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Executive Summary of Successes and Intervention Points (Recap)

First-Year Students

Successes

- About 85% of our first-year students rate us as providing them with a “good” or “excellent” first year experience.
- About 84% of our first-year students report they would “probably” or “definitely” attend UI if they were starting over again.
- Our first-year students rate us equivalently to students in the comparison institution groups in the EIs of: Higher-Order Learning, Reflective and Integrative Learning, Quantitative Reasoning, Collaborative Learning, Discussion with Diverse Others, and Quality of Interactions.
- Our first-year students rate us somewhat higher than students in our comparison groups for Student-Faculty Interaction.

Intervention Points

- Potentially increase the teaching methods that more overtly teach students how to identify key material in readings and lectures, review and synthesize class notes, and summarize course materials.
- Potentially increase course organization while more overtly clarifying goals/outcomes/expectations, along with timely feedback including examples to help clarify difficult concepts.
- Potentially create greater opportunities for in- and out-of-class study/review groups and course discussions focused on analysis and synthesis skills may assist as well.
- Potentially review first-year student writing experiences to see if an increase in the assigned number of pages or reading work can be increased.

Senior Students

Successes

- About 87% of our senior students rate us as providing them with a “good” or “excellent” college experience.
- About 84% of our senior students report they would “probably” or “definitely” attend UI if they were starting over again.
- Compared to students in the comparison institution groups, our senior students rate us equivalently to slightly above in the EIs of: Reflective and Integrative Learning, Quantitative Reasoning, Collaborative Learning, and Quality of Interactions.
- Our senior students report doing more assigned writing than last year.

Intervention Points

- Potentially increase the teaching methods that more overtly teach students how to identify key material in readings and lectures, review and synthesize class notes, and summarize course materials.
- Potentially increase course organization while more overtly clarifying goals/outcomes/expectations, along with timely feedback including examples to help clarify difficult concepts.
• Potentially create greater opportunities for in- and out-of-class study/review groups and course discussions focused on analysis and synthesis skills may assist as well.
• Potentially create more opportunities for faculty and SR students to interact more frequently.
• Potentially find ways to increase institutional emphasis on, and/or create/communicate pathways of access to learning and social support networks. These opportunities should include social-emotional supports and programming, in addition to academic programming.
• Potentially find ways to increase opportunities to interact with students from diverse backgrounds, ethnic groups and political/philosophical points of view.
Introduction:

NSSE recommends looking at the normative comparison of the Engagement Indicators (EI) initially to establish the overall context for any other reports. The Engagement Indicators are the key summary scores from the NSSE. These cover the areas of Academic Challenge (4 scores) Learning with Peers (2 scores), Experiences with Faculty (2 scores) and Campus Environment (2 scores).

| 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    |

NSSE recommends using both the difference and the effect size to determine the more useful places to initiate interventions. Specifically recommended is starting with those areas having either a solid downward pointing or solid upward pointing triangle as initial intervention points. Those areas having a solid upward pointing triangle are considered meaningful strengths while those with a solid downward triangle are considered meaningful weakness areas. Open triangles are considered areas that may be of interest (high or low) but are not, practically speaking, much different.

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.

Descriptions of scale scores can be found at: http://nsse.iub.edu/html/engagement_indicators.cfm#a1 or in Appendix A of this document.

In viewing the Engagement Indicators, NSSE recommends using normative item information to fill in the detail surrounding the information provided by the more global Engagement Indicators. This is anticipated to allow for a more contextually accurate description and for more targeted interventions. The significant item level information is provided in Appendix B.

