



NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT ENGAGEMENT (NSSE)

University of Louisiana at Lafayette

NSSE obtains, on an annual basis, information from hundreds of four-year colleges and universities nationwide about student participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending college. Survey items on The NSSE represent empirically confirmed "good practices" in undergraduate education. That is, they reflect behaviors by students and institutions that are associated with desired outcomes of college. Institutions use their data to identify aspects of the undergraduate experience inside and outside the classroom that can be improved through changes in policies and practices more consistent with good practices in undergraduate education. This information is also used by prospective college students, their parents, college counselors, academic advisers, institutional research officers, and researchers in learning more about how students spend their time at different colleges and universities and what they gain from their experiences.

Alise Hagan
Office of Institutional Assessment
March 12, 2015

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): UL Lafayette

Sample

The 2014 NSSE survey, which was administered electronically, was distributed to 2,603 first-year (FY) students and 2,838 seniors (SR). The overall response rate was 17% (433) for FY students (compared to 21% for UL System and 18% for Carnegie Class). The overall response rate was 22% (626) for SR students (compared to 25% for UL System and 22% for Carnegie Class). An analysis of sample characteristics indicates the respondents were primarily female.

Themes and Engagement Indicators

NSSE questions are grouped into ten Engagement Indicators which are organized into four broad themes:

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

Comparison of 2012 and 2014 NSSE results (Overall Satisfaction)

First Year (FY) students are overall pleased with the quality of academic advising and quality of interaction with their advisors. While the rating scale changed between 2012 and 2014, FY students rated their advising experience as “good” (though this rating is significantly lower than UL System peers). FY students remain satisfied with the overall “entire education experience” (from 3.26 in 2012 to 3.3 in 2014), rating significantly higher than their UL System peers. If they had to start over again, these FY students would return to this institution (from 3.41 in 2012 to 3.4 in 2014), rating significantly higher than their UL System and Carnegie Class peers.

First Year (FY) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012: 12.) Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution? (<i>Where 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=excellent</i>)	3.11	3.07	--
(2014: 13b.) Indicate the quality of your interaction with the following people at your institution: Academic advisors (<i>Where 1=Poor and 7=Excellent</i>)	5.0	5.0	5.3
(2012: 13.) How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution? (<i>Where 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=excellent</i>)	3.26	3.23	--

(2014: 18.) How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution? (Where 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=excellent)	3.3	3.2	3.2
(2012: 14.) If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending? (Where 1=Definitely no, 2=Probably no, 3=Probably yes, 4=Definitely yes)	3.41	3.26	--
(2014: 19.) If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending? (Where 1=Definitely no, 2=Probably no, 3=Probably yes, 4=Definitely yes)	3.4	3.3	3.3

Senior (SR) students are overall pleased with the quality of academic advising and quality of interaction with their advisors. While the rating scale changed between 2012 and 2014, SR students rated their advising experience as “good” (significantly better than Carnegie Class peers). SR students remain satisfied with the overall “entire education experience” (from 3.12 in 2012 to 3.1 in 2014), but rated significantly lower than their Carnegie Class and UL System peers. If they had to start over again, these SR students would return to this institution (from 3.20 in 2012 to 3.2 in 2014).

Senior (SR) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012: 12.) Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution? (Where 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=excellent)	3.01	2.92	--
(2014: 13b.) Indicate the quality of your interaction with the following people at your institution: Academic advisors (Where 1=Poor and 7=Excellent)	5.3	5.0	5.4
(2012: 13.) How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution? (Where 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=excellent)	3.12	3.22	--
(2014: 18.) How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution? (Where 1=Poor, 2=Fair, 3=Good, 4=excellent)	3.1	3.2	3.2
(2012: 14.) If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending? (Where 1=Definitely no, 2=Probably no, 3=Probably yes, 4=Definitely yes)	3.20	3.22	--
(2014: 19.) If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending? (Where 1=Definitely no, 2=Probably no, 3=Probably yes, 4=Definitely yes)	3.2	3.2	3.2

Holistic Summary: 2012 to 2014

The “Holistic Summary” in the 2012 review document listed several areas of note. The original statements from the 2012 document are listed below. In the pages that follow, the 2014 NSSE results are provided for comparison in these specific areas.

