



---

# **NSSE 2017**

## **Engagement Indicators**

Kenyon College

---

### About Your Engagement Indicators Report

Engagement Indicators (EIs) provide a useful summary of the detailed information contained in your students' NSSE responses. By combining responses to related NSSE questions, each EI offers valuable information about a distinct aspect of student engagement. Ten indicators, based on three to eight survey questions each (a total of 47 survey questions), are organized into four broad themes as shown at right.

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

### Report Sections

- Overview (p. 3)** Displays how average EI scores for your 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 2016 and 2017 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—Institution Version and your *Major Field Report* (both to be released in the fall) offer valuable perspectives on internal variation and help you investigate your students' engagement in depth.

### How Engagement Indicators are Computed

Each EI is scored on a 60-point scale. To produce an indicator score, the response set for each item is converted to a 60-point scale (e.g., Never = 0; Sometimes = 20; Often = 40; Very often = 60), and the rescaled items are averaged. Thus a score of zero means a student responded at the bottom of the scale for every item in the EI, while a score of 60 indicates responses at the top of the scale on every item.

For more information on EIs and their psychometric properties, refer to the NSSE website: [nsse.indiana.edu](http://nsse.indiana.edu)

## Engagement Indicators: Overview

Engagement Indicators are summary measures based on sets of NSSE questions examining key dimensions of student engagement. The ten indicators are organized within four 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.

### First-Year Students

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Engagement Indicator</i>	Your first-year students compared with Private IPUG	Your first-year students compared with Carnegie Class	Your first-year students compared with NSSE 2016 & 2017
<i>Academic Challenge</i>	Higher-Order Learning	--	--	△
	Reflective & Integrative Learning	--	△	▲
	Learning Strategies	--	--	--
	Quantitative Reasoning	--	--	--
<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning	--	--	--
	Discussions with Diverse Others	▽	▽	--
<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Student-Faculty Interaction	▽	▽	--
	Effective Teaching Practices	--	--	△
<i>Campus Environment</i>	Quality of Interactions	--	--	△
	Supportive Environment	--	--	--

### Seniors

<i>Theme</i>	<i>Engagement Indicator</i>	Your seniors compared with Private IPUG	Your seniors compared with Carnegie Class	Your seniors compared with NSSE 2016 & 2017
<i>Academic Challenge</i>	Higher-Order Learning	--	--	△
	Reflective & Integrative Learning	--	--	△
	Learning Strategies	▽	▽	▽
	Quantitative Reasoning	--	--	--
<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning	--	--	△
	Discussions with Diverse Others	--	▽	--
<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Student-Faculty Interaction	--	--	▲
	Effective Teaching Practices	--	--	△
<i>Campus Environment</i>	Quality of Interactions	--	▽	--
	Supportive Environment	▽	▽	--

### Academic Challenge: First-year students


Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. Colleges and universities promote student learning by challenging and supporting them to engage in various forms of deep learning. Four Engagement Indicators are part of this theme: *Higher-Order Learning*, *Reflective & Integrative Learning*, *Learning Strategies*, and *Quantitative Reasoning*. Below and on the next page are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.

#### Mean Comparisons

Engagement Indicator	Kenyon Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		Private IPUG		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2016 & 2017	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Higher-Order Learning	41.0	40.9	.01	39.8	.10	37.9 ***	.23
Reflective & Integrative Learning	39.0	38.3	.06	36.9 *	.17	35.0 ***	.33
Learning Strategies	39.0	39.0	.00	39.0	.00	38.3	.06
Quantitative Reasoning	26.7	28.0	-.09	28.0	-.09	27.6	-.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 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<sup>a</sup> 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.

