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# NSSE 2018 Engagement Indicators 

## 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 broad themes as shown at right.

## Report Sections

Overview (p. 3)

Theme Reports (pp. 4-13)

| Theme | Engagement Indicator |
| :--- | :--- |
| Academic Challenge | Higher-Order Learning <br> Reflective \& 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 |

Displays how average EI scores for your 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.
Performance on Indicator Items
Responses to each item in a given EI are summarized for your institution and comparison groups.

Comparisons with High-
Performing Institutions (p. 15)
Comparisons of your students' average scores on each EI with those of students at institutions whose average scores were in the top $50 \%$ and top $10 \%$ of 2017 and 2018 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. For EI comparisons, NSSE research has concluded that an effect size of about . 1 may be considered small, .3 medium, and .5 large (Rocconi \& Gonyea, 2015). Comparisons with an effect size of at least .3 in magnitude (before rounding) are highlighted in the Overview (p. 3).

EIs vary more among students within an institution than between institutions, like many experiences and outcomes in higher education. As a result, focusing attention on average scores alone amounts to examining the tip of the iceberg. It's equally important to understand how student engagement varies within your institution. Score distributions indicate how EI scores vary among your students and those in your comparison groups. The Report Builder 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 website: nsse.indiana.edu
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## Overview

The University of Texas at Arlington

## Engagement Indicators: Overview

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

Use the following key:

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

| First-Year Students |  | Your first-year students | Your first-year students | Your first-year students |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Theme | Engagement Indicator | UT System | Baseline Peers | Doc/Highest |
| AcademicChallenge | Higher-Order Learning | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ |
|  | Reflective \& Integrative Learning | -- | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ |
|  | Learning Strategies | -- | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ |
|  | Quantitative Reasoning | -- | -- | $\nabla$ |
| Learning with Peers | Collaborative Learning | $\nabla$ | -- | $\nabla$ |
|  | Discussions with Diverse Others | $\Delta$ | -- | -_ |
| Experiences with Faculty | Student-Faculty Interaction | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ |
|  | Effective Teaching Practices | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ |
| Campus | Quality of Interactions | $\nabla$ | -- | $\nabla$ |
| Environment | Supportive Environment | $\nabla$ | -- | $\nabla$ |


| Seniors Theme | Engagement Indicator | Your seniors compared with UT System | Your seniors compared with Baseline Peers | Your seniors compared with Doc/Highest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Higher-Order Learning | $\triangle$ | $\triangle$ | $\triangle$ |
| Academic | Reflective \& Integrative Learning | -- | -- | $\nabla$ |
| Challenge | Learning Strategies | - | $\triangle$ | - |
|  | Quantitative Reasoning | -- | -- | $\nabla$ |
| Learning with | Collaborative Learning | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ |
| Peers | Discussions with Diverse Others | $\Delta$ | -- | $\nabla$ |
| Experiences with Faculty | Student-Faculty Interaction | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ |
|  | Effective Teaching Practices | -- | -- | -- |
| Campus | Quality of Interactions | $\Delta$ | $\Delta$ | $\Delta$ |
| Environment | Supportive Environment | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ | $\nabla$ |
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# NSSE 2018 Engagement Indicators 

## Academic Challenge

The University of Texas at Arlington

## 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 | Your first-year students compared with |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | UT System |  | Baseline Peers |  |  | Doc/Highest |  |  |
|  |  | Effect |  |  | Effect |  |  | Effect |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean | size | Mean |  | size | Mean |  | size |
| Higher-Order Learning | 37.3 * | -. 11 | 37.6 |  | -. 14 | 38.0 |  | -. 18 |
| Reflective \& Integrative Learning | 33.6 | -. 09 | 35.0 |  | -. 21 | 35.0 |  | -. 22 |
| Learning Strategies | 36.2 | -. 06 | 37.8 |  | -. 17 | 37.6 |  | -. 16 |
| Quantitative Reasoning | 27.7 | -. 09 | 27.5 |  | -. 08 | 28.6 |  | -. 15 |

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

## Score Distributions



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

The University of Texas at Arlington

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

## Performance on Indicator Items

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

|  |  | Percentage | erence ${ }^{a}$ between | dents and |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Higher-Order Learning | UTA | UT System | Baseline Peers | Doc/Highest |
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## Academic Challenge

The University of Texas at Arlington

## 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 | Your seniors compared with |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | UT System |  |  | Baseline Peers |  |  | Doc/Highest |  |  |
|  | Effect |  |  | Effect |  |  | Effect |  |  |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean |  | size | Mean |  | size | Mean |  | size |
| Higher-Order Learning | 39.0 |  | . 18 | 39.0 |  | . 18 | 38.8 |  | . 20 |
| Reflective \& Integrative Learning | 35.8 |  | . 03 | 36.6 |  | -. 04 | 37.0 |  | -. 07 |
| Learning Strategies | 37.6 |  | . 29 | 38.9 |  | . 20 | 37.1 |  | . 32 |
| Quantitative Reasoning | 28.7 |  | -. 03 | 29.1 |  | -. 05 | 30.6 |  | -. 14 |

