



NSSE 2024

Engagement Indicators

California State University, Fullerton

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. The specific items within each EI are listed below, starting on page 5.

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

Report Sections

Overview (p. 3)

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

Theme Reports (pp. 4-13)

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

Mean Comparisons

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

Score Distributions

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

Performance on Indicator Items

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

Comparisons with High-Performing Institutions (p. 15)

Comparisons of your students' average scores on each EI with those of students at institutions whose average scores were in the top 50% and top 10% of all current- and prior-year institutions.

Detailed Statistics (pp. 16-End)

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, 2018). 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. Your NSSE Tableau dashboards and Report Builder (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

Rocconi, L.M., & Gonyea, R.M. (2018). Contextualizing effect sizes in the National Survey of Student Engagement: An empirical analysis. *Research & Practice in Assessment*, 13 (Summer/Fall), pp. 22-38.

Engagement Indicators: Overview

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

- ▲ **Your students' average** was significantly higher ($p < .05$) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.
- △ **Your students' average** was significantly higher ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
- No significant difference.
- ▽ **Your students' average** was significantly lower ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
- ▼ **Your students' average** was significantly lower ($p < .05$) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.

Note: It is important to interpret the direction of differences relative to your institutional context. You may not see all of these symbols in your report.

First-Year Students

Theme	Engagement Indicator	Your first-year students	Your first-year students	Your first-year students
		compared with All CSUs	compared with Large Non-CSUs	compared with Large HSIs
Academic Challenge	Higher-Order Learning	--	--	--
	Reflective & Integrative Learning	--	--	--
	Learning Strategies	--	▽	--
	Quantitative Reasoning	▽	▽	▽
Learning with Peers	Collaborative Learning	▽	△	--
	Discussions with Diverse Others	--	--	▽
Experiences with Faculty	Student-Faculty Interaction	▽	▼	▽
	Effective Teaching Practices	--	▽	--
Campus Environment	Quality of Interactions	▽	▼	▽
	Supportive Environment	▽	▽	▽

Seniors

Theme	Engagement Indicator	Your seniors	Your seniors	Your seniors
		compared with All CSUs	compared with Large Non-CSUs	compared with Large HSIs
Academic Challenge	Higher-Order Learning	--	▽	--
	Reflective & Integrative Learning	▽	--	--
	Learning Strategies	▽	▽	▽
	Quantitative Reasoning	▽	▽	▽
Learning with Peers	Collaborative Learning	--	▲	--
	Discussions with Diverse Others	--	△	--
Experiences with Faculty	Student-Faculty Interaction	▽	△	▽
	Effective Teaching Practices	▽	▽	▽
Campus Environment	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	Cal State Fullerton Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		All CSUs		Large Non-CSUs		Large HSIs	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Higher-Order Learning	38.0	37.6	.02	38.1	-.01	38.0	.00
Reflective & Integrative Learning	34.9	35.1	-.01	35.3	-.03	35.1	-.01
Learning Strategies	37.8	37.3	.03	38.7 *	-.07	37.6	.01
Quantitative Reasoning	27.9	29.3 **	-.09	29.9 ***	-.12	29.7 ***	-.12

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

Score Distributions



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

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.

	Cal State Fullerton	Percentage point difference ^a between your FY students and		
		All CSUs	Large Non-CSUs	Large HSIs
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	68	+2	-0	+0
4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	68	+1	+2	+1
4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	72	+2	+3	+1
4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	71	+0	-1	+0
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	52	-2	+1	-1
2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	49	+0	-2	-0
2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	53	-2	+1	+0
2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	61	-1	-3	-3
2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from their perspective	71	+0	+1	+0
2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	69	+2	+2	+2
2g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	75	+1	-1	-0
Learning Strategies				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
9a. Identified key information from reading assignments	71	-0	+0	-0
9b. Reviewed your notes after class	65	+1	-2	+1
9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	65	+4	-1	+2
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.)	51	-2	-6	-4
6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	41	-3	-4	-3
6c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	38	-5	-7	-6

Notes: Refer to your *Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons* report for full distributions and significance tests. Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile 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.