	Kenyon	Percentage point difference between your FY students and		
		Private IPUG	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2016 & 2017
<b>Higher-Order Learning</b>				
<i>Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much coursework emphasized...</i>				
	%			
4b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	79	+3 	+4 	+8 
4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	81	+2 	+5 	+11 
4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	72	-5 	-2 	+3 
4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	79	+2 	+6 	+11 
<b>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</b>				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
2a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	60	+3 	+6 	+8 
2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	64	-0 	+6 	+13 
2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	63	-0 	+5 	+13 
2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	68	-1 	+1 	+5 
2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	78	+3 	+6 	+9 
2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	79	+5 	+9 	+12 
2g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	85	+0 	+4 	+8 
<b>Learning Strategies</b>				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
9a. Identified key information from reading assignments	89	+2 	+6 	+12 
9b. Reviewed your notes after class	61	+0 	-2 	-4 
9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	66	+4 	+3 	+4 
<b>Quantitative Reasoning</b>				
<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.)	48	-3 	-4 	-5 
6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	38	-1 	-1 	-1 
6c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	44	+2 	+4 	+6 

Notes: Refer to your *Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons* report for full distributions and significance tests. Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile included in your *Institutional Report* and available on the NSSE 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	Kenyon Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		Private IPUG		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2016 & 2017	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Higher-Order Learning	42.7	42.7	.00	41.9	.07	40.0 **	.20
Reflective & Integrative Learning	41.0	41.9	-.08	40.7	.03	38.0 ***	.24
Learning Strategies	35.3	38.2 *	-.21	38.3 **	-.22	38.7 **	-.24
Quantitative Reasoning	29.4	31.9	-.15	31.3	-.11	29.9	-.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.

## Academic Challenge: Seniors (continued)

### Performance<sup>a</sup> 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.

	Kenyon	Percentage point difference between your seniors and		
		Private IPUG	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2016 & 2017
<b>Higher-Order Learning</b>				
<i>Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much coursework emphasized...</i>				
	%			
4b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	79	-1	-1	+1
4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	83	+0	+3	+8
4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	80	+1	+4	+10
4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	80	+1	+4	+9
<b>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</b>				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
2a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	78	+2	+5	+9
2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	73	-2	+2	+11
2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	68	+1	+5	+15
2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	80	+6	+8	+15
2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	80	+2	+4	+8
2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	76	-3	-0	+5
2g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	92	+2	+4	+8
<b>Learning Strategies</b>				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
9a. Identified key information from reading assignments	84	-4	-2	+5
9b. Reviewed your notes after class	40	-10	-14	-22
9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	53	-6	-7	-10
<b>Quantitative Reasoning</b>				
<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	-6	-6	-5
6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	43	-4	-3	-1
6c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	54	-1	+3	+10

Notes: Refer to your *Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons* report for full distributions and significance tests. Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile included in your *Institutional Report* and available on the NSSE 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 developing interpersonal and social competence prepare students to deal with complex, unscripted problems they will encounter during and after college. Two Engagement Indicators make up this theme: *Collaborative Learning* and *Discussions with Diverse Others*. Below are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.

### Mean Comparisons

Engagement Indicator	Kenyon Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		Private IPUG		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2016 & 2017	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Collaborative Learning	33.5	34.3	-.06	34.6	-.08	32.2	.09
Discussions with Diverse Others	38.7	41.4 *	-.20	41.4 *	-.19	39.7	-.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 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<sup>a</sup> 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.

Engagement Indicator	Kenyon %	Percentage point difference between your FY students and		
		Private IPUG	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2016 & 2017
<b>Collaborative Learning</b>				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
1e. Asked another student to help you understand course material	58	+0	-0	+5
1f. Explained course material to one or more students	60	-1	-1	+3
1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	57	-0	-0	+7
1h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	50	-8	-9	-4
<b>Discussions with Diverse Others</b>				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often" had discussions with...</i>				
8a. People from a race or ethnicity other than your own	70	-6	-5	-1
8b. People from an economic background other than your own	73	-6	-4	+1
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own	77	+4	+6	+11
8d. People with political views other than your own	34	-24	-32	-33

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.