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

## Score Distributions



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

The University of Texas at Arlington

## Academic Challenge: Seniors (continued)

## Performance on Indicator Items

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

|  |  | Percentage point difference ${ }^{a}$ between your seniors and |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Higher-Order Learning | UTA | UT System | Baseline Peers | Doc/Highest |


| 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 | 79 | +5 | +3 |  | +2 |  |
| 4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts | 79 | +6 | +5 |  | +6 |  |
| 4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source | 74 | +8 | +6 |  | +9 |  |
| 4 e . Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information | 74 | +6 | +5 |  | +7 |  |
| Reflective \& Integrative Learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments | 51 | -15 |  | -16 |  | -18 |
| 2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues | 57 | +4 | +1 |  | +0 |  |
| 2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments | 50 | +9 | +3 |  | +3 |  |
| 2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue | 66 | +6 | +4 |  | +3 |  |
| $2 e$. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective | 73 | +4 | +3 |  | +2 |  |
| 2 f . Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept | 70 | +2 | +2 |  |  | -0 |
| 2 g . Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge | 81 | +2 | +0 |  |  | -1 |
| Learning Strategies |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9a. Identified key information from reading assignments | 83 | +8 | +5 |  | +7 |  |
| 9b. Reviewed your notes after class | 72 | +9 | +7 |  | +15 |  |
| 9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials | 72 | +12 | +8 |  | +13 |  |
| Quantitative Reasoning |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $6 a$. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.) | 55 | -1 |  | -0 |  | -3 |
| 6 b . Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.) | 43 | +2 |  | -1 |  | -2 |
| 6 c . Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information | 39 | -3 |  | -2 |  | -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 you Institutional Report and available on the NSSE website. <br> a. Percentage point difference $=$ Institution percentage - Comparison group percentage. Because results are rounded to whole numbers, differences of less than 1 point may or may not display a bar. Small, but nonzero differences may be represented as +0 or -0 . |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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# NSSE 2018 Engagement Indicators 

## Learning with Peers

The University of Texas at Arlington

## 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 | Your first-year students compared with |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | UT System |  |  | Baseline Peers |  | Doc/Highest |  |
|  | Effect |  |  | Effect |  | Effect |  |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean |  | size | Mean | size | Mean | size |
| Collaborative Learning | 33.0 |  | -. 16 | 30.5 | . 01 | 34.2 | -. 25 |
| Discussions with Diverse Others | 36.5 | *** | . 24 | 39.9 | . 04 | 41.5 | -. 06 |

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

## Score Distributions



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

## Performance on Indicator Items

The table below displays how your students responded to each EI item, and the difference, in percentage points, between your students and those of your comparison group. Blue bars indicate how much higher your institution's percentage is from that of the comparison group. Dark red bars indicate how much lower your institution's percentage is from that of the comparison group.
Collaborative Learning
Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...
1e. Asked another student to help you understand course material
1f. Explained course material to one or more students
1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students
1h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments
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
8b. People from an economic background other than your own
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own
8d. People with political views other than your own

Notes: Refer to your Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons report for full distributions and significance tests. Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile included in your Institutional Report and available on the NSSE website.
a. Percentage point difference $=$ Institution percentage - Comparison group percentage. Because results are rounded to whole numbers, differences of less than 1 point may or may not display a bar. Small, but nonzero differences may be represented as +0 or -0 .
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# NSSE 2018 Engagement Indicators 

## Learning with Peers

The University of Texas at Arlington

## 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 | Your seniors compared with |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | UT System |  |  | Baseline Peers |  | Doc/Highest |  |  |
|  | Effect |  |  | Effect |  | Effect |  |  |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean |  | size | Mean | size | Mean |  | size |
| Collaborative Learning | 33.4 |  | -. 88 | 30.6 | -. 69 | 34.3 |  | -. 99 |
| Discussions with Diverse Others | 39.1 | * | . 07 | 40.7 | -. 02 | 41.7 |  | -. 09 |

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

## Score Distributions



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

## Performance on Indicator Items

The table below displays how your students responded to each EI item, and the difference, in percentage points, between your students and those of your comparison group. Blue bars indicate how much higher your institution's percentage is from that of the comparison group. Dark red bars indicate how much lower your institution's percentage is from that of the comparison group.
Collaborative Learning
Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...
1e. Asked another student to help you understand course material
1f. Explained course material to one or more students
1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students
1h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments
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
8b. People from an economic background other than your own
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own
8d. People with political views other than your own
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# NSSE 2018 Engagement Indicators 

## Experiences with Faculty

The University of Texas at Arlington

## 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: StudentFaculty Interaction and Effective Teaching Practices. Below are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.