- Faculty disengagement (inside and outside the classroom) seems evident from survey results. We should identify ways to reengage faculty in this uncertain fiscal environment to avoid future erosion of our educational experiences.
- Our seniors seem to be lacking a capstone culminating experience – only 15% of our seniors report doing any culminating experience at all versus 31% in our Carnegie peers and 27% in the ULS institutions. These experiences need to provide our students the opportunity to integrate coursework, analyze problems and synthesize data.
- Our FY students continue to lack a sense of community, socially and intellectually.
- Our students report focusing too much on memorization and way too little on higher-order thinking. We also seem to expect too little writing (any length of paper) across the curriculum versus our peers.
- Our students continue to have too little exposure to globalization opportunities (foreign language coursework, student abroad opportunities, etc.).
- We have a five year (three NSSE administration) decline in SFI (Student-Faculty Interaction), EEE (Enriching Educational Experiences), and LAC (Level of Academic Challenge).

“Faculty disengagement (inside and outside the classroom) seems evident from survey results. We should identify ways to reengage faculty in this uncertain fiscal environment to avoid future erosion of our educational experiences.”

2012-2014 Comparison (FY): UL Lafayette still lags behind Carnegie Class and significantly behind UL System ratings on faculty-student interaction; however, in most measures listed here, UL Lafayette’s rating increased (showing *slightly* more student-faculty engagement) in 2014 from 2012.

Unless otherwise noted, First Year (FY) students answered the following questions using this scale: 1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often.

First Year (FY) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012: 1n.) Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor	2.59	2.6	--
(2014: 3d.) Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	2.0	2.1	2.1
(2012: 1o.) Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor	2.03	2.17	--
(2014: 3a.) Talked about career plans with a faculty member	2.0	2.2	2.2
(2012: 1p.) Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class	1.72	1.86	--
(2014: 3c.) Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	1.8	2.0	2.0
(2012: 1q.) Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance	2.62	2.65	--
(2014: 5d.) Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	2.8	2.8	2.9

(2014: 5e.) Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	2.7	2.7	2.8
(2012: 1s.) Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)	1.57	1.66	--
(2014: 3b.) Worked with faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	1.6	1.7	1.7
(2012: 8b.) Relationships with faculty members (<i>Where 1=Unavailable, Unhelpful, Unsympathetic and 7=Available, Helpful, Sympathetic</i>)	5.12	5.19	--
(2014: 13c.) Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution: Faculty (<i>Where 1=Poor and 7=Excellent</i>)	5.2	5.2	5.1

2012-2014 Comparison (SR): In most measures listed here, UL Lafayette's rating increased (showing *slightly* more student-faculty engagement) in 2014 from 2012. SR students are significantly lower than their UL System peers in all measures listed below, except measure 2014: 5e ("Provided prompt and detailed feedback..."); for that measure, SR students' rating is significantly higher than Carnegie Class peers.

Unless otherwise noted, Senior (SR) students answered the following questions using this scale: 1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often.

Senior (SR) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012: 1n.) Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor	2.86	2.8	--
(2014: 3d.) Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	2.2	2.2	2.4
(2012: 1o.) Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor	2.31	2.36	--
(2014: 3a.) Talked about career plans with a faculty member	2.3	2.4	2.5
(2012: 1p.) Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class	2.04	2.05	--
(2014: 3c.) Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	2.1	2.2	2.3
(2012: 1q.) Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance	2.96	2.74	--
(2014: 5d.) Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	2.8	2.7	2.9
(2014: 5e.) Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	3.0	2.8	3.0
(2012: 1s.) Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student life activities, etc.)	1.79	1.83	--
(2014: 3b.) Worked with faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	1.8	1.9	2.0
(2012: 8b.) Relationships with faculty members (<i>Where 1=Unavailable, Unhelpful, Unsympathetic and 7=Available, Helpful, Sympathetic</i>)	5.4	5.39	--

(2014: 13c.) Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution: Faculty (<i>Where 1=Poor and 7=Excellent</i>)	5.4	5.5	5.6
---	-----	-----	-----

“Our seniors seem to be lacking a capstone culminating experience – only 15% of our seniors report doing any culminating experience at all versus 31% in our Carnegie peers and 27% in the ULS institutions. These experiences need to provide our students the opportunity to integrate coursework, analyze problems and synthesize data.”