### Learning with Peers: Seniors


Collaborating with others in mastering difficult material and developing interpersonal and social competence prepare students to deal with complex, unscripted problems they will encounter during and after college. Two Engagement Indicators make up this theme: *Collaborative Learning* and *Discussions with Diverse Others*. Below are three views of your results alongside those of your comparison groups.

#### Mean Comparisons

Engagement Indicator	Kenyon Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		Private IPUG		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2016 & 2017	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Collaborative Learning	35.6	35.1	.04	35.4	.01	32.3 **	.22
Discussions with Diverse Others	38.7	40.8	-.16	40.9 *	-.16	40.5	-.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.

#### Performance<sup>a</sup> 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.

Engagement Indicator	Kenyon %	Percentage point difference between your seniors and		
		Private IPUG	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2016 & 2017
<b>Collaborative Learning</b>				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
1e. Asked another student to help you understand course material	48	-1	-2	+5
1f. Explained course material to one or more students	65	-1	-2	+7
1g. Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	64	+8	+8	+17
1h. Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	59	-7	-9	-5
<b>Discussions with Diverse Others</b>				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often" had discussions with...</i>				
8a. People from a race or ethnicity other than your own	66	-9	-6	-5
8b. People from an economic background other than your own	76	-2	-0	+3
8c. People with religious beliefs other than your own	75	+4	+6	+7
8d. People with political views other than your own	39	-15	-25	-29

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.

### 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	Kenyon Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		Private IPUG		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2016 & 2017	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Student-Faculty Interaction	20.4	23.4 **	-.23	23.7 ***	-.24	20.6	-.02
Effective Teaching Practices	41.7	41.1	.05	40.6	.09	38.7 **	.23

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<sup>a</sup> 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	Kenyon %	Percentage point difference between your FY students and		
		Private IPUG	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2016 & 2017
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
3a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member	20	-13	-17	-15
3b. Worked w/faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	18	-3	-5	-2
3c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	36	+1	+3	+11
3d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	24	-10	-11	-5
<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	84	+1	+3	+6
5b. Taught course sessions in an organized way	86	+4	+6	+10
5c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	87	+7	+9	+12
5d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	62	-7	-8	-2
5e. Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	71	+0	+3	+11

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.

### 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	Kenyon Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		Private IPUG Effect size		Carnegie Class Effect size		NSSE 2016 & 2017 Effect size	
	Mean	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Student-Faculty Interaction	30.0	30.1	-.01	30.4	-.02	23.6 ***	.40
Effective Teaching Practices	41.4	42.7	-.11	42.1	-.06	39.6 *	.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.

#### Performance<sup>a</sup> 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	Kenyon %	Percentage point difference between your seniors and		
		Private IPUG	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2016 & 2017
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
3a. Talked about career plans with a faculty member	53	-1	-4	+10
3b. Worked w/faculty on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	37	-1	-3	+10
3c. Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	56	+4	+7	+24
3d. Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	38	-3	-4	+5
<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	89	+2	+4	+8
5b. Taught course sessions in an organized way	87	+0	+3	+8
5c. Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	87	+2	+3	+10
5d. Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	56	-14	-13	-4
5e. Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	78	+3	+5	+14

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.

### 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	Kenyon Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		Private IPUG		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2016 & 2017	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Quality of Interactions	45.2	44.0	.12	43.7	.14	41.7 ***	.28
Supportive Environment	37.3	38.8	-.12	38.6	-.11	36.3	.07

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<sup>a</sup> 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	Kenyon	Percentage point difference between your FY students and		
		Private IPUG	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2016 & 2017
<i>Percentage rating their interactions a 6 or 7 (on a scale from 1="Poor" to 7="Excellent") with...</i>				
13a. Students	52	-2	-3	+1
13b. Academic advisors	57	+4	+4	+8
13c. Faculty	66	+4	+6	+17
13d. Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)	52	+3	+3	+8
13e. Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)	48	-0	+0	+5
<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	85	+3	+4	+9
14c. Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	81	-1	-1	+4
14d. Encouraging contact among students from diff. backgrounds (soc., racial/eth., relig., etc.)	40	-26	-25	-22
14e. Providing opportunities to be involved socially	67	-9	-8	-4
14f. Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	82	+7	+8	+13
14g. Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	41	+1	-2	-2
14h. Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	73	+4	+3	+8
14i. Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	73	+3	+8	+21

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.