Norms Used 2015

There are substantial changes in norms groups used in 2015 compared those of 2014. As such, the relative standing between UI’s scores to those of the various reference groups are not comparable. In 2014 the groups referenced were “Western Public Rural” consisting of 24 institutions, “All Public High Research” consisting of 92 institutions and “Peer Institutions” consisting of 13 institutions. In 2015 we used three groups which consisted of:
Participating Peer Institutions (N=7):
- Clemson University (Clemson, SC)
- Montana State University - Bozeman (Bozeman, MT)
- New Mexico State University (Las Cruces, NM)
- University of New Hampshire (Durham, NH)
- University of Wyoming (Laramie, WY)
- Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Blacksburg, VA)
- Washington State University (Pullman, WA)

Selected Carnegie Class (Public Research Institutions in our Size Category) (N=8)
- Florida A&M University (Tallahassee, FL)
- Jackson State University (Jackson, MS)
- Louisiana Tech University (Ruston, LA)
- Michigan Technological University (Houghton, MI)
- Texas A&M University - Commerce (Commerce, TX)
- Texas A&M University - Kingsville (Kingsville, TX)
- University of Alabama in Huntsville (Huntsville, AL)
- University of South Dakota (Vermillion, SD)

S/M Public ProfASHGC (Public Research, Small to Mid-size where Carnegie UG Matches UI: Professions plus Arts & Sciences with High Graduate Coexistence) (N=7)
- Auburn University (Auburn University, AL)
- Mississippi State University (Mississippi State, MS)
- Montana State University - Bozeman (Bozeman, MT)
- New Mexico State University (Las Cruces, NM)
- University of Alabama in Huntsville (Huntsville, AL)
- University of North Dakota (Grand Forks, ND)
- University of Wyoming (Laramie, WY)

Comparisons of UI results to itself over time are not affected by these changes, just the reference points to relative standing in comparison with other institutions.

FY General Satisfaction.
On the NSSE there have historically been two items tracking student satisfaction. One reads, “If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?” The second item reads, “How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?” The FY students on average rated us somewhat lower than our Participating Peers and somewhat below our S/M Public Professional ASHGC group when evaluating their entire education experience. The FY students rated us somewhat below our S/M Public Professional ASHGC and/or Participating Peers on attending the same institution again.
The EI areas that were significantly related to each of these two elements of general satisfaction ordered from the strongest were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Ed. Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective and Integrative Learning</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Same Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective and Integrative Learning</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**First-Year Student Engagement Indicator Overview.**

In the “Overview” for First-Year (FY) students shown in the summary graph from NSSE 2015, we are essentially equivalent to our Peers, Carnegie, and S/M Public Prof in the following areas: Higher Order Learning, Reflective & Integrative Learning, Quantitative Reasoning, Collaborative Learning, Discussion with Diverse Others, and Quality of Interactions.
### Engagement Indicator Summary for FY Students

Overall we are nearly equivalent to our three reference groups in all areas. There were small, but not substantial, differences in some areas.

Our FY student’s ratings of us were somewhat above our Participating Peers and S/M Public Professional ASHGC rating for Student-Faculty Interactions. The ratings were equivalent to our Selected Carnegie norm group in this area.

Our FY students rated us somewhat below the comparison groups in the EI’s for Learning Strategies, Effective teaching Practices and Supportive Environment. The ratings were equivalent to our Selected Carnegie norm group in this area.

These data suggest that our FY students feel we have provided an education environment that included more frequent quality contact with faculty than many in our comparison groups. This often has a positive impact on student learning and persistence.

These data suggest that our FY students report we have been less effective in providing opportunities to engage in analysis of course material, rather than rote memorization and effective teaching practices. *Interventions* that may improve ratings in this area include more methods that more overtly teach students how to identify key material in readings and lectures, review and synthesize class notes, and summarize course materials. Additional strategies that may increase student ratings in these areas include increasing course organization while more overtly clarifying goals/outcomes/expectations along with timely feedback, including examples to help clarify difficult concepts. Creating greater opportunities for in- and out-of-class study/review groups and course discussions focused on analysis and synthesis skills may assist as well.

These data suggest that our FY students report we have been less effective in providing a supportive campus environment to promote learning. *Interventions* that may improve ratings in this area include greater institutional emphasis on, and/or creating/communicating pathways of access to, learning and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First-Year Students</th>
<th>Your first-year students compared with Peers participating</th>
<th>Your first-year students compared with Carnegie Class</th>
<th>Your first-year students compared with S/M Public ProfASHGC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
<td><strong>Engagement Indicator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Challenge</td>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning with Peers</td>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiences with Faculty</td>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Environment</td>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>△</td>
<td>△</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
social support networks. These opportunities should include social-emotional supports and programming in addition to academic programming.