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	Cal State Fullerton Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		All CSUs		Large Non-CSUs		Large HSIs	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Higher-Order Learning	40.1	40.8	-.05	41.4 ***	-.09	40.7	-.04
Reflective & Integrative Learning	37.9	38.8 **	-.06	38.2	-.02	37.9	.00
Learning Strategies	38.7	39.9 **	-.08	40.8 ***	-.14	39.7 **	-.07
Quantitative Reasoning	29.3	31.2 ***	-.11	31.0 ***	-.10	31.4 ***	-.13

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

Score Distributions



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

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.

	Cal State Fullerton	Percentage point difference ^a between your seniors and		
		All CSUs	Large Non-CSUs	Large HSIs
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	76	+1	-1	-0
4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	75	-1	-2	-1
4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	73	-2	-0	+0
4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	73	-2	-0	-1
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	69	+0	+6	+2
2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	60	-3	+0	+1
2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	53	-5	+1	+1
2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	65	-1	-2	-0
2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from their perspective	74	+0	+1	+2
2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	72	-1	+0	+1
2g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	83	+1	+1	+2
Learning Strategies				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
9a. Identified key information from reading assignments	74	-3	-3	-2
9b. Reviewed your notes after class	65	-3	-5	-3
9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	66	-2	-4	-2
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.)	54	-2	-4	-3
6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	45	-4	-2	-4
6c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	45	-3	-0	-3

Notes: Refer to your *Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons* report for full distributions and significance tests. Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile 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.

Learning with Peers: First-year students


Collaborating with others in mastering difficult material and interacting with peers from different backgrounds prepares 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	Cal State Fullerton Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		All CSUs		Large Non-CSUs		Large HSIs	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Collaborative Learning	29.3	30.1 *	-.06	26.7 ***	.17	29.9	-.04
Discussions with Diverse Others	36.4	36.4	.00	36.7	-.02	37.8 **	-.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 5th (bottom of lower bar), 25th (bottom of box), 50th (middle line), 75th (top of box), and 95th (top of upper bar) percentile scores. The dot represents the mean score. Refer to Detailed Statistics for your institution's sample sizes.

Performance 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.

	Cal State Fullerton	Percentage point difference ^a between your FY students and		
		All CSUs	Large Non-CSUs	Large HSIs
Collaborative Learning				
Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...				
	%			
1b. Asked another student to help you understand course material	49	+2	+10	+3
1c. Explained course material to one or more students	43	-4	+2	-4
1d. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	37	-3	+1	-4
1e. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	50	-6	+3	-4
Discussions with Diverse Others				
Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often" had discussions with...				
8a. People of races or ethnicities other than your own	71	-1	+7	-0
8b. People from economic backgrounds other than your own	68	+1	+4	-1
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own	60	+1	-0	-3
8d. People with political views other than your own	50	+1	-8	-6

Notes: Refer to your *Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons* report for full distributions and significance tests. Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile 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.

Learning with Peers: Seniors


Collaborating with others in mastering difficult material and interacting with peers from different backgrounds prepares 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	Cal State Fullerton Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		All CSUs		Large Non-CSUs		Large HSIs	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Collaborative Learning	32.2	32.8	-.04	26.1 ***	.38	31.8	.03
Discussions with Diverse Others	38.9	39.5	-.03	37.8 *	.07	39.5	-.03

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

Score Distributions



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

Performance 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.

Item	Cal State Fullerton %	Percentage point difference ^a between your seniors and		
		All CSUs	Large Non-CSUs	Large HSIs
Collaborative Learning				
Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...				
1b. Asked another student to help you understand course material	48	+2	+16	+4
1c. Explained course material to one or more students	53	-0	+11	+1
1d. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	40	-3	+9	-2
1e. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	67	-1	+17	+3
Discussions with Diverse Others				
Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often" had discussions with...				
8a. People of races or ethnicities other than your own	76	-1	+9	+2
8b. People from economic backgrounds other than your own	71	-2	+4	-1
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own	64	-1	+1	-2
8d. People with political views other than your own	54	-2	-6	-5

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

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

Experiences with Faculty: 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	Cal State Fullerton Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		All CSUs		Large Non-CSUs		Large HSIs	
	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	
Student-Faculty Interaction	16.0	19.7 *** -0.24	20.8 *** -0.31	20.6 *** -0.30			
Effective Teaching Practices	38.4	38.5 .00	40.0 *** -0.11	38.9 -0.03			