### 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	Kenyon Mean	Your seniors compared with					
		Private IPUG		Carnegie Class		NSSE 2016 & 2017	
		Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Quality of Interactions	41.9	43.2	-.13	43.8 *	-.18	42.3	-.03
Supportive Environment	32.7	35.1 *	-.19	35.7 **	-.24	32.3	.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<sup>a</sup> 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	Kenyon	Percentage point difference between your seniors and		
		Private IPUG	Carnegie Class	NSSE 2016 & 2017
<i>Percentage rating their interactions a 6 or 7 (on a scale from 1="Poor" to 7="Excellent") with...</i>				
	%			
13a. Students	55	+1	-3	-3
13b. Academic advisors	62	-1	-0	+11
13c. Faculty	73	+6	+6	+16
13d. Student services staff (career services, student activities, housing, etc.)	30	-8	-11	-11
13e. Other administrative staff and offices (registrar, financial aid, etc.)	25	-13	-16	-17
<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	74	-3	-5	+3
14c. Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	67	-5	-6	+1
14d. Encouraging contact among students from diff. backgrounds (soc., racial/eth., relig., etc.)	35	-21	-22	-20
14e. Providing opportunities to be involved socially	64	-5	-6	+0
14f. Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	65	+2	-2	+4
14g. Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	30	+3	-3	-1
14h. Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	60	-3	-5	+7
14i. Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	62	-3	+1	+19

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.

This page intentionally left blank.

### 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](http://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<sup>a</sup> for their high average levels of student engagement:

- (a) institutions with average scores placing them in the top 50% of all 2016 and 2017 NSSE institutions, and
- (b) institutions with average scores placing them in the top 10% of all 2016 and 2017 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<sup>b</sup> 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		Kenyon Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
			NSSE Top 50%			NSSE Top 10%		
			Mean	Effect size	✓	Mean	Effect size	✓
<i>Academic Challenge</i>	Higher-Order Learning	41.0	39.2 *	.14	✓	41.2	-.01	✓
	Reflective and Integrative Learning	39.0	36.6 *	.20	✓	38.2	.06	✓
	Learning Strategies	39.0	39.8	-.06	✓	41.9 *	-.21	
	Quantitative Reasoning	26.7	28.8	-.14		30.4 **	-.25	
<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning	33.5	35.2	-.12		37.1 ***	-.27	
	Discussions with Diverse Others	38.7	41.7 **	-.20		43.8 ***	-.35	
<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Student-Faculty Interaction	20.4	23.8 ***	-.23		27.2 ***	-.44	
	Effective Teaching Practices	41.7	40.7	.07	✓	42.6	-.07	✓
<i>Campus Environment</i>	Quality of Interactions	45.2	43.8	.12	✓	46.1	-.07	✓
	Supportive Environment	37.3	38.2	-.08	✓	40.0 **	-.21	

Seniors		Kenyon Mean	Your seniors compared with					
			NSSE Top 50%			NSSE Top 10%		
			Mean	Effect size	✓	Mean	Effect size	✓
<i>Academic Challenge</i>	Higher-Order Learning	42.7	41.8	.07	✓	43.3	-.04	✓
	Reflective and Integrative Learning	41.0	40.0	.08	✓	42.0	-.08	✓
	Learning Strategies	35.3	40.7 ***	-.38		42.9 ***	-.53	
	Quantitative Reasoning	29.4	31.1	-.11		33.0 *	-.22	
<i>Learning with Peers</i>	Collaborative Learning	35.6	35.8	-.02	✓	37.9 *	-.17	
	Discussions with Diverse Others	38.7	42.3 ***	-.23		44.3 ***	-.37	
<i>Experiences with Faculty</i>	Student-Faculty Interaction	30.0	29.2	.05	✓	33.0 **	-.19	
	Effective Teaching Practices	41.4	41.8	-.03	✓	43.8 **	-.18	
<i>Campus Environment</i>	Quality of Interactions	41.9	44.8 ***	-.25		46.9 ***	-.41	
	Supportive Environment	32.7	34.8	-.15		37.2 ***	-.32	

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 (produced by Hierarchical Linear Modeling) were used to determine the top 50% and top 10% institutions for each Engagement Indicator from all NSSE 2016 and 2017 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.



#### Detailed Statistics: First-year students

	Mean statistics			Percentile <sup>d</sup> scores					Comparison results			
	Mean	SD <sup>b</sup>	SEM <sup>c</sup>	5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	Deg. of freedom <sup>e</sup>	Mean diff.	Sig. <sup>f</sup>	Effect size <sup>g</sup>
<b>Academic Challenge</b>												
<b>Higher-Order Learning</b>												
Kenyon (N = 157)	41.0	11.1	.89	20	35	40	50	60				
Private IPUG	40.9	12.0	.16	20	35	40	50	60	5,747	.2	.868	.013
Carnegie Class	39.8	12.6	.09	20	30	40	50	60	19,407	1.2	.222	.098
NSSE 2016 & 2017	37.9	13.3	.02	20	30	40	45	60	157	3.1	.001	.232
Top 50%	39.2	13.1	.03	20	30	40	50	60	157	1.9	.038	.141
Top 10%	41.2	13.3	.07	20	35	40	50	60	158	-.2	.861	-.012
<b>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</b>												
Kenyon (N = 163)	39.0	11.5	.90	20	31	40	46	60				
Private IPUG	38.3	11.4	.15	20	31	37	46	57	5,985	.7	.442	.061
Carnegie Class	36.9	11.8	.08	20	29	37	46	57	20,128	2.0	.027	.174
NSSE 2016 & 2017	35.0	12.0	.02	17	26	34	43	57	355,860	3.9	.000	.325
Top 50%	36.6	12.0	.03	17	29	37	46	57	181,026	2.4	.011	.199
Top 10%	38.2	12.3	.06	20	29	37	46	60	39,283	.7	.462	.058
<b>Learning Strategies</b>												
Kenyon (N = 142)	39.0	13.0	1.09	20	27	40	47	60				
Private IPUG	39.0	12.9	.18	20	27	40	47	60	5,250	.0	.974	.003
Carnegie Class	39.0	13.3	.10	20	27	40	47	60	17,545	.0	.979	.002
NSSE 2016 & 2017	38.3	13.7	.02	20	27	40	47	60	304,250	.8	.509	.055
Top 50%	39.8	13.7	.04	20	27	40	53	60	150,366	-.8	.489	-.058
Top 10%	41.9	14.1	.07	20	33	40	53	60	38,251	-2.9	.014	-.207
<b>Quantitative Reasoning</b>												
Kenyon (N = 156)	26.7	14.9	1.19	0	20	27	40	53				
Private IPUG	28.0	15.2	.20	0	20	27	40	60	5,722	-1.3	.275	-.089
Carnegie Class	28.0	15.3	.11	0	20	27	40	60	19,311	-1.3	.286	-.086
NSSE 2016 & 2017	27.6	15.4	.03	0	20	27	40	60	340,404	-.9	.460	-.059
Top 50%	28.8	15.2	.03	0	20	27	40	60	210,042	-2.2	.077	-.141
Top 10%	30.4	15.2	.07	7	20	27	40	60	51,238	-3.7	.002	-.245
<b>Learning with Peers</b>												
<b>Collaborative Learning</b>												
Kenyon (N = 167)	33.5	13.8	1.07	15	25	30	40	60				
Private IPUG	34.3	13.3	.17	15	25	35	45	60	6,164	-.8	.415	-.064
Carnegie Class	34.6	13.4	.09	15	25	35	45	60	20,771	-1.1	.280	-.084
NSSE 2016 & 2017	32.2	14.5	.02	10	20	30	40	60	368,900	1.3	.235	.092
Top 50%	35.2	13.6	.03	15	25	35	45	60	210,607	-1.7	.106	-.125
Top 10%	37.1	13.4	.06	15	25	40	45	60	51,748	-3.6	.001	-.268
<b>Discussions with Diverse Others</b>												
Kenyon (N = 143)	38.7	12.6	1.05	20	30	40	50	60				
Private IPUG	41.4	13.3	.19	20	30	40	50	60	5,307	-2.6	.019	-.199
Carnegie Class	41.4	14.0	.11	20	30	40	55	60	17,706	-2.7	.022	-.193
NSSE 2016 & 2017	39.7	15.5	.03	15	30	40	55	60	142	-.9	.378	-.060
Top 50%	41.7	14.9	.03	20	30	40	55	60	143	-3.0	.005	-.201
Top 10%	43.8	14.5	.07	20	35	45	60	60	143	-5.1	.000	-.349



#### Detailed Statistics: First-year students

	Mean statistics			Percentile <sup>d</sup> scores					Comparison results			
	Mean	SD <sup>b</sup>	SEM <sup>c</sup>	5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	Deg. of freedom <sup>e</sup>	Mean diff.	Sig. <sup>f</sup>	Effect size <sup>g</sup>
<b>Experiences with Faculty</b>												
<b>Student-Faculty Interaction</b>												
Kenyon (N = 160)	20.4	11.3	.89	5	15	20	25	40				
Private IPUG	23.4	13.5	.18	5	15	20	30	50	172	-3.0	.001	-.226
Carnegie Class	23.7	13.9	.10	5	15	20	30	50	163	-3.3	.000	-.239
NSSE 2016 & 2017	20.6	14.5	.02	0	10	20	30	50	159	-.2	.808	-.015
Top 50%	23.8	14.7	.04	0	15	20	35	55	160	-3.4	.000	-.232
Top 10%	27.2	15.6	.11	5	15	25	40	60	164	-6.9	.000	-.441
<b>Effective Teaching Practices</b>												
Kenyon (N = 157)	41.7	11.1	.89	24	32	40	52	60				
Private IPUG	41.1	11.7	.16	20	32	40	48	60	5,795	.5	.562	.047
Carnegie Class	40.6	12.2	.09	20	32	40	48	60	19,587	1.1	.276	.087
NSSE 2016 & 2017	38.7	13.1	.02	16	28	40	48	60	157	3.0	.001	.227
Top 50%	40.7	13.0	.04	20	32	40	52	60	157	1.0	.277	.075
Top 10%	42.6	13.6	.08	20	36	44	56	60	159	-.9	.298	-.069
<b>Campus Environment</b>												
<b>Quality of Interactions</b>												
Kenyon (N = 134)	45.2	8.9	.77	30	40	46	52	60				
Private IPUG	44.0	10.4	.15	25	38	46	52	60	5,103	1.2	.188	.115
Carnegie Class	43.7	11.0	.08	24	38	46	52	60	136	1.5	.054	.137
NSSE 2016 & 2017	41.7	12.4	.02	18	34	43	50	60	133	3.5	.000	.282
Top 50%	43.8	11.5	.03	22	38	46	52	60	133	1.4	.069	.123
Top 10%	46.1	11.7	.08	24	40	48	56	60	136	-.8	.292	-.070
<b>Supportive Environment</b>												
Kenyon (N = 134)	37.3	10.4	.90	18	30	38	43	55				
Private IPUG	38.8	12.1	.17	18	30	40	48	60	143	-1.5	.107	-.124
Carnegie Class	38.6	12.6	.10	18	30	40	48	60	136	-1.4	.130	-.110
NSSE 2016 & 2017	36.3	13.6	.03	15	28	38	45	60	133	.9	.316	.067
Top 50%	38.2	13.1	.03	18	30	40	48	60	133	-1.0	.277	-.075
Top 10%	40.0	13.0	.07	18	31	40	50	60	134	-2.7	.003	-.211

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 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.

#### Detailed Statistics: Seniors

	Mean statistics			Percentile <sup>d</sup> scores					Comparison results			
	Mean	SD <sup>b</sup>	SEM <sup>c</sup>	5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	Deg. of freedom <sup>e</sup>	Mean diff.	Sig. <sup>f</sup>	Effect size <sup>g</sup>
<b>Academic Challenge</b>												
<b>Higher-Order Learning</b>												
Kenyon (N = 155)	42.7	11.2	.90	25	35	40	50	60				
Private IPUG	42.7	12.2	.17	20	35	40	55	60	5,570	.0	.992	-.001
Carnegie Class	41.9	12.6	.09	20	35	40	50	60	19,060	.9	.382	.070
NSSE 2016 & 2017	40.0	13.7	.02	20	30	40	50	60	155	2.7	.003	.197
Top 50%	41.8	13.5	.03	20	35	40	55	60	155	.9	.316	.067
Top 10%	43.3	13.4	.06	20	35	40	55	60	156	-.5	.569	-.038
<b>Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning</b>												
Kenyon (N = 167)	41.0	10.6	.82	26	33	40	49	60				
Private IPUG	41.9	11.7	.16	20	34	40	51	60	178	-.9	.295	-.075
Carnegie Class	40.7	12.0	.09	20	31	40	49	60	169	.4	.666	.030
NSSE 2016 & 2017	38.0	12.6	.02	17	29	37	46	60	166	3.0	.000	.238
Top 50%	40.0	12.3	.03	20	31	40	49	60	166	1.0	.220	.082
Top 10%	42.0	12.2	.06	20	34	43	51	60	168	-1.0	.241	-.080
<b>Learning Strategies</b>												
Kenyon (N = 141)	35.3	14.1	1.19	13	27	33	47	60				
Private IPUG	38.2	13.7	.19	20	27	40	47	60	5,190	-2.9	.013	-.212
Carnegie Class	38.3	13.8	.10	13	27	40	47	60	17,658	-3.0	.010	-.219
NSSE 2016 & 2017	38.7	14.5	.02	13	27	40	53	60	438,711	-3.5	.005	-.239
Top 50%	40.7	14.4	.03	20	33	40	53	60	231,206	-5.5	.000	-.380
Top 10%	42.9	14.3	.05	20	33	40	60	60	67,412	-7.6	.000	-.534
<b>Quantitative Reasoning</b>												
Kenyon (N = 157)	29.4	19.1	1.52	0	20	27	40	60				
Private IPUG	31.9	17.0	.23	0	20	33	40	60	164	-2.5	.106	-.147
Carnegie Class	31.3	16.7	.12	0	20	33	40	60	158	-1.8	.234	-.109
NSSE 2016 & 2017	29.9	16.3	.02	0	20	27	40	60	157	-.4	.783	-.026
Top 50%	31.1	16.2	.03	0	20	33	40	60	157	-1.7	.266	-.105
Top 10%	33.0	15.9	.06	7	20	33	40	60	157	-3.5	.021	-.223
<b>Learning with Peers</b>												
<b>Collaborative Learning</b>												
Kenyon (N = 169)	35.6	13.5	1.04	15	25	35	45	60				
Private IPUG	35.1	13.3	.18	15	25	35	45	60	5,843	.5	.624	.038
Carnegie Class	35.4	13.4	.10	15	25	35	45	60	20,025	.2	.854	.014
NSSE 2016 & 2017	32.3	15.1	.02	5	20	30	40	60	508,948	3.3	.004	.221
Top 50%	35.8	13.8	.03	15	25	35	45	60	270,486	-.2	.838	-.016
Top 10%	37.9	13.4	.06	15	30	40	50	60	55,146	-2.3	.026	-.172
<b>Discussions with Diverse Others</b>												
Kenyon (N = 145)	38.7	12.3	1.02	20	30	40	50	60				
Private IPUG	40.8	13.2	.18	20	30	40	50	60	5,245	-2.1	.059	-.159
Carnegie Class	40.9	13.9	.10	20	30	40	50	60	147	-2.3	.030	-.162
NSSE 2016 & 2017	40.5	15.9	.02	15	30	40	55	60	145	-1.8	.074	-.116
Top 50%	42.3	15.6	.03	15	30	40	60	60	145	-3.6	.000	-.234
Top 10%	44.3	15.3	.06	20	35	45	60	60	145	-5.6	.000	-.367