**FY Engagement Indicator Trends**
NSSE provides a report looking at the changes in the Engagement Indicators (EI) over time. As the NSSE was significantly revised in 2013 with different EIs there are only two years of data available. While this does not provide sufficient time points to look at trends, it does allow year-to-year comparisons.

The majority of EI areas have remained relatively constant over the last two years. There were no statistical differences between cohorts for any areas except Experiences with Faculty: Student Faculty Interactions. There has been a substantial increase with the Student-Faculty Interactions this year.

**FY Key Academic Challenge Activities**
In the Multi-Year report provided by NSSE includes a set of five scores considered key Academic Challenge activities. These are seen as key behaviors related to students’ academic success and worth tracking over multiple years. NSSE does not provide an easy way to evaluate the significance of differences for these scores. A two-sample-test for using sample mean, standard deviation and sample size was calculated.
Only the area of Course Reading was significantly different across years. It indicated a significant decline in the amount of course-related reading this year. While Assigned Writing is up, it was not statistically different due to the large variation in reporting amount of assigned writing within each year (2014 sd=49.8 pages; 2015 sd=44.7 pages).

Senior General Satisfaction.

On the NSSE there have historically been two items tracking student satisfaction. One reads, “If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending?” The second item reads, “How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?” The SR students on average rated us somewhat lower than our Participating Peers and somewhat below our
S/M Public Professional ASHGC group when evaluating the entire education experience. The SR students rated us somewhat below our S/M Public Professional ASHGC and/or Participating Peers on attending the same institution again.

The EI areas that were significantly related to each of these two elements of general satisfaction ordered from the strongest were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Ed. Experience</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Same Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Higher-Order Learning</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Collaborative Learning</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Student-Faculty Interaction</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Effective Teaching Practices</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>Quality of Interactions</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Supportive Environment</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Reflective and Integrative Learning</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective and Integrative Learning</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Learning Strategies</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Discussions with Diverse Others</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Senior Student Engagement Indicator Overview.**

In looking at the “Overview” for senior (SR) students found in the spreadsheet, we are largely equivalent to our Carnegie, Regional, and NSSE national comparison groups in most areas. We have two areas where we have slighter higher (Reflective & Integrative Learning and Quality of Interactions) ratings and several areas (Higher-Order Learning, Discussion with Diverse Others, Student-Faculty Interactions, and Supportive Environment) where we have slightly lower ratings. We have one area (Learning Strategies) where UI ratings are substantially below those of our Selected Carnegie Peers.
Engagement Indicator Summary of for SR Students

We are largely equivalent to our Carnegie, Regional, and NSSE national comparison groups in most areas. We have two areas where we have slightly higher ratings (Reflective & Integrative Learning and Quality of Interactions), and several areas (Higher-Order Learning, Discussion with Diverse Others, Student-Faculty Interactions, and Supportive Environment) where we have slightly lower ratings. We have one area (Learning Strategies) where UI ratings are substantially below those of our Selected Carnegie Peers.

The SRs rated us somewhat higher than our Small/Mid-Size Professional comparisons group in the areas of Reflective & Integrative Learning and Quality of Interactions. The ratings in these areas were equivalent to other comparison groups. This suggests we have been somewhat more effective in providing opportunities to connect learning to student experiences in a meaningful way, and a campus where many were able to establish positive interpersonal relationships that promote learning and success. These aspects increase learning and have a positive impact on student retention and success.

SR students rated us lower in Higher-Order Learning (all comparison groups), Quality of Interaction (all comparison groups), Supportive Environment (all comparison groups), Reflective and Integrative Learning (S/M Prof. Peers), Discussion with Diverse Others (Selected Peers), Student-Faculty Interactions (Carnegie Peers) and Effective Teaching Strategies (Carnegie Peers).