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

Score Distributions



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

Performance 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	Cal State Fullerton	Percentage point difference ^a between your FY students and		
		All CSUs	Large Non-CSUs	Large HSIs
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
	%			
3a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member	26	-7	-12	-10
3b. Worked w/faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	15	-6	-7	-7
3c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	21	-3	-4	-4
3d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	20	-8	-10	-9
<i>Effective Teaching Practices</i>				
<i>Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much instructors have...</i>				
5a. Clearly explained course goals and requirements	77	+1	-2	+0
5b. Taught course sessions in an organized way	73	+2	-1	-0
5c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	73	+0	+0	+0
5d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	61	-6	-8	-6
5e. Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	57	-4	-8	-4

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

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

Experiences with Faculty: Seniors


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	Cal State Fullerton Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		All CSUs		Large Non-CSUs		Large HSIs	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Student-Faculty Interaction	20.6	22.8 ***	-.13	19.6 *	.06	22.3 ***	-.11
Effective Teaching Practices	38.9	40.6 ***	-.12	40.6 ***	-.12	40.0 **	-.08

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

Score Distributions



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

Performance 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	Cal State Fullerton	Percentage point difference ^a between your seniors and		
		All CSUs	Large Non-CSUs	Large HSIs
Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...				
	%			
3a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member	34	-5	+1	-4
3b. Worked w/faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	24	-2	+3	-2
3c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	25	-6	+0	-5
3d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	27	-5	-0	-3
Effective Teaching Practices				
Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much instructors have...				
5a. Clearly explained course goals and requirements	79	-2	-2	-1
5b. Taught course sessions in an organized way	72	-4	-4	-3
5c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	76	-2	-1	-1
5d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	61	-5	-1	-2
5e. Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	59	-6	-5	-3

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

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

Campus Environment: First-year students


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	Cal State Fullerton Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		All CSUs		Large Non-CSUs		Large HSIs	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Quality of Interactions	40.0	42.2 ***	-.18	44.1 ***	-.32	42.5 ***	-.21
Supportive Environment	31.5	34.1 ***	-.18	35.2 ***	-.26	35.0 ***	-.25

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

Score Distributions



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

Performance 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	Cal State Fullerton	Percentage point difference ^a between your FY students and		
		All CSUs	Large Non-CSUs	Large HSIs
<i>Percentage rating their interactions a 6 or 7 (on a scale from 1="Poor" to 7="Excellent") with...</i>				
13a. Students	41	-7	-11	-8
13b. Academic advisors	44	-9	-16	-9
13c. Faculty	45	-2	-8	-3
13d. Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)	41	-5	-11	-6
13e. Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)	38	-7	-13	-6
<i>Supportive Environment</i>				
<i>Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much the institution emphasized...</i>				
14b. Providing support to help students succeed academically	67	-2	-4	-3
14c. Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	67	-3	-7	-5
14d. Encouraging contact among students from diff. backgrounds (soc., racial/eth., relig., etc.)	59	-1	-3	-3
14e. Providing opportunities to be involved socially	58	-5	-8	-9
14f. Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	62	-3	-5	-4
14g. Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	38	-6	-8	-6
14h. Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	48	-8	-11	-15
14i. Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	34	-9	-11	-11

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

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

Campus Environment: 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	Cal State Fullerton Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		All CSUs		Large Non-CSUs		Large HSIs	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Quality of Interactions	39.6	42.8 ***	-.25	44.2 ***	-.35	42.4 ***	-.22
Supportive Environment	30.6	33.0 ***	-.16	32.6 ***	-.13	32.9 ***	-.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), 25th (bottom of box), 50th (middle line), 75th (top of box), and 95th (top of upper bar) percentile scores. The dot represents the mean score. Refer to Detailed Statistics for your institution's sample sizes.

Performance 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	Cal State Fullerton	Percentage point difference ^a between your seniors and		
		All CSUs	Large Non-CSUs	Large HSIs
<i>Percentage rating their interactions a 6 or 7 (on a scale from 1="Poor" to 7="Excellent") with...</i>				
13a. Students	48	-11	-12	-10
13b. Academic advisors	39	-11	-17	-9
13c. Faculty	46	-10	-13	-9
13d. Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)	40	-7	-10	-5
13e. Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)	34	-12	-16	-10
<i>Supportive Environment</i>				
<i>Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much the institution emphasized...</i>				
14b. Providing support to help students succeed academically	64	-4	-7	-3
14c. Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	60	-4	-11	-3
14d. Encouraging contact among students from diff. backgrounds (soc., racial/eth., relig., etc.)	55	-6	-2	-5
14e. Providing opportunities to be involved socially	58	-5	-2	-7
14f. Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	59	-4	-1	-3
14g. Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	34	-4	-4	-4
14h. Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	46	-4	-2	-9
14i. Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	34	-9	-2	-7

Notes: Refer to your *Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons* report for full distributions and significance tests. Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile 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.