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

## Score Distributions



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

## Performance on Indicator Items

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

| Student-Faculty Interaction |  | Percentage point difference ${ }^{\text {a }}$ between your $F Y$ students and |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | UTA | UT System | Baseline Peers | Doc/Highest |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... | \% |  |  |  |
| 3a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member | 23 | -13 | -11 | -11 |
| 3b. Worked w/faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.) | 12 | -9 | - -7 | - 7 |
| 3c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class | 16 | -7 | - -8 | -8 |
| 3d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member | 18 | - -9 | -10 | - -8 |
| Effective Teaching Practices |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much instructors have... |  |  |  |  |
| 5a. Clearly explained course goals and requirements | 71 | - -6 | \| -4 | - -6 |
| 5 b . Taught course sessions in an organized way | 70 | \| -5 | \| -2 | - -6 |
| 5c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points | 70 | \| -4 | \| -1 | - -5 |
| 5d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress | 51 | - 7 | -14 | - 8 |
| 5e. Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments | 50 | - -6 | - -8 | - 5 |
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Experiences with Faculty
The University of Texas at Arlington

## 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: StudentFaculty Interaction and Effective Teaching Practices. Below are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.

| Mean Comparisons | Your seniors compared with |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | UT System |  | Baseline Peers |  |  | Doc/Highest |  |
|  |  | Effect |  |  | Effect |  | Effect |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean | size | Mean |  | size | Mean | size |
| Student-Faculty Interaction | 21.9 *** | -. 53 | 20.8 |  | -. 47 | 23.1 *** | -. 60 |
| Effective Teaching Practices | 38.2 | . 03 | 38.3 |  | . 02 | 38.1 | . 04 |

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

## Score Distributions

Student-Faculty Interaction Effective Teaching Practices


## Performance on Indicator Items

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

| Student-Faculty Interaction |
| :--- |
| Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"... |
| 3a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member |
| 3b. Worked w/faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.) |
| 3c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class |
| 3d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member |
| Effective Teaching Practices |
| Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much instructors have... |
| 5a. Clearly explained course goals and requirements |
| 5b. Taught course sessions in an organized way |
| 5c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points |
| 5d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress |
| 5e. Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments |
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## Campus Environment

The University of Texas at Arlington

## 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 | Your first-year students compared with |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | UT System |  |  | Baseline Peers |  | Doc/Highest |  |  |
|  | Effect |  |  | Effect |  | Effect |  |  |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean |  | size | Mean | size | Mean |  | size |
| Quality of Interactions | 41.1 | * | -. 14 | 39.0 | . 02 | 41.3 |  | -. 17 |
| Supportive Environment | 36.9 |  | -. 22 | 35.2 | -. 10 | 36.7 |  | -. 22 |

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

## Score Distributions



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

## Performance on Indicator Items

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

| Quality of Interactions |
| :--- |
| Percentage rating their interactions a 6 or 7 (on a scale from $1=$ "Poor" to $7=$ "Excellent") with ... |
| 13a. Students |
| 13b. Academic advisors |
| 13c. Faculty |
| 13d. Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.) |
| 13e. Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.) |
| Supportive Environment |

[^4]NSSE
national survey of student engagement
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## Campus Environment

The University of Texas at Arlington

## 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 | Your seniors compared with |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | UT System |  |  | Baseline Peers |  |  | Doc/Highest |  |  |
|  | Effect |  |  | Effect |  |  | Effect |  |  |
| Engagement Indicator | Mean |  | size | Mean |  | size | Mean |  | size |
| Quality of Interactions | 40.7 |  | . 14 | 40.1 | *** | . 18 | 40.4 |  | . 18 |
| Supportive Environment | 31.3 |  | -. 24 | 30.6 | *** | -. 20 | 32.7 |  | -. 36 |

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

## Score Distributions



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

## Performance on Indicator Items

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

| Quality of Interactions |
| :--- |
| Percentage rating their interactions a 6 or 7 (on a scale from $1=$ "Poor" to $7=$ "Excellent") with. .1 |
| 13a. Students |
| 13b. Academic advisors |
| 13c. Faculty |
| 13d. Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.) |
| 13e. Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.) |
| Supportive Environment |
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## Comparisons with High-Performing Institutions The University of Texas at Arlington

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

While NSSE's policy is not to rank institutions (see nsse.indiana.edu/html/position_policies.cfm), the results below are designed to compare the engagement of your students with those attending two groups of institutions identified by NSSE ${ }^{\text {a }}$ for their high average levels of student engagement:
(a) institutions with average scores placing them in the top $50 \%$ of all 2017 and 2018 NSSE institutions, and
(b) institutions with average scores placing them in the top $10 \%$ of all 2017 and 2018 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 ${ }^{b}$ to that of the high-performing group. However, the presence of a check mark does not necessarily 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 |  | UTA Mean | Your first-year students compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NSSE Top 50\% | NSSE Top 10\% |  |  |
| Theme | Engagement Indicator |  | Mean | Effect size | $\checkmark$ | Mean | Effect size | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Higher-Order Learning |  | 35.7 | 38.9 *** | -. 25 |  | 40.5 *** | -. 36 |  |
| Academic | Reflective and Integrative Learning | 32.4 | 36.5 *** | -. 34 |  | 38.1 *** | -. 47 |  |
| Challenge | Learning Strategies | 35.3 | 39.5 *** | -. 30 |  | 41.6 *** | -. 45 |  |
|  | Quantitative Reasoning | 26.3 | 28.7 ** | -. 15 |  | $30.4{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 26 |  |
| Learning | Collaborative Learning | 30.7 | $35.1{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 32 |  | $37.2{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 48 |  |
| with Peers | Discussions with Diverse Others | 40.6 | 41.4 | -. 05 | $\checkmark$ | 43.4 ** | -. 19 |  |
| Experiences | Student-Faculty Interaction | 15.2 | 24.3 *** | -. 61 |  | $27.2{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 77 |  |
| with Faculty | Effective Teaching Practices | 36.0 | 40.3 *** | -. 33 |  | 42.0 *** | -. 44 |  |
| Campus | Quality of Interactions | 39.3 | 43.9 *** | -. 39 |  | 45.9 *** | -. 54 |  |
| Environment | Supportive Environment | 33.8 | 37.9 *** | -. 31 |  | $39.7{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 45 |  |
| Seniors |  | UTA Mean | Your seniors compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | NSSE Top 50\% | NSSE Top 10\% |  |  |
| Theme | Engagement Indicator |  | Mean | Effect size | $\checkmark$ | Mean | Effect size | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Higher-Order Learning |  | 41.5 | 41.3 | . 01 | $\checkmark$ | 42.5 ** | -. 07 |  |
| Academic | Reflective and Integrative Learning | 36.1 | 39.6 *** | -. 28 |  | $41.1{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 41 |  |
| Challenge | Learning Strategies | 41.8 | 40.2 *** | . 11 | $\checkmark$ | 42.4 | -. 04 | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Quantitative Reasoning | 28.3 | 30.7 *** | -. 15 |  | $32.7{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 28 |  |
| Learning | Collaborative Learning | 19.9 | 35.7 *** | -1.14 |  | $38.1{ }^{* * *}$ | -1.31 |  |
| with Peers | Discussions with Diverse Others | 40.3 | 42.0 *** | -. 11 |  | $43.8{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 22 |  |
| Experiences | Student-Faculty Interaction | 13.8 | 29.2 *** | -. 98 |  | 33.3 *** | -1.24 |  |
| with Faculty | Effective Teaching Practices | 38.7 | 41.1 *** | -. 18 |  | 43.1 *** | -. 32 |  |
| Campus | Quality of Interactions | 42.6 | 44.4 *** | -. 16 |  | 46.5 *** | -. 32 |  |
| Environment | Supportive Environment | 27.7 | 34.3 *** | -. 48 |  | $36.4{ }^{* * *}$ | -. 62 |  |
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# NSSE 2018 Engagement Indicators 

