



NSSE 2014

Engagement Indicators

California State University-Chico

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 broad themes as shown at right.

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 first-year and senior 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.
 - Summary of Indicator Items**
Responses to each item in a given EI are displayed 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 2013 and 2014 participating institutions.
- Detailed Statistics (pp. 16-19)** Detailed information about EI score means, distributions, and tests of statistical significance.

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 (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 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

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 ($p < .05$) 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 California State	Your first-year students compared with Carnegie Class	Your first-year students compared with NSSE 2013 & 2014
<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	--	--	--

Seniors

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Engagement Indicator</i>	Your seniors compared with California State	Your seniors compared with Carnegie Class	Your seniors compared with NSSE 2013 & 2014
<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	△	--	--

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

Engagement Indicator	CSU, Chico Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		California State		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2013 & 2014	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Higher-Order Learning	37.9	39.4 *	-.11	39.1	-.09	39.0	-.08
Reflective & Integrative Learning	36.2	35.9	.02	35.6	.04	35.6	.05
Learning Strategies	38.0	38.4	-.03	39.7 *	-.12	39.5	-.10
Quantitative Reasoning	28.0	27.4	.04	27.0	.07	27.4	.04

Notes: Results weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 (2-tailed); Effect size: Mean difference divided by pooled standard deviation; Symbols on the Overview 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. Refer to Detailed Statistics for your institution's sample sizes.

Academic Challenge: First-year students (continued)

Summary of Indicator Items

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
Higher-Order Learning				
<i>Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much coursework emphasized...</i>				
	%	%	%	%
4b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	71 	72 	72 	73 
4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	69 	74 	72 	72 
4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	67 	72 	71 	70 
4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	64 	70 	69 	69 
Reflective & Integrative Learning				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
2a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	57 	56 	55 	56 
2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	54 	53 	53 	53 
2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	55 	51 	51 	50 
2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	63 	63 	63 	63 
2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	67 	69 	67 	66 
2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	68 	67 	65 	65 
2g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	74 	77 	77 	77 
Learning Strategies				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
9a. Identified key information from reading assignments	77 	79 	81 	80 
9b. Reviewed your notes after class	62 	64 	66 	65 
9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	58 	58 	64 	63 
Quantitative Reasoning				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
6a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	50 	51 	50 	52 
6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	39 	38 	38 	38 
6c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	38 	37 	36 	37 

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.

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

Engagement Indicator	CSU, Chico Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		California State		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2013 & 2014	
	Mean	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Higher-Order Learning	40.6	41.2	-.05	41.7 *	-.08	41.2	-.05
Reflective & Integrative Learning	39.3	38.8	.04	39.1	.01	38.9	.03
Learning Strategies	39.2	40.0	-.06	41.0 ***	-.12	40.3 *	-.08
Quantitative Reasoning	30.5	30.7	-.01	29.3 *	.07	29.9	.03

Notes: Results weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 (2-tailed); Effect size: Mean difference divided by pooled standard deviation; Symbols on the Overview 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. Refer to Detailed Statistics for your institution's sample sizes.

Academic Challenge: Seniors (continued)

Summary of Indicator Items

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
Higher-Order Learning				
<i>Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much coursework emphasized...</i>				
	%	%	%	%
4b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	79 	79 	80 	80 
4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	76 	78 	78 	78 
4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	69 	71 	74 	72 
4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	72 	72 	74 	72 
Reflective & Integrative Learning				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
2a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	77 	73 	71 	72 
2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	65 	64 	65 	64 
2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	55 	53 	57 	55 
2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	65 	64 	67 	66 
2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	72 	71 	71 	70 
2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	70 	71 	70 	70 
2g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	84 	83 	84 	84 
Learning Strategies				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
9a. Identified key information from reading assignments	80 	83 	84 	83 
9b. Reviewed your notes after class	62 	63 	66 	63 
9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	61 	62 	67 	66 
Quantitative Reasoning				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
6a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	52 	56 	53 	55 
6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	45 	46 	44 	44 
6c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	45 	46 	43 	44 

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.