This page intentionally left blank.

Comparisons with Top 50% and Top 10% Institutions

While NSSE's policy is not to rank institutions (see go.iu.edu/NSSE-PnP), the results below are designed to compare the engagement of your 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 2023 and 2024 NSSE institutions, and
- (b) institutions with average scores placing them in the top 10% of all 2023 and 2024 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 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

Theme	Engagement Indicator	Cal State Fullerton Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
			NSSE Top 50%			NSSE Top 10%		
			Mean	Effect size	✓	Mean	Effect size	✓
Academic Challenge	Higher-Order Learning	38.0	39.8 ***	-.14		42.4 ***	-.35	
	Reflective and Integrative Learning	34.9	37.3 ***	-.20		39.9 ***	-.43	
	Learning Strategies	37.8	40.2 ***	-.18		43.1 ***	-.38	
	Quantitative Reasoning	27.9	30.8 ***	-.19		33.3 ***	-.35	
Learning with Peers	Collaborative Learning	29.3	33.4 ***	-.29		36.7 ***	-.54	
	Discussions with Diverse Others	36.4	40.7 ***	-.29		44.2 ***	-.56	
Experiences with Faculty	Student-Faculty Interaction	16.0	25.4 ***	-.61		29.9 ***	-.90	
	Effective Teaching Practices	38.4	40.8 ***	-.17		43.6 ***	-.37	
Campus Environment	Quality of Interactions	40.0	45.7 ***	-.50		48.7 ***	-.73	
	Supportive Environment	31.5	37.1 ***	-.43		40.4 ***	-.70	

Seniors

Theme	Engagement Indicator	Cal State Fullerton Mean	Your seniors compared with					
			NSSE Top 50%			NSSE Top 10%		
			Mean	Effect size	✓	Mean	Effect size	✓
Academic Challenge	Higher-Order Learning	40.1	42.4 ***	-.17		44.9 ***	-.37	
	Reflective and Integrative Learning	37.9	40.6 ***	-.22		43.2 ***	-.44	
	Learning Strategies	38.7	41.2 ***	-.17		44.1 ***	-.38	
	Quantitative Reasoning	29.3	32.8 ***	-.22		36.2 ***	-.43	
Learning with Peers	Collaborative Learning	32.2	34.7 ***	-.18		38.0 ***	-.42	
	Discussions with Diverse Others	38.9	41.4 ***	-.16		44.1 ***	-.35	
Experiences with Faculty	Student-Faculty Interaction	20.6	29.9 ***	-.58		34.9 ***	-.90	
	Effective Teaching Practices	38.9	42.5 ***	-.26		45.2 ***	-.48	
Campus Environment	Quality of Interactions	39.6	45.4 ***	-.48		48.1 ***	-.69	
	Supportive Environment	30.6	34.6 ***	-.29		38.0 ***	-.53	

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; *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001 (2-tailed).

a. Precision-weighted means were used to determine the top 50% and top 10% institutions for each Engagement Indicator from all current- and prior-year 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 positive or non-significant with an effect size > -.10.