# Detailed Statistics ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> The University of Texas at Arlington 

## 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. ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | Effect size ${ }^{g}$ |
| Academic Challenge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Higher-Order Learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=392$ ) | 35.7 | 13.4 | . 68 | 10 | 30 | 40 | 40 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 37.3 | 14.0 | . 34 | 15 | 25 | 40 | 45 | 60 | 2,102 | -1.6 | . 041 | -. 115 |
| Baseline Peers | 37.6 | 13.5 | . 31 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 45 | 60 | 2,263 | -1.9 | . 009 | -. 144 |
| Doc/Highest | 38.0 | 12.9 | . 09 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 45 | 60 | 21,422 | -2.4 | . 000 | -. 182 |
| Top 50\% | 38.9 | 13.1 | . 05 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 67,010 | -3.3 | . 000 | -. 250 |
| Top 10\% | 40.5 | 13.3 | . 11 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 16,221 | -4.8 | . 000 | -. 362 |
| Reflective \& Integrative Learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=427$ ) | 32.4 | 12.3 | . 60 | 11 | 23 | 31 | 40 | 54 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 33.6 | 12.4 | . 29 | 14 | 26 | 34 | 40 | 57 | 2,280 | -1.2 | . 078 | -. 095 |
| Baseline Peers | 35.0 | 12.2 | . 28 | 17 | 26 | 34 | 43 | 57 | 2,381 | -2.5 | . 000 | -. 208 |
| Doc/Highest | 35.0 | 11.8 | . 08 | 17 | 26 | 34 | 43 | 57 | 22,495 | -2.6 | . 000 | -. 222 |
| Top 50\% | 36.5 | 11.8 | . 05 | 17 | 29 | 37 | 43 | 57 | 62,950 | -4.0 | . 000 | -. 341 |
| Top 10\% | 38.1 | 12.0 | . 10 | 20 | 29 | 37 | 46 | 60 | 13,818 | -5.6 | . 000 | -. 469 |
| Learning Strategies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=356$ ) | 35.3 | 14.2 | . 75 | 13 | 27 | 33 | 47 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 36.2 | 14.1 | . 35 | 13 | 27 | 33 | 47 | 60 | 1,964 | -. 9 | . 276 | -. 064 |
| Baseline Peers | 37.8 | 13.9 | . 34 | 13 | 27 | 40 | 47 | 60 | 2,066 | -2.4 | . 003 | -. 174 |
| Doc/Highest | 37.6 | 13.6 | . 10 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 47 | 60 | 19,456 | -2.2 | . 002 | -. 164 |
| Top 50\% | 39.5 | 13.7 | . 06 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 53 | 60 | 54,330 | -4.2 | . 000 | -. 305 |
| Top 10\% | 41.6 | 14.1 | . 12 | 20 | 33 | 40 | 53 | 60 | 13,377 | -6.3 | . 000 | -. 446 |
| Quantitative Reasoning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=368$ ) | 26.3 | 15.7 | . 82 | 0 | 13 | 27 | 40 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 27.7 | 15.7 | . 39 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 2,007 | -1.4 | . 130 | -. 087 |
| Baseline Peers | 27.5 | 15.5 | . 36 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 2,223 | -1.2 | . 180 | -. 076 |
| Doc/Highest | 28.6 | 15.1 | . 11 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 20,930 | -2.3 | . 005 | -. 149 |
| Top 50\% | 28.7 | 15.2 | . 06 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 70,823 | -2.3 | . 004 | -. 152 |
| Top 10\% | 30.4 | 15.3 | . 12 | 7 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 17,588 | -4.0 | . 000 | -. 264 |

Learning with Peers
Collaborative Learning
UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=490$
UT System
Baseline Peers
Doc/Highest
Top $50 \%$ 35.1 13.6 . 05

| 5 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 60 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 10 | 20 | 35 | 40 | 60 |
| 10 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 60 |
| 10 | 25 | 35 | 45 | 60 |
| 15 | 25 | 35 | 45 | 60 |
| 15 | 25 | 40 | 45 | 60 |


| 2,470 | -2.3 | .001 | -.161 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2,547 | .2 | .795 | .013 |
| 23,783 | -3.5 | .000 | -.246 |
| 74,011 | -4.4 | .000 | -.323 |
| 16,907 | -6.5 | .000 | -.478 |

Discussions with Diverse Others
UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=361$ )
UT System
Baseline Peers Doc/Highest

Top 50\%
Top 10\%

| 30.7 | 14.4 | .65 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33.0 | 14.1 | .32 |
| 30.5 | 14.2 | .31 |
| 34.2 | 14.0 | .09 |
| 35.1 | 13.6 | .05 |
| 37.2 | 13.6 | .11 |

60
60
60
60
60
,
.478

| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=361$ ) | 40.6 | 16.4 | . 86 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 60 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| UT System | 36.5 | 16.9 | . 42 | 5 | 20 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 1,985 | 4.1 | . 000 | . 243 |
| Baseline Peers | 39.9 | 16.1 | . 39 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 2,088 | . 7 | . 447 | . 044 |
| Doc/Highest | 41.5 | 14.7 | . 11 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 371 | -. 9 | . 320 | -. 059 |
| Top 50\% | 41.4 | 15.0 | . 06 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 364 | -. 8 | . 374 | -. 052 |
| Top 10\% | 43.4 | 14.8 | . 12 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 60 | 60 | 375 | -2.8 | . 001 | -. 189 |

Experiences with Faculty
Student-Faculty Interaction

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { UTA }(\mathrm{N}=405) \\
& \text { UT System }
\end{aligned}
$$

| 15.2 | 13.1 | .65 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 40 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 20.1 | 15.0 | 36 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 50 |


| NSSE <br> national survey of student engagement | NSSE 2018 Engagement Indicators |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | The University of Texas at Arlington |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Detailed Statistics: First-Year Students |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | statist |  |  | Perce | $1{ }^{\text {d }}$ sco |  |  |  | parison | ults |  |
|  | Mean | $S D^{b}$ | SEM ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 5th | 25th | 50th | 75th | 95th | Deg. of freedom ${ }^{e}$ | Mean diff. | Sig. ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effect } \\ & \text { size }^{g} \end{aligned}$ |
| Baseline Peers | 19.9 | 14.5 | . 33 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 45 | 632 | -4.7 | . 000 | -. 330 |
| Doc/Highest | 20.2 | 14.2 | . 10 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 45 | 422 | -5.0 | . 000 | -. 351 |
| Top 50\% | 24.3 | 14.8 | . 07 | 5 | 15 | 20 | 35 | 55 | 414 | -9.0 | . 000 | -. 609 |
| Top 10\% | 27.2 | 15.8 | . 19 | 5 | 15 | 25 | 40 | 60 | 474 | -12.0 | . 000 | -. 767 |
| Effective Teaching Practices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=387$ ) | 36.0 | 14.0 | . 71 | 12 | 28 | 36 | 44 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 38.2 | 13.7 | . 33 | 16 | 28 | 40 | 48 | 60 | 2,089 | -2.2 | . 004 | -. 162 |
| Baseline Peers | 37.9 | 13.4 | . 31 | 16 | 28 | 40 | 48 | 60 | 2,272 | -1.9 | . 010 | -. 143 |
| Doc/Highest | 37.7 | 12.6 | . 09 | 20 | 28 | 40 | 48 | 60 | 398 | -1.7 | . 017 | -. 137 |
| Top 50\% | 40.3 | 13.1 | . 06 | 20 | 32 | 40 | 52 | 60 | 49,643 | -4.3 | . 000 | -. 326 |
| Top 10\% | 42.0 | 13.7 | . 12 | 20 | 32 | 40 | 52 | 60 | 13,158 | -6.0 | . 000 | -. 436 |
| Campus Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Interactions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=297$ ) | 39.3 | 13.2 | . 77 | 16 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 41.1 | 13.3 | . 34 | 16 | 32 | 42 | 52 | 60 | 1,818 | -1.8 | . 031 | -. 137 |
| Baseline Peers | 39.0 | 13.4 | . 33 | 14 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 1,909 | . 3 | . 715 | . 023 |
| Doc/Highest | 41.3 | 11.9 | . 09 | 20 | 34 | 42 | 50 | 60 | 304 | -2.0 | . 010 | -. 168 |
| Top 50\% | 43.9 | 11.6 | . 06 | 22 | 38 | 46 | 52 | 60 | 300 | -4.6 | . 000 | -. 393 |
| Top 10\% | 45.9 | 12.1 | . 13 | 22 | 40 | 48 | 56 | 60 | 314 | -6.6 | . 000 | -. 540 |
| Supportive Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=338$ ) | 33.8 | 13.3 | . 73 | 10 | 25 | 35 | 43 | 55 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 36.9 | 14.3 | . 36 | 13 | 25 | 38 | 48 | 60 | 1,897 | -3.0 | . 000 | -. 216 |
| Baseline Peers | 35.2 | 13.9 | . 34 | 13 | 25 | 35 | 45 | 60 | 1,953 | -1.3 | . 103 | -. 098 |
| Doc/Highest | 36.7 | 13.0 | . 10 | 15 | 28 | 38 | 45 | 60 | 18,552 | -2.9 | . 000 | -. 221 |
| Top 50\% | 37.9 | 13.2 | . 06 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 48 | 60 | 52,840 | -4.1 | . 000 | -. 313 |
| Top 10\% | 39.7 | 13.1 | . 12 | 18 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 12,943 | -5.9 | . 000 | -. 446 |

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 (equal to the sample mean $+/-1.96 \mathrm{x}$ SEM) is the range that is $95 \%$ likely to contain the true population mean.
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.
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# NSSE 2018 Engagement Indicators 