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	CSU, Chico Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		California State Mean	Effect size	Carnegie Class Mean	Effect size	NSSE 2013 & 2014 Mean	Effect size
Collaborative Learning	33.8	33.0	.06	31.0 ***	.19	32.0 **	.12
Discussions with Diverse Others	42.2	40.7	.09	40.3 *	.12	40.9	.08

Notes: Results weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 (2-tailed); Effect size: Mean difference divided by pooled standard deviation; Symbols on the Overview 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. Refer to Detailed Statistics for your institution's sample sizes.

Summary of Indicator Items

Collaborative Learning

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

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
1e. Asked another student to help you understand course material	52	53	47	49
1f. Explained course material to one or more students	59	58	54	57
1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	54	49	46	49
1h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	65	57	50	52

Discussions with Diverse Others

Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often" had discussions with...

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
8a. People from a race or ethnicity other than your own	76	76	71	71
8b. People from an economic background other than your own	74	73	72	73
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own	70	68	67	69
8d. People with political views other than your own	69	64	67	69

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.

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

Engagement Indicator	CSU, Chico Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		California State Mean	Effect size	Carnegie Class Mean	Effect size	NSSE 2013 & 2014 Mean	Effect size
Collaborative Learning	35.0	35.0	.00	31.3 ***	.25	32.4 ***	.18
Discussions with Diverse Others	41.9	43.4 **	-.09	41.4	.03	41.8	.01

Notes: Results weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 (2-tailed); Effect size: Mean difference divided by pooled standard deviation; Symbols on the Overview 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. Refer to Detailed Statistics for your institution's sample sizes.

Summary of Indicator Items

Collaborative Learning

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

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
1e. Asked another student to help you understand course material	45	47	38	40
1f. Explained course material to one or more students	67	62	56	58
1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	51	50	43	46
1h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	73	71	62	64

Discussions with Diverse Others

Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often" had discussions with...

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
8a. People from a race or ethnicity other than your own	75	81	73	73
8b. People from an economic background other than your own	76	77	74	75
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own	71	73	69	70
8d. People with political views other than your own	72	69	70	71

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.

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

Engagement Indicator	CSU, Chico Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		California State		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2013 & 2014	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Student-Faculty Interaction	20.1	18.3 *	.12	20.0	.00	20.3	-.02
Effective Teaching Practices	38.0	40.6 ***	-.19	40.7 ***	-.20	40.2 **	-.16

Notes: Results weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 (2-tailed); Effect size: Mean difference divided by pooled standard deviation; Symbols on the Overview 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. Refer to Detailed Statistics for your institution's sample sizes.

Summary of Indicator Items

Student-Faculty Interaction

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

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
3a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member	28	28	32	32
3b. Worked w/faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	22	16	18	19
3c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	26	23	25	25
3d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	28	26	29	29

Effective Teaching Practices

Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much instructors have...

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
5a. Clearly explained course goals and requirements	79	81	81	81
5b. Taught course sessions in an organized way	75	78	79	79
5c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	73	78	77	77
5d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	60	67	67	65
5e. Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	57	64	64	63

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.

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

Engagement Indicator	CSU, Chico Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		California State		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2013 & 2014	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Student-Faculty Interaction	25.4	21.9 ***	.22	23.1 ***	.14	23.7 **	.10
Effective Teaching Practices	40.4	40.5	-.01	41.5 *	-.08	40.9	-.04

Notes: Results weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 (2-tailed); Effect size: Mean difference divided by pooled standard deviation; Symbols on the Overview 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. Refer to Detailed Statistics for your institution's sample sizes.

Summary of Indicator Items

Student-Faculty Interaction

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

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
3a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member	43	36	41	42
3b. Worked w/faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	29	23	25	26
3c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	37	30	32	33
3d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	35	30	33	33

Effective Teaching Practices

Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much instructors have...