Detailed Statistics: First-Year Students

	Mean statistics			Percentile ^d scores					Comparison results			
	Mean	SD ^b	SE ^c	5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	Deg. of freedom ^e	Mean diff.	Sig. ^f	Effect size ^g
Academic Challenge												
Higher-Order Learning												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1270)	38.0	13.1	.37	20	30	40	45	60				
All CSUs	37.6	13.6	.15	15	30	40	45	60	9,088	.3	.448	.023
Large Non-CSUs	38.1	14.2	.21	15	30	40	50	60	2,188	-.2	.676	-.013
Large HSIs	38.0	13.6	.11	20	30	40	45	60	17,850	.0	.929	-.003
Top 50%	39.8	13.2	.04	20	30	40	50	60	106,447	-1.9	.000	-.141
Top 10%	42.4	12.5	.11	20	35	40	55	60	13,368	-4.4	.000	-.352
Reflective & Integrative Learning												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1363)	34.9	11.3	.31	17	27	34	43	54				
All CSUs	35.1	12.0	.13	17	26	34	43	57	1,890	-.2	.639	-.013
Large Non-CSUs	35.3	13.1	.19	14	26	34	43	60	2,495	-.3	.351	-.026
Large HSIs	35.1	12.2	.09	17	26	34	43	57	1,612	-.2	.627	-.013
Top 50%	37.3	12.0	.04	17	29	37	46	60	1,407	-2.4	.000	-.197
Top 10%	39.9	11.7	.11	20	31	40	49	60	12,448	-5.0	.000	-.427
Learning Strategies												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1176)	37.8	13.1	.38	20	27	40	47	60				
All CSUs	37.3	13.7	.16	20	27	40	47	60	1,625	.5	.259	.034
Large Non-CSUs	38.7	14.6	.23	20	27	40	53	60	2,071	-1.0	.029	-.068
Large HSIs	37.6	14.1	.11	13	27	40	47	60	1,394	.2	.666	.012
Top 50%	40.2	13.9	.05	20	33	40	53	60	86,279	-2.4	.000	-.176
Top 10%	43.1	14.5	.10	20	33	40	60	60	1,357	-5.4	.000	-.375
Quantitative Reasoning												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1198)	27.9	15.1	.44	0	20	27	40	60				
All CSUs	29.3	15.3	.18	7	20	27	40	60	8,553	-1.4	.003	-.093
Large Non-CSUs	29.9	16.4	.25	0	20	27	40	60	2,054	-2.0	.000	-.122
Large HSIs	29.7	15.5	.12	7	20	27	40	60	1,398	-1.8	.000	-.116
Top 50%	30.8	15.5	.05	7	20	33	40	60	1,227	-2.9	.000	-.188
Top 10%	33.3	15.4	.11	7	20	33	40	60	20,179	-5.3	.000	-.348
Learning with Peers												
Collaborative Learning												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1461)	29.3	12.9	.34	10	20	30	40	55				
All CSUs	30.1	13.6	.14	10	20	30	40	55	2,007	-.8	.037	-.057
Large Non-CSUs	26.7	15.8	.22	0	15	25	40	60	2,785	2.5	.000	.167
Large HSIs	29.9	14.0	.10	10	20	30	40	60	1,721	-.6	.077	-.045
Top 50%	33.4	13.9	.04	10	25	35	40	60	1,503	-4.1	.000	-.294
Top 10%	36.7	13.7	.09	15	25	35	45	60	1,691	-7.4	.000	-.542
Discussions with Diverse Others												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1181)	36.4	16.2	.47	5	25	40	45	60				
All CSUs	36.4	15.9	.19	10	25	40	50	60	8,424	.0	.983	-.001
Large Non-CSUs	36.7	17.9	.28	0	20	40	55	60	2,052	-.3	.532	-.019
Large HSIs	37.8	16.2	.13	10	25	40	50	60	16,561	-1.4	.003	-.088
Top 50%	40.7	14.9	.05	20	30	40	55	60	1,205	-4.3	.000	-.288
Top 10%	44.2	13.8	.14	20	35	45	60	60	1,388	-7.8	.000	-.557