These data suggest that our SR students report we have been less effective in providing opportunities to engage in analysis of course material rather than rote memorization and effective teaching practices. Interventions that may improve ratings in this area include more methods that more overtly teach students how to identify key material in readings and lectures, review and synthesize class notes, and summarizing course materials. Additionally, strategies that may increase student ratings in these areas include increasing course organization while more overtly clarifying goals/outcomes/expectations along with timely feedback including examples to help clarify difficult concepts. Creating greater opportunities for in- and out-of-class study/review groups and course discussions focused on analysis and synthesis skills may assist as well. Creating more opportunities for faculty and SR students to interact is suggested. Lastly, interventions that may improve ratings in these areas include greater institutional emphasis on, and/or creating/communicating pathways of access to learning and social support networks. These opportunities should include social-emotional supports and programming in addition to academic programming.

SR Engagement Indicator Trends

NSSE provides a report looking at the changes in the Engagement Indicators (EI) over time. As the NSSE was significantly revised in 2013 with different Engagement Indicators there are only two years of data available. While this does not provide sufficient time points to look at trends it does allow year-to-year comparisons.
All EI areas have remained relatively constant over the last two years. There were no statistical differences between cohorts for any areas. There have been no substantial changes over this time frame.

**SR Key Academic Challenge Activities**

The Multi-Year report provided by NSSE includes a set of five scores considered key Academic Challenge activities. NSSE sees these as key behaviors related to students’ academic success and worth tracking overs multiple years. NSSE does not provide an easy way to evaluate the significance of differences for these scores. A two-sample-test for using sample mean, standard deviation and sample size was calculated.
No areas were significantly different across years. While Assigned Writing is up, it was not statistically different due to the wide variation in reporting the amount of assigned writing within each year (2014 $sd=75.4$ pages; 2015 $sd=94.7$ pages).

Successes and Intervention Points

First-Year Students

Successes

- About 85% of our first-year students rate us as providing them with a “good” or “excellent” first year experience.
- About 84% of our first-year students report they would “probably” or “definitely” attend UI if they were starting over again.
- Our first-year students rate us equivalently to students in the comparison institution groups in the EIs of: Higher-Order Learning, Reflective and Integrative Learning, Quantitative Reasoning, Collaborative Learning, Discussion with Diverse Others, and Quality of Interactions.
- Our first-Year students rate us somewhat higher than students in our comparison groups for Student-Faculty Interaction.

Intervention Points

- Potentially increase the teaching methods that more overtly teach students how to identify key material in readings and lectures, review and syntheses class notes, and summarizing course materials.
- Potentially increase course organization while more overtly clarifying goals/outcomes/expectations along with timely feedback including examples to help clarify difficult concepts.
- Potentially creating greater opportunities for in and out of class study/review groups and course discussions focused on analysis and synthesis skills may assist as well.
- Potentially review first-year student writing experiences to see if an increase in the assigned number or reading work can be increased.

Senior Students

Successes

- About 87% of our senior students rate us as providing them with a “good” or “excellent” college experience.
- About 84% of our senior students report they would “probably” or “definitely” attend UI if they were start over again.
- Our senior students rate us equivalently to slightly above to students in the comparison institution groups in the EIs of: Reflective and Integrative Learning, Quantitative Reasoning, Collaborative Learning and Quality of Interactions.
- Our senior students report doing more assigned writing than last year.

Intervention Points

- Potentially increase the teaching methods that more overtly teach students how to identify key material in readings and lectures, review and syntheses class notes, and summarizing course materials.
• Potentially increase course organization while more overtly clarifying goals/outcomes/expectations along with timely feedback including examples to help clarify difficult concepts.
• Potentially creating greater opportunities for in and out of class study/review groups and course discussions focused on analysis and synthesis skills may assist as well.
• Potentially creating more opportunities for faculty and SR students to interact is suggested.
• Potentially finding was to increase institutional emphasis on, and/or creating/communicating pathways of access to learning and social support networks. These opportunities should include social-emotional supports and programming in addition to academic programing.
• Potentially finding ways to increase opportunities to interact with students from diverse backgrounds, ethnic groups and political/philosophical points of view.
APPENDIX A: Descriptions and Definitions of Scores