# Detailed Statistics ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> The University of Texas at Arlington 

## 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. ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effect } \\ & \text { size }^{g} \end{aligned}$ |
| Academic Challenge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Higher-Order Learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=1981$ ) | 41.5 | 14.6 | . 33 | 15 | 35 | 40 | 55 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 39.0 | 14.3 | . 22 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 6,075 | 2.5 | . 000 | . 176 |
| Baseline Peers | 39.0 | 14.2 | . 21 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 3,622 | 2.5 | . 000 | . 177 |
| Doc/Highest | 38.8 | 13.7 | . 06 | 15 | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 2,134 | 2.7 | . 000 | . 196 |
| Top 50\% | 41.3 | 13.5 | . 04 | 20 | 35 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 2,046 | . 2 | . 602 | . 013 |
| Top 10\% | 42.5 | 13.6 | . 08 | 20 | 35 | 40 | 55 | 60 | 2,216 | -1.0 | . 002 | -. 075 |
| Reflective \& Integrative Learning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=2107$ ) | 36.1 | 12.7 | . 28 | 17 | 29 | 37 | 46 | 57 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 35.8 | 13.1 | . 20 | 14 | 26 | 34 | 46 | 60 | 4,284 | . 3 | . 305 | . 027 |
| Baseline Peers | 36.6 | 13.0 | . 19 | 17 | 26 | 37 | 46 | 60 | 4,085 | -. 5 | . 160 | -. 036 |
| Doc/Highest | 37.0 | 12.5 | . 06 | 17 | 29 | 37 | 46 | 60 | 49,530 | -. 9 | . 001 | -. 071 |
| Top 50\% | 39.6 | 12.2 | . 04 | 20 | 31 | 40 | 49 | 60 | 1,04,256 | -3.5 | . 000 | -. 283 |
| Top 10\% | 41.1 | 12.2 | . 08 | 20 | 33 | 40 | 51 | 60 | 23,832 | -5.0 | . 000 | -. 410 |
| Learning Strategies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=1832$ ) | 41.8 | 14.5 | . 34 | 20 | 33 | 40 | 53 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 37.6 | 14.7 | . 24 | 13 | 27 | 40 | 47 | 60 | 5,697 | 4.2 | . 000 | . 285 |
| Baseline Peers | 38.9 | 14.7 | . 22 | 13 | 27 | 40 | 53 | 60 | 6,145 | 2.9 | . 000 | . 196 |
| Doc/Highest | 37.1 | 14.5 | . 07 | 13 | 27 | 40 | 47 | 60 | 43,577 | 4.7 | . 000 | . 322 |
| Top 50\% | 40.2 | 14.3 | . 04 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 53 | 60 | 1,10,759 | 1.6 | . 000 | . 111 |
| Top 10\% | 42.4 | 14.2 | . 08 | 20 | 33 | 40 | 53 | 60 | 29,876 | -. 6 | . 066 | -. 044 |
| Quantitative Reasoning |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=1893$ ) | 28.3 | 16.1 | . 37 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 28.7 | 16.2 | . 26 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 5,838 | -. 4 | . 346 | -. 026 |
| Baseline Peers | 29.1 | 16.5 | . 24 | 0 | 20 | 27 | 40 | 60 | 6,583 | -. 8 | . 072 | -. 049 |
| Doc/Highest | 30.6 | 16.1 | . 08 | 0 | 20 | 33 | 40 | 60 | 46,565 | -2.3 | . 000 | -. 141 |
| Top 50\% | 30.7 | 16.0 | . 04 | 0 | 20 | 33 | 40 | 60 | 1,43,202 | -2.4 | . 000 | -. 151 |
| Top 10\% | 32.7 | 15.7 | . 09 | 7 | 20 | 33 | 40 | 60 | 2,116 | -4.4 | . 000 | -. 277 |

Learning with Peers
Collaborative Learning
UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=2203$ )

| 19.9 | 17.3 | .37 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 33.4 | 14.3 | .21 |
| 30.6 | 14.8 | .21 |
| 34.3 | 14.5 | .07 |
| 35.7 | 13.9 | .04 |
| 38.1 | 13.5 | .09 |


| 0 | 5 | 15 | 30 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 10 | 25 | 35 | 45 |
| 5 | 20 | 30 | 40 |
| 10 | 25 | 35 | 45 |
| 15 | 25 | 35 | 45 |
| 15 | 30 | 40 | 50 |


| 55 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 60 | 3,706 | -13.5 | .000 | -.880 |
| 60 | 3,651 | -10.7 | .000 | -.688 |
| 60 | 2,342 | -14.5 | .000 | -.992 |
| 60 | 2,249 | -15.8 | .000 | -1.137 |
| 60 | 2,471 | -18.2 | .000 | -1.315 |

Discussions with Diverse Others
UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=1848$ )
UT System
Baseline Peers
Doc/Highest
Top $50 \%$
Top 10\%

| 40.3 | 18.2 | .42 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 39.1 | 17.3 | .28 |
| 40.7 | 16.7 | .25 |
| 41.7 | 15.2 | .07 |
| 42.0 | 15.6 | .04 |
| 43.8 | 15.5 | .08 |


| 0 | 25 | 40 | 60 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| 5 | 25 | 40 | 55 |
| 10 | 30 | 40 | 60 |
| 20 | 30 | 40 | 55 |
| 15 | 30 | 40 | 60 |
| 20 | 35 | 45 | 60 |


| 5,750 | 1.2 | .018 | .067 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3,250 | -.4 | .461 | -.021 |
| 1,962 | -1.4 | .001 | -.093 |
| 1,882 | -1.7 | .000 | -.106 |
| 1,991 | -3.5 | .000 | -.224 |

Experiences with Faculty
Student-Faculty Interaction

> UTA $(\mathrm{N}=2034)$
> UT System

| 13.8 | 14.1 | .31 | 0 | 5 | 10 | 20 | 40 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 21.9 | 15.7 | .24 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 55 |

$4,444 \quad-8.0 \quad .000$
$-.528$
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# Detailed Statistics ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> The University of Texas at Arlington 

## Detailed Statistics: Seniors

|  | 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. ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | Effect <br> size ${ }^{g}$ |
| Baseline Peers | 20.8 | 15.4 | . 22 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 55 | 4,170 | -7.0 | . 000 | -. 466 |
| Doc/Highest | 23.1 | 15.4 | . 07 | 0 | 10 | 20 | 35 | 55 | 2,252 | -9.2 | . 000 | -. 603 |
| Top 50\% | 29.2 | 15.8 | . 07 | 5 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 60 | 2,217 | -15.4 | . 000 | -. 979 |
| Top 10\% | 33.3 | 16.1 | . 19 | 10 | 20 | 35 | 45 | 60 | 3,641 | -19.5 | . 000 | -1.240 |
| Effective Teaching Practices |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=1962$ ) | 38.7 | 15.0 | . 34 | 12 | 28 | 40 | 52 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 38.2 | 14.4 | . 23 | 16 | 28 | 40 | 48 | 60 | 3,720 | . 5 | . 218 | . 034 |
| Baseline Peers | 38.3 | 14.1 | . 20 | 16 | 28 | 40 | 48 | 60 | 3,454 | . 3 | . 378 | . 024 |
| Doc/Highest | 38.1 | 13.3 | . 06 | 16 | 28 | 40 | 48 | 60 | 2,094 | . 5 | . 112 | . 041 |
| Top 50\% | 41.1 | 13.6 | . 05 | 16 | 32 | 40 | 52 | 60 | 2,031 | -2.4 | . 000 | -. 179 |
| Top 10\% | 43.1 | 13.7 | . 10 | 20 | 36 | 44 | 56 | 60 | 2,317 | -4.4 | . 000 | -. 318 |
| Campus Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of Interactions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=1403$ ) | 42.6 | 13.9 | . 37 | 16 | 34 | 45 | 53 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 40.7 | 13.1 | . 22 | 16 | 32 | 42 | 50 | 60 | 2,401 | 1.8 | . 000 | . 138 |
| Baseline Peers | 40.1 | 13.1 | . 21 | 16 | 32 | 42 | 50 | 60 | 2,339 | 2.5 | . 000 | . 185 |
| Doc/Highest | 40.4 | 12.1 | . 06 | 18 | 33 | 42 | 50 | 60 | 1,478 | 2.2 | . 000 | . 179 |
| Top 50\% | 44.4 | 11.9 | . 04 | 22 | 38 | 46 | 54 | 60 | 1,441 | -1.9 | . 000 | -. 155 |
| Top 10\% | 46.5 | 12.3 | . 09 | 22 | 40 | 50 | 58 | 60 | 1,559 | -3.9 | . 000 | -. 317 |
| Supportive Environment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTA ( $\mathrm{N}=1757$ ) | 27.7 | 15.4 | . 37 | 5 | 18 | 26 | 38 | 60 |  |  |  |  |
| UT System | 31.3 | 14.5 | . 24 | 8 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 58 | 3,259 | -3.6 | . 000 | -. 241 |
| Baseline Peers | 30.6 | 14.4 | . 22 | 8 | 20 | 30 | 40 | 58 | 3,122 | -2.9 | . 000 | -. 198 |
| Doc/Highest | 32.7 | 13.7 | . 07 | 10 | 23 | 33 | 40 | 58 | 1,880 | -4.9 | . 000 | -. 358 |
| Top 50\% | 34.3 | 13.7 | . 05 | 13 | 25 | 35 | 43 | 60 | 1,811 | -6.6 | . 000 | -. 476 |
| Top 10\% | 36.4 | 13.7 | . 10 | 13 | 28 | 38 | 45 | 60 | 2,031 | -8.6 | . 000 | -. 622 |

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 (equal to the sample mean $+/-1.96 \mathrm{x}$ SEM) is the range that is $95 \%$ likely to contain the true population mean.
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]:    Rocconi, L., \& Gonyea, R. M. (2015, May). Contextualizing student engagement effect sizes: An empirical analysis. Paper presented at the Association for Institutional Research Annual Forum, Denver, CO.

[^1]:    Notes: Refer to your Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons report for full distributions and significance tests. Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile included in your Institutional Report and available on the NSSE website
    a. Percentage point difference $=$ Institution percentage - Comparison group percentage. Because results are rounded to whole numbers, differences of less than 1 point may or may not display a bar. Small, but nonzero differences may be represented as +0 or -0 .

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

[^3]:    Notes: Refer to your Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons report for full distributions and significance tests. Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile included in your Institutional Report and available on the NSSE website.
    a. Percentage point difference $=$ Institution percentage - Comparison group percentage. Because results are rounded to whole numbers, differences of less than 1 point may or may not display a bar. Small, but nonzero differences may be represented as +0 or -0 .

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

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

[^6]:    Notes: Results weighted by institution-reported sex and enrollment status (and institution size for comparison groups); Effect size: Mean difference divided by the pooled standard deviation; $* \mathrm{p}<.05, * * \mathrm{p}<.01, * * * \mathrm{p}<.001$ (2-tailed).
    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 2017 and 2018 institutions, separately by class. 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 $>-.10$.