Detailed Statistics: First-Year Students

	Mean statistics			Percentile ^d scores					Comparison results			
	Mean	SD ^b	SE ^c	5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	Deg. of freedom ^e	Mean diff.	Sig. ^f	Effect size ^g
Experiences with Faculty												
Student-Faculty Interaction												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1312)	16.0	14.2	.39	0	5	15	25	45				
All CSUs	19.7	15.2	.17	0	10	15	30	50	1,825	-3.6	.000	-.241
Large Non-CSUs	20.8	16.0	.23	0	10	20	30	60	2,325	-4.8	.000	-.307
Large HSIs	20.6	15.4	.12	0	10	20	30	50	1,553	-4.5	.000	-.296
Top 50%	25.4	15.3	.06	5	15	25	35	60	1,378	-9.3	.000	-.608
Top 10%	29.9	15.5	.18	5	20	30	40	60	1,913	-13.8	.000	-.902
Effective Teaching Practices												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1262)	38.4	12.8	.36	20	28	40	48	60				
All CSUs	38.5	13.4	.15	16	28	40	48	60	9,068	.0	.976	-.001
Large Non-CSUs	40.0	14.3	.21	16	30	40	52	60	2,225	-1.6	.000	-.113
Large HSIs	38.9	13.4	.10	16	28	40	48	60	17,793	-.5	.241	-.034
Top 50%	40.8	13.5	.05	20	32	40	52	60	77,784	-2.3	.000	-.172
Top 10%	43.6	14.1	.12	20	36	44	56	60	1,549	-5.1	.000	-.365
Campus Environment												
Quality of Interactions												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 968)	40.0	12.9	.41	16	32	40	50	60				
All CSUs	42.2	12.3	.16	18	35	44	50	60	7,284	-2.2	.000	-.179
Large Non-CSUs	44.1	12.7	.21	20	38	46	54	60	4,741	-4.1	.000	-.320
Large HSIs	42.5	12.2	.10	20	36	44	50	60	14,666	-2.6	.000	-.209
Top 50%	45.7	11.5	.05	24	40	48	54	60	994	-5.7	.000	-.498
Top 10%	48.7	11.9	.11	24	42	52	60	60	1,119	-8.7	.000	-.727
Supportive Environment												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1147)	31.5	13.9	.41	8	20	33	40	58				
All CSUs	34.1	14.0	.17	13	23	35	43	60	8,059	-2.6	.000	-.185
Large Non-CSUs	35.2	14.6	.23	13	25	35	45	60	1,932	-3.7	.000	-.257
Large HSIs	35.0	13.9	.12	13	25	35	43	60	15,676	-3.5	.000	-.251
Top 50%	37.1	13.0	.05	17	28	38	45	60	1,180	-5.6	.000	-.431
Top 10%	40.4	12.6	.17	20	33	40	50	60	1,547	-8.9	.000	-.696

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 x SE) 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.

Detailed Statistics: Seniors

	Mean statistics			Percentile ^d scores					Comparison results			
	Mean	SD ^b	SE ^c	5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	Deg. of freedom ^e	Mean diff.	Sig. ^f	Effect size ^g
Academic Challenge												
Higher-Order Learning												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1755)	40.1	14.0	.33	20	30	40	50	60				
All CSUs	40.8	14.2	.12	20	30	40	55	60	16,549	-.7	.058	-.048
Large Non-CSUs	41.4	14.7	.18	15	30	40	55	60	2,841	-1.3	.000	-.092
Large HSIs	40.7	14.3	.09	20	30	40	55	60	1,989	-.6	.106	-.039
Top 50%	42.4	13.6	.05	20	35	40	55	60	83,337	-2.3	.000	-.171
Top 10%	44.9	12.8	.14	20	40	45	60	60	10,277	-4.8	.000	-.368
Reflective & Integrative Learning												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1870)	37.9	12.6	.29	17	29	37	46	60				
All CSUs	38.8	13.2	.10	17	29	40	49	60	2,378	-.8	.007	-.064
Large Non-CSUs	38.2	13.8	.16	17	29	40	49	60	3,126	-.3	.410	-.020
Large HSIs	37.9	13.3	.08	17	29	37	49	60	2,135	.1	.835	.005
Top 50%	40.6	12.4	.04	20	31	40	51	60	83,551	-2.7	.000	-.215
Top 10%	43.2	11.8	.13	23	34	43	54	60	2,704	-5.3	.000	-.438
Learning Strategies												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1665)	38.7	14.2	.35	20	27	40	47	60				
All CSUs	39.9	14.4	.12	20	27	40	53	60	15,529	-1.2	.001	-.084
Large Non-CSUs	40.8	15.1	.19	13	33	40	53	60	2,731	-2.1	.000	-.141
Large HSIs	39.7	14.6	.09	20	27	40	53	60	28,047	-1.1	.003	-.075
Top 50%	41.2	14.5	.05	20	33	40	53	60	100,930	-2.5	.000	-.173
Top 10%	44.1	14.2	.13	20	33	47	60	60	13,914	-5.4	.000	-.383
Quantitative Reasoning												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1690)	29.3	16.2	.39	0	20	27	40	60				
All CSUs	31.2	16.6	.14	0	20	33	40	60	15,808	-1.9	.000	-.113
Large Non-CSUs	31.0	16.8	.21	0	20	33	40	60	2,718	-1.7	.000	-.103
Large HSIs	31.4	16.7	.10	0	20	33	40	60	1,921	-2.2	.000	-.130
Top 50%	32.8	16.5	.05	7	20	33	40	60	108,746	-3.6	.000	-.215
Top 10%	36.2	16.2	.16	7	20	40	47	60	12,371	-6.9	.000	-.427
Learning with Peers												
Collaborative Learning												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1939)	32.2	13.7	.31	10	20	30	40	60				
All CSUs	32.8	14.3	.11	10	20	30	40	60	2,463	-.6	.087	-.040
Large Non-CSUs	26.1	16.6	.19	0	15	25	40	60	3,548	6.1	.000	.380
Large HSIs	31.8	15.1	.08	5	20	30	40	60	2,233	.4	.197	.028
Top 50%	34.7	14.2	.05	10	25	35	45	60	101,052	-2.5	.000	-.177
Top 10%	38.0	13.6	.12	15	30	40	50	60	14,579	-5.8	.000	-.425
Discussions with Diverse Others												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1671)	38.9	16.7	.41	10	25	40	55	60				
All CSUs	39.5	16.4	.14	10	30	40	55	60	15,630	-.5	.223	-.032
Large Non-CSUs	37.8	18.2	.23	0	20	40	60	60	2,795	1.2	.013	.065
Large HSIs	39.5	17.0	.10	10	25	40	55	60	28,283	-.6	.184	-.034
Top 50%	41.4	15.6	.05	15	30	40	60	60	1,717	-2.4	.000	-.156
Top 10%	44.1	14.5	.13	20	35	45	60	60	2,038	-5.2	.000	-.350

Detailed Statistics: Seniors

	Mean statistics			Percentile ^d scores					Comparison results			
	Mean	SD ^b	SE ^c	5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	Deg. of freedom ^e	Mean diff.	Sig. ^f	Effect size ^g
Experiences with Faculty												
Student-Faculty Interaction												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1814)	20.6	15.5	.36	0	10	20	30	50				
All CSUs	22.8	16.5	.13	0	10	20	35	60	2,330	-2.2	.000	-.134
Large Non-CSUs	19.6	16.6	.20	0	5	15	30	60	2,982	1.0	.018	.060
Large HSIs	22.3	16.6	.10	0	10	20	35	60	2,081	-1.8	.000	-.106
Top 50%	29.9	16.3	.08	5	20	30	40	60	1,979	-9.4	.000	-.576
Top 10%	34.9	16.1	.23	10	20	35	45	60	3,400	-14.3	.000	-.900
Effective Teaching Practices												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1762)	38.9	13.7	.33	16	28	40	48	60				
All CSUs	40.6	14.2	.12	16	32	40	52	60	16,513	-1.7	.000	-.123
Large Non-CSUs	40.6	14.7	.18	16	32	40	52	60	2,906	-1.7	.000	-.117
Large HSIs	40.0	14.4	.09	16	32	40	52	60	2,012	-1.1	.001	-.078
Top 50%	42.5	13.8	.05	20	32	44	56	60	75,400	-3.6	.000	-.258
Top 10%	45.2	13.1	.14	20	36	48	60	60	10,769	-6.3	.000	-.480
Campus Environment												
Quality of Interactions												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1465)	39.6	13.1	.34	16	30	40	50	60				
All CSUs	42.8	13.1	.12	18	35	44	53	60	13,893	-3.2	.000	-.246
Large Non-CSUs	44.2	13.0	.18	20	36	46	55	60	6,929	-4.6	.000	-.353
Large HSIs	42.4	13.1	.09	18	34	44	52	60	25,110	-2.8	.000	-.216
Top 50%	45.4	12.0	.04	22	38	48	55	60	1,515	-5.8	.000	-.483
Top 10%	48.1	12.3	.10	23	42	50	60	60	1,746	-8.5	.000	-.689
Supportive Environment												
Cal State Fullerton (N = 1635)	30.6	14.4	.36	8	20	30	40	58				
All CSUs	33.0	14.9	.13	8	23	33	43	60	2,077	-2.4	.000	-.165
Large Non-CSUs	32.6	15.2	.19	8	20	33	43	60	2,668	-2.0	.000	-.134
Large HSIs	32.9	14.8	.09	8	23	33	43	60	27,360	-2.3	.000	-.154
Top 50%	34.6	14.2	.05	10	25	35	45	60	76,737	-4.1	.000	-.286
Top 10%	38.0	13.7	.16	15	28	40	48	60	2,364	-7.4	.000	-.533

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 x SE) 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.