Theme: Academic Challenge

Higher-Order Learning
Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. Colleges and universities promote high levels of student achievement by calling on students to engage in complex cognitive tasks requiring more than mere memorization of facts. This Engagement Indicator captures how much students’ coursework emphasizes challenging cognitive tasks such as application, analysis, judgment, and synthesis. Items include:

During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following?
- Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations
- Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts
- Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source
- Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information

Reflective & Integrative Learning
Personally connecting with course material requires students to relate their understandings and experiences to the content at hand. Instructors emphasizing reflective and integrative learning motivate students to make connections between their learning and the world around them, reexamining their own beliefs and considering issues and ideas from others’ perspectives. Items include:

During the current school year, how often have you done the following?
- Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments
- Connected your learning to societal problems or issues
- Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments
- Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue
- Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective
- Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept
- Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge

Learning Strategies
College students enhance their learning and retention by actively engaging with and analyzing course material rather than approaching learning as absorption. Examples of effective learning strategies include identifying key information in readings, reviewing notes after class, and summarizing course material. Knowledge about the prevalence of effective learning strategies helps colleges and universities target interventions to promote student learning and success. Items include:

During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?
- Identified key information from reading assignments
- Reviewed your notes after class
• Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials

Quantitative Reasoning
Quantitative literacy—the ability to use and understand numerical and statistical information in everyday life—is an increasingly important outcome of higher education. All students, regardless of major, should have ample opportunities to develop their ability to reason quantitatively—to evaluate, support, and critique arguments using numerical and statistical information. Items include:

During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?
• Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)
• Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)
• Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information

Theme: Learning With Peers

Collaborative Learning
Collaborating with peers in solving problems or mastering difficult material deepens understanding and prepares students to deal with the messy, unscripted problems they encounter during and after college. Working on group projects, asking others for help with difficult material or explaining it to others, and working through course material in preparation for exams all represent collaborative learning activities. Items include:

During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?
• Asked another student to help you understand course material
• Explained course material to one or more students
• Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students
• Worked with other students on course projects or assignments

Discussions with Diverse Others
Colleges and universities afford students new opportunities to interact with and learn from others with different backgrounds and life experiences. Interactions across difference, both inside and outside the classroom, confer educational benefits and prepare students for personal and civic participation in a diverse and interdependent world. Items include:

During the current school year, how often have you had discussions with people from the following groups?
• People from a race or ethnicity other than your own
• People from an economic background other than your own
• People with religious beliefs other than your own
• People with political views other than your own

Theme: Experiences With Faculty
**Student-Faculty Interaction**

Interactions with faculty can positively influence the cognitive growth, development, and persistence of college students. Through their formal and informal roles as teachers, advisors, and mentors, faculty members model intellectual work, promote mastery of knowledge and skills, and help students make connections between their studies and their future plans. Items include:

*During the current school year, about how often have you done the following?*
- Talked about career plans with a faculty member
- Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)
- Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class
- Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member

**Effective Teaching Practices**

Student learning is heavily dependent on effective teaching. Organized instruction, clear explanations, illustrative examples, and effective feedback on student work all represent aspects of teaching effectiveness that promote student comprehension and learning. Items include:

*During the current school year, to what extent have your instructors done the following?*
- Clearly explained course goals and requirements
- Taught course sessions in an organized way
- Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points
- Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress
- Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments

**Theme: Campus Environment**

**Quality of Interactions**

College environments characterized by positive interpersonal relations promote student learning and success. Students who enjoy supportive relationships with peers, advisors, faculty, and staff are better able to find assistance when needed, and to learn from and with those around them. Items include:

*Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution:*
- Students
- Academic advisors
- Faculty
- Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)
- Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)

**Supportive Environment**

Institutions that are committed to student success provide support and involvement across a variety of domains, including the cognitive, social, and physical. These commitments foster higher levels of student performance and satisfaction. This Engagement Indicator summarizes students' perceptions of how
much an institution emphasizes services and activities that support their learning and development. Items include:

*How much does your institution emphasize the following?*

- Providing support to help students succeed academically
- Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)
- Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)
- Providing opportunities to be involved socially
- Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)
- Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)
- Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)
- Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues