | 75th | 95th | Deg. of freedom ${ }^{e}$ | Mean diff. | Sig. ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effect } \\ \text { size }^{g} \end{gathered}$ |
| Experiences with Faculty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student-Faculty Interaction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=254$ ) | 19.5 | 14.5 | . 91 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 25 | 50 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 19.9 | 14.7 | . 21 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 50 | 5,151 | -. 3 | . 714 | -. 024 |
| Carnegie Class | 19.2 | 14.0 | . 21 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 25 | 45 | 4,558 | . 3 | . 741 | . 021 |
| NSSE 2013 | 20.0 | 14.5 | . 08 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 50 | 31,735 | -. 5 | . 601 | -. 033 |
| Top 50\% | 23.4 | 15.0 | . 15 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 35 | 55 | 10,283 | -3.9 | . 000 | -. 257 |
| Top 10\% | 26.7 | 16.4 | . 42 | 0 | 15 | 25 | 40 | 60 | 368 | -7.1 | . 000 | -. 440 |
| Effective Teaching Practices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=262$ ) | 40.3 | 11.8 | . 73 | 20 | 32 | 40 | 48 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 40.2 | 13.5 | . 19 | 20 | 32 | 40 | 52 | 60 | 299 | . 1 | . 898 | . 007 |
| Carnegie Class | 38.3 | 12.7 | . 19 | 16 | 28 | 40 | 48 | 60 | 298 | 2.0 | . 008 | . 160 |
| NSSE 2013 | 40.4 | 13.3 | . 07 | 20 | 32 | 40 | 52 | 60 | 266 | -. 1 | . 852 | -. 010 |
| Top 50\% | 42.8 | 13.3 | . 13 | 20 | 35 | 44 | 56 | 60 | 276 | -2.5 | . 001 | -. 189 |
| Top 10\% | 44.7 | 13.8 | . 26 | 20 | 36 | 48 | 60 | 60 | 329 | -4.4 | . 000 | -. 320 |
| Campus Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Interactions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=238$ ) | 39.3 | 13.6 | . 88 | 12 | 33 | 40 | 50 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 41.0 | 12.7 | . 19 | 18 | 34 | 42 | 50 | 60 | 4,498 | -1.7 | . 046 | -. 133 |
| Carnegie Class | 41.0 | 11.9 | . 19 | 20 | 34 | 42 | 50 | 60 | 261 | -1.6 | . 073 | -. 136 |
| NSSE 2013 | 41.7 | 12.5 | . 07 | 18 | 34 | 44 | 50 | 60 | 28,048 | -2.4 | . 003 | -. 191 |
| Top 50\% | 44.3 | 11.6 | . 12 | 22 | 38 | 46 | 53 | 60 | 246 | -5.0 | . 000 | -. 427 |
| Top 10\% | 46.3 | 12.0 | . 23 | 23 | 40 | 48 | 56 | 60 | 272 | -6.9 | . 000 | -. 569 |
| Supportive Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=228$ ) | 38.3 | 12.8 | . 85 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 48 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 38.0 | 14.0 | . 22 | 15 | 28 | 40 | 48 | 60 | 259 | . 3 | . 719 | . 023 |
| Carnegie Class | 37.4 | 13.1 | . 22 | 15 | 28 | 38 | 48 | 60 | 3,874 | . 9 | . 301 | . 071 |
| NSSE 2013 | 37.2 | 14.0 | . 09 | 13 | 28 | 38 | 48 | 60 | 232 | 1.1 | . 192 | . 080 |
| Top 50\% | 39.6 | 13.2 | . 12 | 18 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 12,600 | -1.3 | . 143 | -. 098 |
| Top 10\% | 41.4 | 12.9 | . 26 | 20 | 33 | 43 | 53 | 60 | 2,709 | -3.1 | . 000 | -. 244 |

a. Results weighted by gender and enrollment status (and institutional size for comparison groups).
b. Standard deviation is a measure of the amount the individual scores deviate from the mean of all the scores in the distribution.
c. Standard error of the mean, used to compute a confidence interval (CI) around the sample mean. For example, the $95 \%$ CI is the range of values that is $95 \%$ likely to contain the true population mean, equal to the sample mean $+/-1.96$ * SEM.
d. A percentile is the point in the distribution of student-level EI scores at or below which a given percentage of EI scores fall.
e. Degrees of freedom used to compute the t-tests. Values vary from the total Ns due to weighting and whether equal variances were assumed.
f. Statistical significance represents the probability that the difference between the mean of your institution and that of the comparison group occurred by chance.
g. Effect size is the mean difference divided by the pooled standard deviation.

## Detailed Statistics: Seniors



Academic Challenge
Higher-Order Learning

| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=342$ ) | 38.6 | 14.1 | . 76 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Southeast Public | 41.3 | 14.3 | . 15 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 9,344 | -2.7 | . 001 | -. 186 |
| Carnegie Class | 39.5 | 14.1 | . 16 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 8,495 | -. 9 | . 268 | -. 061 |
| NSSE 2013 | 41.3 | 14.0 | . 06 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 62,310 | -2.7 | . 000 | -. 193 |
| Top 50\% | 43.5 | 13.7 | . 09 | 20 | 35 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 24,313 | -4.9 | . 000 | -. 356 |
| Top 10\% | 45.3 | 13.6 | . 16 | 20 | 40 | 45 | 60 | 60 | 7,347 | -6.6 | . 000 | -. 488 |

Reflective and Integrative Learning

| USC (N = 356) | 37.9 | 13.6 | .72 | 17 | 29 | 37 | 49 | 60 |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Southeast Public | 38.3 | 13.2 | .14 | 17 | 29 | 37 | 49 | 60 | 9,726 | -.4 | .619 |
| Carnegie Class | 37.5 | 13.0 | .14 | 17 | 29 | 37 | 46 | 60 | 8,803 | .5 | .489 |
| NSSE 2013 | 38.9 | 13.0 | .05 | 17 | 29 | 40 | 49 | 60 | 64,701 | -1.0 | .158 |
| Top $50 \%$ | 41.1 | 12.6 | .08 | 20 | 31 | 40 | 51 | 60 | 24,080 | -.075 |  |
| Top 10\% | 43.1 | 12.6 | .16 | 20 | 34 | 43 | 54 | 60 | .000 | -.250 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 6,738 | -5.1 | .000 | -.405 |  |  |

Learning Strategies
USC ( $\mathrm{N}=321$ )

| Southeast Public | 41.7 | 14.7 | .16 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Carnegie Class | 38.4 | 14.8 | .17 |
| NSSE 2013 | 40.7 | 14.7 | .06 |
| Top $50 \%$ | 43.2 | 14.4 | .09 |
| Top $10 \%$ | 45.4 | 14.0 | .15 |


| 20 | 27 | 40 | 53 | 60 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20 | 33 | 40 | 53 | 60 |
| 13 | 27 | 40 | 53 | 60 |
| 13 | 33 | 40 | 53 | 60 |
| 20 | 33 | 40 | 60 | 60 |
| 20 | 40 | 47 | 60 | 60 |


| 8,729 | -2.5 | .003 | -.171 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 7,950 | .8 | .346 | .054 |
| 59,247 | -1.5 | .062 | -.105 |
| 28,360 | -4.0 | .000 | -.277 |
| 8,606 | -6.2 | .000 | -.443 |

Quantitative Reasoning
USC ( $\mathrm{N}=346$ )

| USC $(\mathrm{N}=346)$ | 29.7 | 17.2 | .93 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Southeast Public | 30.4 | 17.5 | .18 |
| Carnegie Class | 30.6 | 17.1 | .19 |
| NSSE 2013 | 29.7 | 17.3 | .07 |
| Top $50 \%$ | 31.2 | 17.2 | .09 |
| Top $10 \%$ | 32.5 | 17.0 | .17 |

Learning with Peers
Collaborative Learning
USC ( $\mathrm{N}=364$ )
Southeast Public
Carnegie Class
NSSE 2013
Top 50\%
Top 10\%

| 33.6 | 13.6 | .71 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33.0 | 14.6 | .15 |
| 33.2 | 14.6 | .16 |
| 31.7 | 14.6 | .06 |
| 35.0 | 13.8 | .09 |
| 37.5 | 13.5 | .21 |


| 15 | 25 | 35 | 40 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 10 | 20 | 30 | 45 |
| 10 | 20 | 35 | 45 |
| 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 |
| 15 | 25 | 35 | 45 |
| 15 | 25 | 40 | 50 |

60

| 60 | 9,911 | .6 | .425 | .043 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 60 | 9,005 | .4 | .650 | .024 |
| 60 | 65,458 | 1.9 | .015 | .128 |
| 60 | 26,772 | -1.4 | .047 | -.105 |
| 60 | 4,360 | -3.9 | .000 | -.291 |

Discussions with Diverse Others
USC ( $\mathrm{N}=325$ )
Southeast Public

| 44.5 | 14.6 | .81 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 42.9 | 16.1 | .17 |
| 42.1 | 15.7 | .18 |
| 41.8 | 16.1 | .07 |
| 44.1 | 15.9 | .09 |
| 45.9 | 15.7 | .16 |


| 20 | 35 | 45 | 60 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 15 | 35 | 45 | 60 |
| 15 | 30 | 40 | 60 |
| 15 | 30 | 40 | 60 |
| 20 | 35 | 45 | 60 |
| 20 | 40 | 50 | 60 |


| 355 | 1.6 | .058 | .099 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 8,025 | 2.4 | .007 | .152 |
| 328 | 2.7 | .001 | .169 |
| 332 | .4 | .637 | .024 |
| 350 | -1.4 | .091 | -.090 |

NSSE
NSSE 2013 Engagement Indicators
national survey of student engagement

Detailed Statistics ${ }^{\text {a }}$
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## Detailed Statistics: Seniors

|  | Mean statistics |  |  | Percentile ${ }^{\text {d }}$ scores |  |  |  |  | Comparison results |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | $S D^{b}$ | SEM ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 5th | 25th | 50th | 75th | 95th | Deg. of freedom ${ }^{e}$ | Mean diff. | Sig. ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effect } \\ \text { size }^{g} \end{gathered}$ |
| Experiences with Faculty |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student-Faculty Interaction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=351$ ) | 25.8 | 16.2 | . 86 | 0 | 15 | 20 | 35 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 24.3 | 16.7 | . 17 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 35 | 60 | 9,531 | 1.5 | . 099 | . 090 |
| Carnegie Class | 22.1 | 15.6 | . 17 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 55 | 8,643 | 3.7 | . 000 | . 239 |
| NSSE 2013 | 23.2 | 16.3 | . 06 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 35 | 55 | 63,475 | 2.6 | . 002 | . 162 |
| Top 50\% | 29.7 | 16.1 | . 14 | 5 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 60 | 13,632 | -3.8 | . 000 | -. 239 |
| Top 10\% | 34.6 | 16.0 | . 40 | 10 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 60 | 1,953 | -8.7 | . 000 | -. 546 |
| Effective Teaching Practices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=351$ ) | 41.0 | 12.3 | . 66 | 20 | 32 | 40 | 52 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 41.5 | 13.9 | . 14 | 16 | 32 | 40 | 52 | 60 | 384 | -. 5 | . 421 | -. 039 |
| Carnegie Class | 39.1 | 13.2 | . 14 | 16 | 32 | 40 | 48 | 60 | 384 | 1.9 | . 006 | . 141 |
| NSSE 2013 | 41.1 | 13.8 | . 05 | 16 | 32 | 40 | 52 | 60 | 355 | -. 1 | . 852 | -. 009 |
| Top 50\% | 43.3 | 13.7 | . 09 | 20 | 36 | 44 | 56 | 60 | 363 | -2.3 | . 001 | -. 168 |
| Top 10\% | 45.3 | 13.5 | . 21 | 20 | 36 | 48 | 60 | 60 | 425 | -4.3 | . 000 | -. 323 |
| Campus Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Interactions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=321$ ) | 40.5 | 11.2 | . 62 | 22 | 33 | 42 | 48 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 42.4 | 12.1 | . 13 | 20 | 35 | 44 | 52 | 60 | 8,504 | -1.9 | . 005 | -. 159 |
| Carnegie Class | 41.2 | 11.5 | . 13 | 20 | 34 | 42 | 50 | 60 | 7,667 | -. 7 | . 306 | -. 058 |
| NSSE 2013 | 42.8 | 11.9 | . 05 | 20 | 36 | 44 | 52 | 60 | 57,129 | -2.3 | . 001 | -. 192 |
| Top 50\% | 45.8 | 11.5 | . 08 | 24 | 40 | 48 | 55 | 60 | 19,229 | -5.3 | . 000 | -. 458 |
| Top 10\% | 47.6 | 11.6 | . 16 | 24 | 42 | 50 | 58 | 60 | 5,777 | -7.1 | . 000 | -. 617 |
| Supportive Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| USC ( $\mathrm{N}=309$ ) | 36.0 | 13.7 | . 78 | 10 | 28 | 38 | 45 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| Southeast Public | 34.5 | 14.5 | . 16 | 10 | 25 | 35 | 45 | 60 | 8,252 | 1.5 | . 076 | . 103 |
| Carnegie Class | 32.9 | 13.8 | . 16 | 10 | 23 | 33 | 43 | 58 | 7,537 | 3.0 | . 000 | . 218 |
| NSSE 2013 | 33.0 | 14.4 | . 06 | 10 | 23 | 33 | 43 | 60 | 56,586 | 2.9 | . 000 | . 202 |
| Top 50\% | 36.2 | 13.7 | . 10 | 13 | 28 | 38 | 45 | 60 | 21,067 | -. 2 | . 787 | -. 015 |
| Top 10\% | 39.5 | 13.0 | . 24 | 18 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 3,302 | -3.5 | . 000 | -. 268 |

a. Results weighted by gender and enrollment status (and institutional size for comparison groups).
b. Standard deviation is a measure of the amount the individual scores deviate from the mean of all the scores in the distribution.
c. Standard error of the mean, used to compute a confidence interval (CI) around the sample mean. For example, the $95 \%$ CI is the range of values that is $95 \%$ likely to contain the true population mean, equal to the sample mean $+/-1.96$ * SEM.
d. A percentile is the point in the distribution of student-level EI scores at or below which a given percentage of EI scores fall.
e. Degrees of freedom used to compute the t-tests. Values vary from the total Ns due to weighting and whether equal variances were assumed.
f. Statistical significance represents the probability that the difference between the mean of your institution and that of the comparison group occurred by chance.
g. Effect size is the mean difference divided by the pooled standard deviation.


[^0]:    2 • NSSE 2013 ENGAGEMENT INDICATORS

[^1]:    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.

[^2]:    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 Web site.

[^3]:    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.

[^4]:    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 Web site.

[^5]:    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 Web site.

[^6]:    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 Web site.

[^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 Web site.

[^8]:    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 Web site.

[^9]:    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 Web site.

[^10]:    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 Web site.

[^11]:    Notes: Precision-weighted means (produced by Hierarchical Linear Modeling) were used to determine the top $50 \%$ and top $10 \%$ institutions for each Engagement Indicator, separately for first-year and senior students. Using this method, Engagement Indicator scores of institutions with relatively large standard errors were adjusted toward the mean of all students, while those with smaller standard errors received smaller corrections. As a result, schools with less stable data-even those with high average scores-may not be among the top scorers. NSSE does not publish the names of the top $50 \%$ and top $10 \%$ institutions because of our commitment not to release institutional results and our policy against ranking institutions.

    Results weighted by gender and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); ${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<.05$, ${ }^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.01,{ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.001$ (2-tailed); Effect size: Mean difference divided by the pooled standard deviation.