2012-2014 Comparison (SR): Between 2012 and 2014, the rating scale changed regarding “culminating senior experience”. In 2012, 15% of SR UL Lafayette students responded “Done”. In 2014, 36% of SR UL Lafayette students responded “Done or In Progress”. UL Lafayette still significantly lags behind Carnegie Class in SR students completing a senior experience; there is no significant difference with UL System peers.

Senior (SR) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012: 7h.) Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)	15%	31%	--
	<i>2012: Mean is the proportion responding “Done” among all valid respondents.</i>		
(2014: 11f.) Complete a culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.)	36%	44%	40%
	<i>2014: Means indicate the percentage who responded “Done or in progress”.</i>		

“Our FY students continue to lack a sense of community, socially and intellectually.”

2012-2014 Comparison (FY): In the area of community-based projects (service learning), UL Lafayette First Year students participated significantly more frequently than their Carnegie Class and UL System peers, and participated more frequently they then did in 2012. Quality interactions with other students remains positive. UL Lafayette FY students rated significantly lower than Carnegie Class and UL Systems peers in attending an art exhibit, play or other arts performance; additionally they are significantly lower than Carnegie Class in giving a course presentation and working with others on course projects / assignments, and in the number of weekly hours spend on co-curricular activities.

Unless otherwise noted, First Year (FY) students answered the following questions using this scale: 1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Very Often.

First Year (FY) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012: 1a.) Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions	2.7	2.71	--
(2014: 1a.) Asked questions or contributed to course discussions in other ways	2.7	2.8	2.8
<hr/>			
(2012: 1b.) Made a class presentation	1.95	2.2	--
(2014: 1i.) Gave a course presentation	1.9	2.1	1.9
<hr/>			
(2012: 1g.) Worked with other students on projects during class	2.41	2.43	--
(2012: 1h.) Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments	2.18	2.51	--
(2014: 1h.) Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	2.4	2.6	2.4
<hr/>			

(2012: 1k.) Participated in a community-based project (e.g., service learning) as part of a regular course	1.75	1.6	--
(2014: 12.) About how many of your courses at this institution have included a community-based project (service learning)? (Where 1=None, 2=Some, 3=Most, and 4=All)	1.9	1.6	1.6
(2012: 6a.) Attended an art exhibit, play, dance, music, theater, or other performance	1.89	2.10	--
(2014: 1d.) Attended an art exhibit, play or other arts performance (dance, music, etc.)	1.8	2.0	2.0
(2012: 8a.) Relationships with other students (Where 1=Unfriendly, Unsupportive, Sense of Alienation and 7=Friendly, Supportive, Sense of belonging)	5.57	5.48	--
(2014: 13a.) Indicate the quality of your interactions with the following people at your institution: Students (Where 1=Poor and 7=Excellent)	5.6	5.5	5.4
(2012: 9d.) Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.) (Where 1=0 hrs/wk, 2=1-5 hrs/wk, 3=6-10 hrs/wk, 4=11-15 hrs/wk, 5=16-20 hrs/wk, 6=21-25 hrs/wk, 7=26-30 hrs/wk, 8=more than 30 hrs/wk)	1.96	2.35	--
(2014: 15b.) About how many hours do you spend in a typical 7-day week: Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, campus publications, student government, fraternity or sorority, intercollegiate or intramural sports, etc.) (Where 0=0 hrs/wk, 3=1-5 hrs/wk, 8=6-10 hrs/wk, 13=11-15 hrs/wk, 18=16-20 hrs/wk, 23=21-25 hrs/wk, 28=26-30 hrs/wk, 33=more than 30 hrs/wk)	4.3	5.4	5.0

“Our students report focusing too much on memorization and way too little on higher-order thinking. We also seem to expect too little writing (any length of paper) across the curriculum versus our peers.”

Students responded to the question “During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities?” (2012) or “During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following?” (2014), where 1=Very little, 2=Some, 3=Quite a bit, 4=Very much.

2012-2014 Comparison (FY): FY students are at or below their Carnegie Class and UL System peers in every measure listed. For measure 2014:4e (“Forming a new idea ...”), UL Lafayette FY students rated significantly lower than both Carnegie Class and UL System peers.

First Year (FY) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012: 2a.) Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same format	2.93	3.00	--
(2014: 4a.) Memorizing course material	3.0	3.0	3.0
(2012: 2b.) Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	2.99	3.20	--

(2014: 4c.) Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	2.9	3.0	2.9
(2012: 2c.) Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	2.73	2.98	--
(2014: 4e.) Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	2.7	2.9	2.9
(2012: 2d.) Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	2.84	2.95	--
(2014: 4d.) Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	2.8	2.9	2.9
(2012: 2e.) Applying theories or concepts to practical problems in new situations	2.97	3.11	--
(2014: 4b.) Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	2.9	3.0	2.9

2012-2014 Comparison (SR): SR students are at or below their Carnegie Class and UL System peers in every measure listed. For measures 2014:4e (“Forming a new idea ...”) and 2014: 4d (“Evaluating a point of view...”), UL Lafayette SR students rated significantly lower than UL System peers.

Senior (SR) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	
(2012: 2a.) Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same format	2.91	2.84	--
(2014: 4a.) Memorizing course material	2.8	2.8	2.9
(2012: 2b.) Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	3.19	3.32	--
(2014: 4c.) Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	3.1	3.1	3.1
(2012: 2c.) Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	2.96	3.11	--
(2014: 4e.) Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	2.9	2.9	3.0
(2012: 2d.) Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	3.01	3.05	--
(2014: 4d.) Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	2.9	2.9	3.0
(2012: 2e.) Applying theories or concepts to practical problems in new situations	3.18	3.28	--
(2014: 4b.) Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	3.2	3.1	3.2

2012-2014 Comparison (OVERVIEW): Students responded to the question “During the current school year, about how much reading and writing have you done?” (2012) where 1=None, 2=1-4, 3=5-10, 4=11-20, 5=More than 20, or “During the current school year, about how many papers, reports or other writing tasks of the following lengths have you been assigned? (Include those not yet completed.)” (2014) where 0=None, 1.5=1-2, 4=3-5, 8=6-10, 13=11-15, 18=16-20, 23=More than 20.

2012-2014 Comparison (FY): First Year students overall are writing significantly less than their Carnegie Class peers. In 2014, UL Lafayette FY students averaged 32.5 pages of writing compared to 47.3 for Carnegie Class, but no statistically significant difference compared to UL System peers (33.5 pages).

First Year (FY) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012: 3c.) Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages	2.49	2.93	--
(2014: 7a.) Up to 5 pages	4.5	6.8	4.9
First Year (FY) Students:			
(2012: 3c.) Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more	1.20	1.25	--
(2012: 3d.) Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages	2.14	2.18	--
(2014: 7b.) Between 6 and 10 pages	2.0	2.1	1.5
(2014: 7c.) 11 pages or more	.5	.8	.6
First Year (FY) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012) N/A	--	--	--
(2014) Estimated number of assigned pages of student writing.	32.5	47.3	33.5

2012-2014 Comparison (SR): Senior students overall are writing significantly less than their Carnegie Class peers. In 2014, UL Lafayette SR students averaged 57.5 pages of writing compared to 73.6 for Carnegie Class, but no statistically significant difference compared to UL System peers (60.8 pages).

Senior (SR) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012: 3c.) Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages	2.68	2.91	--
(2014: 7a.) Up to 5 pages	5.7	7.3	5.8
Senior (SR) Students:			
(2012: 3c.) Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more	1.52	1.61	--
(2012: 3d.) Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages	2.20	2.44	--
(2014: 7b.) Between 6 and 10 pages	2.6	3.2	2.8
(2014: 7c.) 11 pages or more	1.6	1.9	1.7
Senior (SR) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012) N/A	--	--	--
(2014) Estimated number of assigned pages of student writing.	57.5	73.6	60.8

“Our students continue to have too little exposure to globalization opportunities (foreign language coursework, student abroad opportunities, etc.).”

2012-2014 Comparison: UL Lafayette First Year students show no significant difference to their Carnegie Class and UL System peers in study abroad participation. UL Lafayette Senior students, however, lag significantly behind Carnegie Class peers in study abroad participation.

First Year (FY) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012: 7e) Foreign language coursework (where 0=Have not decided, Do not plan to do, Plan to do; 1=Done)	.07	.20	--
	2012: Mean is the proportion responding “Done” among all valid respondents.		
(2014) N/A	--	--	--
(2012: 7f.) Study abroad (where 0=Have not decided, Do not plan to do, Plan to do; 1=Done)	.02	.03	--
	2012: Mean is the proportion responding “Done” among all valid respondents.		
(2014: 11d.) Participate in a study abroad program	2%	3%	3%
	2014: Means indicate the percentage who responded “Done or in progress”.		

Senior (SR) Students:	UL Lafayette	Carnegie Class	UL System
(2012: 7e) Foreign language coursework (where 0=Have not decided, Do not plan to do, Plan to do; 1=Done)	.25	.38	--
	2012: Mean is the proportion responding “Done” among all valid respondents.		
(2014) N/A	--	--	--
(2012: 7f.) Study abroad	.05	.13	--
	2012: Mean is the proportion responding “Done” among all valid respondents.		
(2014: 11d.) Participate in a study abroad program	5%	14%	7%
	2014: Means indicate the percentage who responded “Done or in progress”.		

“We have a five year (three NSSE administration) decline in SFI (Student-Faculty Interaction), EEE (Enriching Educational Experiences), and LAC (Level of Academic Challenge).”

2012-2014 Comparison (FY): In 2014, NSSE restructured the prior hierarchies and created ten new engagement indicators (listed on page 1). UL Lafayette FY students’ average was significantly lower compared to Carnegie Class and/or UL System peers in several indicators noted below.

First Year (FY) Students	2007	2010	2012	2014
Level of Academic Challenge (LAC)	48.7	50.9	49.2	--
Academic Challenge: Higher-Order Learning	--	--	--	36.3 <i>significantly lower compared to Carnegie Class</i>
Academic Challenge: Reflective & Integrative Learning	--	--	--	32.8 <i>significantly lower compared to Carnegie Class</i>
Academic Challenge: Learning Strategies	--	--	--	37.4 <i>significantly lower compared to UL System</i>
Academic Challenge: Quantitative Reasoning	--	--	--	24.0 <i>significantly lower compared to Carnegie Class and UL System</i>
Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI)	33.2	32.3	31.8	--
Experiences with Faculty: Student-Faculty Interaction	--	--	--	17.3 <i>significantly lower compared to Carnegie Class and UL System</i>

Experiences with Faculty: Effective Teaching Practices	--	--	--	38.0 <i>significantly lower compared to Carnegie Class</i>
Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE)	24.4	24.7	25.9	--
Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL)	37.8	38.3	39.3	--
Learning with Peers: Collaborative Learning	--	--	--	29.4 <i>significantly lower compared to Carnegie Class</i>
Learning with Peers: Discussions with Diverse Others	--	--	--	40.1
Supportive Campus Environment (SCE)	59.9	60.3	62.9	--
Campus Environment: Quality of Interactions	--	--	--	40.3
Campus Environment: Supportive Environment	--	--	--	38.4

2012-2014 Comparison (SR): In 2014, NSSE restructured the prior hierarchies and created ten new engagement indicators (listed on page 1). UL Lafayette SR students' average was significantly lower compared to Carnegie Class and/or UL System peers in a few indicators noted below. The only indicator that marked significantly higher was Learning Strategies (compared to Carnegie Class).

Senior (SR) Students	2007	2010	2012	2014
Level of Academic Challenge (LAC)	54.3	54.3	54.2	--
Academic Challenge: Higher-Order Learning	--	--	--	40.4 <i>significantly lower compared to UL System</i>
Academic Challenge: Reflective & Integrative Learning	--	--	--	35.6 <i>significantly lower compared to Carnegie Class and UL System</i>
Academic Challenge: Learning Strategies	--	--	--	41.8 <i>significantly higher compared to Carnegie Class</i>
Academic Challenge: Quantitative Reasoning	--	--	--	28.2 <i>significantly lower compared to Carnegie Class</i>
Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI)	42.7	41.5	41.2	--
Experiences with Faculty: Student-Faculty Interaction	--	--	--	21.6 <i>significantly lower compared to Carnegie Class and UL System</i>
Experiences with Faculty: Effective Teaching Practices	--	--	--	40.0 <i>significantly lower compared to UL System</i>
Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE)	35.2	35.0	34.6	--
Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL)	51.3	49.0	49.6	--
Learning with Peers: Collaborative Learning	--	--	--	32.2
Learning with Peers: Discussions with Diverse Others	--	--	--	42.0
Supportive Campus Environment (SCE)	58.7	56.1	58.5	--
Campus Environment: Quality of Interactions	--	--	--	42.2
Campus Environment: Supportive Environment	--	--	--	33.5