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
5a. Clearly explained course goals and requirements	83	83	83	83
5b. Taught course sessions in an organized way	80	79	81	81
5c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	82	80	79	79
5d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	62	61	64	62
5e. Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	63	64	69	67

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.

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

Engagement Indicator	CSU, Chico Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		California State		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2013 & 2014	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Quality of Interactions	41.6	39.0 ***	.19	41.4	.02	41.5	.01
Supportive Environment	36.5	36.5	.00	37.0	-.03	37.3	-.06

Notes: Results weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 (2-tailed); Effect size: Mean difference divided by pooled standard deviation; Symbols on the Overview 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. Refer to Detailed Statistics for your institution's sample sizes.

Summary of Indicator Items

Quality of Interactions

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

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
13a. Students	56	56	59	59
13b. Academic advisors	51	41	48	48
13c. Faculty	49	42	50	50
13d. Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)	45	38	43	43
13e. Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)	42	36	42	41

Supportive Environment

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

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
14b. Providing support to help students succeed academically	74	76	77	78
14c. Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	77	76	78	78
14d. Encouraging contact among students from diff. backgrounds (soc., racial/eth., relig., etc.)	63	62	59	59
14e. Providing opportunities to be involved socially	72	69	71	73
14f. Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	72	72	71	72
14g. Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	44	47	45	44
14h. Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	62	59	65	68
14i. Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	55	48	52	53

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.

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

Engagement Indicator	CSU, Chico Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		California State		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2013 & 2014	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Quality of Interactions	43.7	41.3 ***	.19	42.8 *	.07	42.5 **	.10
Supportive Environment	33.2	32.1 *	.08	32.9	.02	33.3	-.01

Notes: Results weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 (2-tailed); Effect size: Mean difference divided by pooled standard deviation; Symbols on the Overview 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. Refer to Detailed Statistics for your institution's sample sizes.

Summary of Indicator Items

Quality of Interactions

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

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
13a. Students	61	63	64	64
13b. Academic advisors	52	47	53	52
13c. Faculty	61	56	61	60
13d. Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)	47	39	43	42
13e. Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)	44	37	43	42

Supportive Environment

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

	CSU, Chico	California State	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2013 & 2014
14b. Providing support to help students succeed academically	74	69	73	72
14c. Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	64	63	67	67
14d. Encouraging contact among students from diff. backgrounds (soc., racial/eth., relig., etc.)	51	55	54	53
14e. Providing opportunities to be involved socially	67	62	64	66
14f. Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	67	63	61	63
14g. Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	30	31	33	32
14h. Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	53	49	53	57
14i. Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	46	42	45	46

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.

This page intentionally left blank.

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^a for their high average levels of student engagement:

- (a) institutions with average scores placing them in the top 50% of all 2013 and 2014 NSSE institutions, and
- (b) institutions with average scores placing them in the top 10% of all 2013 and 2014 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 (✓) signifies those comparisons where your average score was at least comparable^b to that of the high-performing 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		CSU, Chico	Your first-year students compared with					
			NSSE Top 50%			NSSE Top 10%		
			Mean	Effect size	✓	Mean	Effect size	✓
Theme	Engagement Indicator	Mean	Mean	Effect size	✓	Mean	Effect size	✓
<i>Academic Challenge</i>	Higher-Order Learning	37.9	40.6 ***	-.20		42.7 ***	-.35	
	Reflective and Integrative Learning	36.2	37.3	-.09	✓	39.3 ***	-.25	
	Learning Strategies	38.0	41.2 ***	-.23		43.4 ***	-.39	
	Quantitative Reasoning	28.0	28.8	-.05	✓	30.6 **	-.16	
<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning	33.8	34.7	-.07	✓	37.0 ***	-.24	
	Discussions with Diverse Others	42.2	43.2	-.07	✓	45.6 ***	-.23	
<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Student-Faculty Interaction	20.1	23.3 ***	-.22		26.9 ***	-.43	
	Effective Teaching Practices	38.0	42.4 ***	-.33		44.6 ***	-.49	
<i>Campus Environment</i>	Quality of Interactions	41.6	44.0 ***	-.21		46.0 ***	-.38	
	Supportive Environment	36.5	39.4 ***	-.22		41.4 ***	-.38	

Seniors		CSU, Chico	Your seniors compared with					
			NSSE Top 50%			NSSE Top 10%		
			Mean	Effect size	✓	Mean	Effect size	✓
Theme	Engagement Indicator	Mean	Mean	Effect size	✓	Mean	Effect size	✓
<i>Academic Challenge</i>	Higher-Order Learning	40.6	43.3 ***	-.20		45.3 ***	-.34	
	Reflective and Integrative Learning	39.3	41.1 ***	-.14		43.1 ***	-.30	
	Learning Strategies	39.2	42.5 ***	-.23		44.9 ***	-.40	
	Quantitative Reasoning	30.5	31.3	-.05	✓	33.0 ***	-.15	
<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning	35.0	35.4	-.03	✓	37.7 ***	-.20	
	Discussions with Diverse Others	41.9	44.0 ***	-.13		45.8 ***	-.25	
<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Student-Faculty Interaction	25.4	29.5 ***	-.26		34.4 ***	-.55	
	Effective Teaching Practices	40.4	43.0 ***	-.19		45.1 ***	-.35	
<i>Campus Environment</i>	Quality of Interactions	43.7	45.3 ***	-.14		47.4 ***	-.32	
	Supportive Environment	33.2	36.1 ***	-.21		39.0 ***	-.43	

Note: Results weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); *p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001 (2-tailed); Effect size: Mean difference divided by the pooled standard deviation.

a. Precision-weighted means (produced by Hierarchical Linear Modeling) were used to determine the top 50% and top 10% institutions for each Engagement Indicator from all NSSE 2013 and 2014 institutions, 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.

b. Check marks are assigned to comparisons that are either significant and positive, or non-significant with an effect size > -.10.

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
Academic Challenge												
Higher-Order Learning												
CSU, Chico (N = 396)	37.9	14.1	.71	15	25	40	50	60				
California State	39.4	14.0	.19	15	30	40	50	60	5,817	-1.5	.040	-.107
Carnegie Class	39.1	14.0	.07	15	30	40	50	60	37,224	-1.2	.092	-.085
NSSE 2013 & 2014	39.0	13.8	.04	15	30	40	50	60	122,261	-1.2	.095	-.084
Top 50%	40.6	13.6	.06	20	30	40	50	60	60,757	-2.7	.000	-.198
Top 10%	42.7	13.6	.13	20	35	40	55	60	11,557	-4.8	.000	-.353
Reflective & Integrative Learning												
CSU, Chico (N = 415)	36.2	12.4	.61	17	26	37	43	60				
California State	35.9	12.7	.17	17	26	37	43	60	6,097	.2	.700	.020
Carnegie Class	35.6	12.7	.06	17	26	34	43	60	38,898	.5	.382	.043
NSSE 2013 & 2014	35.6	12.6	.04	17	26	34	43	60	127,603	.6	.352	.046
Top 50%	37.3	12.5	.05	17	29	37	46	60	60,787	-1.2	.061	-.092
Top 10%	39.3	12.6	.11	20	31	40	49	60	13,426	-3.1	.000	-.247
Learning Strategies												
CSU, Chico (N = 350)	38.0	14.3	.76	20	27	40	47	60				
California State	38.4	14.4	.20	13	27	40	47	60	5,373	-.4	.631	-.027
Carnegie Class	39.7	14.2	.08	20	27	40	53	60	34,537	-1.7	.024	-.121
NSSE 2013 & 2014	39.5	14.2	.04	20	27	40	53	60	113,300	-1.5	.051	-.105
Top 50%	41.2	14.0	.06	20	33	40	53	60	53,683	-3.2	.000	-.230
Top 10%	43.4	14.0	.13	20	33	40	60	60	11,646	-5.4	.000	-.387
Quantitative Reasoning												
CSU, Chico (N = 403)	28.0	15.6	.78	0	20	27	40	60				
California State	27.4	16.4	.22	0	20	27	40	60	5,931	.6	.465	.038
Carnegie Class	27.0	16.6	.09	0	13	27	40	60	37,844	1.1	.194	.065
NSSE 2013 & 2014	27.4	16.4	.05	0	20	27	40	60	124,245	.7	.400	.042
Top 50%	28.8	16.3	.06	0	20	27	40	60	77,730	-.7	.358	-.046
Top 10%	30.6	16.2	.12	0	20	27	40	60	18,124	-2.6	.002	-.160
Learning with Peers												
Collaborative Learning												
CSU, Chico (N = 429)	33.8	12.4	.60	15	25	35	40	55				
California State	33.0	13.5	.18	10	20	30	40	60	506	.8	.217	.058
Carnegie Class	31.0	14.3	.07	10	20	30	40	60	441	2.7	.000	.190
NSSE 2013 & 2014	32.0	14.1	.04	10	20	30	40	60	432	1.7	.005	.121
Top 50%	34.7	13.7	.05	15	25	35	45	60	435	-.9	.118	-.069
Top 10%	37.0	13.6	.11	15	25	35	45	60	455	-3.3	.000	-.241
Discussions with Diverse Others												
CSU, Chico (N = 354)	42.2	16.0	.85	20	30	40	60	60				
California State	40.7	16.7	.23	10	30	40	60	60	5,419	1.5	.099	.091
Carnegie Class	40.3	16.3	.09	10	30	40	60	60	34,958	1.9	.029	.116
NSSE 2013 & 2014	40.9	16.0	.05	15	30	40	60	60	114,705	1.3	.129	.081
Top 50%	43.2	15.4	.06	20	35	45	60	60	357	-1.0	.220	-.068
Top 10%	45.6	14.8	.13	20	40	50	60	60	369	-3.4	.000	-.231

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												
CSU, Chico (N = 405)	20.1	14.7	.73	0	10	20	30	50				
California State	18.3	14.6	.20	0	5	15	25	45	5,953	1.7	.021	.119
Carnegie Class	20.0	14.8	.08	0	10	20	30	50	38,022	.0	.957	.003
NSSE 2013 & 2014	20.3	14.6	.04	0	10	20	30	50	124,692	-.2	.761	-.015
Top 50%	23.3	15.0	.07	0	10	20	30	55	44,460	-3.3	.000	-.218
Top 10%	26.9	16.2	.19	5	15	25	40	60	460	-6.9	.000	-.427
Effective Teaching Practices												
CSU, Chico (N = 407)	38.0	13.5	.67	20	28	36	48	60				
California State	40.6	13.3	.18	20	32	40	52	60	6,027	-2.6	.000	-.194
Carnegie Class	40.7	13.4	.07	20	32	40	52	60	38,321	-2.6	.000	-.197
NSSE 2013 & 2014	40.2	13.3	.04	20	32	40	52	60	125,711	-2.1	.001	-.160
Top 50%	42.4	13.2	.06	20	32	44	52	60	49,283	-4.3	.000	-.328
Top 10%	44.6	13.3	.14	20	36	44	56	60	10,129	-6.6	.000	-.495
Campus Environment												
Quality of Interactions												
CSU, Chico (N = 329)	41.6	12.5	.69	18	34	44	50	60				
California State	39.0	13.6	.20	14	30	40	50	60	384	2.6	.000	.195
Carnegie Class	41.4	12.8	.07	18	34	43	50	60	33,406	.3	.721	.020
NSSE 2013 & 2014	41.5	12.4	.04	18	34	43	50	60	109,787	.1	.912	.006
Top 50%	44.0	11.4	.06	22	38	46	52	60	332	-2.4	.001	-.208
Top 10%	46.0	11.6	.13	24	40	48	55	60	8,884	-4.4	.000	-.380
Supportive Environment												
CSU, Chico (N = 312)	36.5	13.5	.76	15	25	38	45	60				
California State	36.5	14.6	.21	13	25	38	48	60	363	.1	.930	.005
Carnegie Class	37.0	14.1	.08	13	28	38	48	60	32,140	-.4	.596	-.030
NSSE 2013 & 2014	37.3	13.8	.04	15	28	38	48	60	105,627	-.8	.324	-.056
Top 50%	39.4	13.2	.06	18	30	40	50	60	54,378	-2.9	.000	-.217
Top 10%	41.4	12.8	.12	20	33	40	53	60	12,112	-4.8	.000	-.376