#### Detailed Statistics: Seniors

	Mean statistics			Percentile <sup>d</sup> scores					Comparison results			
	Mean	SD <sup>b</sup>	SEM <sup>c</sup>	5th	25th	50th	75th	95th	Deg. of freedom <sup>e</sup>	Mean diff.	Sig. <sup>f</sup>	Effect size <sup>g</sup>
<b>Experiences with Faculty</b>												
<b>Student-Faculty Interaction</b>												
Kenyon (N = 164)	30.0	14.3	1.12	10	20	30	40	60				
Private IPUG	30.1	14.6	.20	10	20	30	40	60	5,630	-.1	.902	-.010
Carnegie Class	30.4	14.9	.11	10	20	30	40	60	19,298	-.4	.753	-.025
NSSE 2016 & 2017	23.6	16.0	.02	0	10	20	35	55	163	6.4	.000	.402
Top 50%	29.2	15.7	.05	5	20	30	40	60	163	.8	.503	.048
Top 10%	33.0	16.0	.12	10	20	30	45	60	166	-3.0	.008	-.189
<b>Effective Teaching Practices</b>												
Kenyon (N = 158)	41.4	11.2	.89	20	35	40	52	60				
Private IPUG	42.7	11.7	.16	24	36	40	52	60	5,603	-1.3	.181	-.108
Carnegie Class	42.1	12.3	.09	20	36	40	52	60	19,226	-.7	.463	-.059
NSSE 2016 & 2017	39.6	13.7	.02	16	32	40	52	60	158	1.8	.044	.132
Top 50%	41.8	13.5	.03	20	32	40	52	60	158	-.4	.693	-.026
Top 10%	43.8	13.4	.07	20	36	44	56	60	160	-2.4	.008	-.178
<b>Campus Environment</b>												
<b>Quality of Interactions</b>												
Kenyon (N = 140)	41.9	8.9	.75	30	36	42	48	56				
Private IPUG	43.2	10.0	.14	26	36	44	50	58	150	-1.3	.102	-.125
Carnegie Class	43.8	10.3	.08	24	38	44	50	60	143	-1.8	.016	-.177
NSSE 2016 & 2017	42.3	12.1	.02	20	35	44	50	60	140	-.3	.658	-.027
Top 50%	44.8	11.6	.03	23	38	46	54	60	140	-2.9	.000	-.247
Top 10%	46.9	12.1	.06	23	40	50	58	60	141	-5.0	.000	-.411
<b>Supportive Environment</b>												
Kenyon (N = 135)	32.7	11.9	1.03	15	23	33	40	54				
Private IPUG	35.1	12.4	.18	15	28	35	43	58	5,070	-2.4	.027	-.193
Carnegie Class	35.7	12.8	.10	15	28	35	45	60	17,092	-3.0	.006	-.235
NSSE 2016 & 2017	32.3	14.2	.02	10	23	33	40	60	134	.4	.685	.029
Top 50%	34.8	13.7	.03	13	25	35	45	60	189,850	-2.0	.089	-.147
Top 10%	37.2	13.6	.07	13	28	38	48	60	34,433	-4.4	.000	-.325

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 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.