a. Results weighted by institution-reported sex 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

	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
Academic Challenge												
Higher-Order Learning												
CSU, Chico (N = 936)	40.6	14.1	.46	15	30	40	50	60				
California State	41.2	14.3	.13	15	30	40	55	60	14,064	-.6	.182	-.045
Carnegie Class	41.7	14.1	.05	20	35	40	55	60	73,076	-1.1	.020	-.077
NSSE 2013 & 2014	41.2	14.1	.03	20	30	40	55	60	223,724	-.7	.155	-.047
Top 50%	43.3	13.7	.05	20	35	40	55	60	89,868	-2.7	.000	-.196
Top 10%	45.3	13.6	.09	20	40	45	60	60	22,794	-4.7	.000	-.345
Reflective & Integrative Learning												
CSU, Chico (N = 975)	39.3	13.1	.42	20	30	40	49	60				
California State	38.8	13.0	.11	17	29	40	49	60	14,634	.5	.239	.039
Carnegie Class	39.1	13.0	.05	20	30	40	49	60	76,015	.2	.669	.014
NSSE 2013 & 2014	38.9	13.0	.03	17	29	40	49	60	232,708	.4	.350	.030
Top 50%	41.1	12.6	.04	20	31	40	51	60	87,112	-1.8	.000	-.140
Top 10%	43.1	12.5	.09	20	34	43	54	60	20,073	-3.7	.000	-.299
Learning Strategies												
CSU, Chico (N = 847)	39.2	15.0	.52	13	27	40	53	60				
California State	40.0	14.6	.13	13	27	40	53	60	960	-.8	.113	-.058
Carnegie Class	41.0	14.8	.06	13	33	40	53	60	69,232	-1.8	.000	-.122
NSSE 2013 & 2014	40.3	14.8	.03	13	27	40	53	60	211,663	-1.2	.021	-.080
Top 50%	42.5	14.5	.04	20	33	40	60	60	109,998	-3.3	.000	-.228
Top 10%	44.9	14.1	.08	20	33	47	60	60	892	-5.7	.000	-.403
Quantitative Reasoning												
CSU, Chico (N = 951)	30.5	17.3	.56	0	20	27	40	60				
California State	30.7	17.3	.15	0	20	27	40	60	14,312	-.2	.701	-.013
Carnegie Class	29.3	17.4	.06	0	20	27	40	60	74,494	1.2	.041	.067
NSSE 2013 & 2014	29.9	17.4	.04	0	20	27	40	60	227,957	.6	.311	.033
Top 50%	31.3	17.2	.05	0	20	33	40	60	138,134	-.8	.133	-.049
Top 10%	33.0	16.9	.09	0	20	33	47	60	35,428	-2.6	.000	-.151
Learning with Peers												
Collaborative Learning												
CSU, Chico (N = 991)	35.0	14.0	.45	15	25	35	45	60				
California State	35.0	13.6	.12	15	25	35	45	60	14,857	.0	.913	.004
Carnegie Class	31.3	15.0	.05	5	20	30	40	60	1,020	3.7	.000	.250
NSSE 2013 & 2014	32.4	14.6	.03	10	20	30	40	60	999	2.6	.000	.181
Top 50%	35.4	13.8	.04	15	25	35	45	60	116,430	-.4	.422	-.026
Top 10%	37.7	13.6	.09	15	30	40	50	60	24,254	-2.7	.000	-.198
Discussions with Diverse Others												
CSU, Chico (N = 870)	41.9	15.6	.53	20	30	40	60	60				
California State	43.4	16.1	.15	15	35	45	60	60	13,186	-1.5	.010	-.091
Carnegie Class	41.4	16.5	.06	15	30	40	60	60	893	.5	.362	.029
NSSE 2013 & 2014	41.8	16.1	.03	15	30	40	60	60	213,684	.1	.870	.006
Top 50%	44.0	15.8	.04	20	35	45	60	60	134,204	-2.0	.000	-.128
Top 10%	45.8	15.4	.08	20	40	50	60	60	35,515	-3.9	.000	-.254

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												
CSU, Chico (N = 956)	25.4	16.2	.52	0	15	25	35	60				
California State	21.9	15.7	.14	0	10	20	30	55	14,325	3.5	.000	.223
Carnegie Class	23.1	16.5	.06	0	10	20	35	60	74,408	2.3	.000	.139
NSSE 2013 & 2014	23.7	16.3	.03	0	10	20	35	60	227,903	1.7	.001	.104
Top 50%	29.5	16.1	.07	5	20	30	40	60	56,019	-4.1	.000	-.255
Top 10%	34.4	16.4	.19	10	20	35	45	60	1,219	-9.0	.000	-.548
Effective Teaching Practices												
CSU, Chico (N = 960)	40.4	13.7	.44	20	32	40	52	60				
California State	40.5	13.7	.12	16	32	40	52	60	14,479	-.1	.805	-.008
Carnegie Class	41.5	13.8	.05	20	32	40	52	60	75,306	-1.1	.017	-.078
NSSE 2013 & 2014	40.9	13.7	.03	16	32	40	52	60	230,296	-.5	.264	-.036
Top 50%	43.0	13.6	.05	20	36	44	56	60	83,462	-2.6	.000	-.192
Top 10%	45.1	13.4	.11	20	36	48	60	60	14,932	-4.7	.000	-.350
Campus Environment												
Quality of Interactions												
CSU, Chico (N = 814)	43.7	11.0	.39	24	36	45	52	60				
California State	41.3	12.4	.11	18	34	43	50	60	960	2.3	.000	.190
Carnegie Class	42.8	12.1	.05	20	36	44	52	60	837	.8	.037	.067
NSSE 2013 & 2014	42.5	11.9	.03	20	36	44	50	60	820	1.1	.003	.096
Top 50%	45.3	11.3	.04	24	38	48	54	60	71,570	-1.6	.000	-.144
Top 10%	47.4	11.6	.08	24	40	50	58	60	19,949	-3.7	.000	-.320
Supportive Environment												
CSU, Chico (N = 787)	33.2	13.9	.50	10	23	33	43	60				
California State	32.1	14.6	.14	8	20	33	40	60	12,307	1.1	.039	.076
Carnegie Class	32.9	14.7	.06	10	23	33	43	60	808	.3	.554	.020
NSSE 2013 & 2014	33.3	14.4	.03	10	23	33	43	60	201,687	-.1	.858	-.006
Top 50%	36.1	13.8	.05	13	28	38	45	60	85,478	-2.9	.000	-.211
Top 10%	39.0	13.3	.11	17	30	40	50	60	869	-5.8	.000	-.434

a. Results weighted by institution-reported sex 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.