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## Interpreting the <br> Benchmark Comparisons Report

To focus discussions about the importance of student engagement and guide institutional improvement efforts, NSSE created five clusters or "benchmarks" of effective educational practice: Level of Academic Challenge, Active and Collaborative Learning, Student-Faculty Interaction, Enriching Educational Experiences, and Supportive Campus Environment. This Benchmark Comparisons Report compares the performance of your institution with your selected peers or consortium. In addition, page 9 provides two other comparisons between your school and (a) above-average institutions with benchmarks in the top $50 \%$ of all NSSE institutions and (b) high-performing institutions with benchmarks in the top $10 \%$ of all NSSE institutions. These displays allow you to determine if the engagement of your typical student differs in a statistically significant, meaningful way from the average student in these comparison groups. More detailed information about how benchmarks are created can be found on the NSSE Web site at www.nsse.iub.edu/2007_Institutional_Report/.


## Level of Academic Challenge (LAC)

## Benchmark Comparisons

HWS compared with:

|  | HWS | Selected Peers |  |  | Carnegie Peers |  |  | NSSE 2007 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $s i{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effet } \\ & \text { Size } \end{aligned}$ | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $s i g^{\text {b }}$ | Effect Size | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Sig ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Effect Size ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| First-Year | 58.0 | 59.9 | ** | -. 16 | 55.9 | ** | . 16 | 51.7 | *** | . 47 |
| Senior | 63.3 | 63.7 |  | -. 03 | 59.8 | *** | . 26 | 55.6 | *** | . 54 |
|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  | nior |  |  |  |



## Level of Academic Challenge (LAC) Items

Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. Colleges and universities promote high levels of student achievement by emphasizing the importance of academic effort and setting high expectations for student performance.

- Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, etc. related to academic program)
- Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings
- Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more; number of written papers or reports of between 5 and 19 pages; and number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages
- Coursework emphasizing analysis of the basic elements of an idea, experience or theory
- Coursework emphasizing synthesis and organizing of ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships
- Coursework emphasizing the making of judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods
- Coursework emphasizing application of theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations
- Working harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor's standards or expectations
- Campus environment emphasizing time studying and on academic work
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## Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL)

## Benchmark Comparisons

HWS compared with:

|  | HWS | Selected Peers |  |  | Carnegie Peers |  |  | NSSE 2007 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Sig ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effect } \\ & \text { Size }^{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $s i{ }^{\text {b }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effect } \\ & \text { Size } \end{aligned}$ | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Sig ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Effect } \\ & \text { Sizec } \end{aligned}$ |
| First-Year | 44.3 | 42.8 | * | . 11 | 44.8 |  | -. 03 | 41.2 | *** | . 19 |
| Senior | 54.0 | 50.6 | ** | . 22 | 52.8 |  | . 07 | 50.1 | *** | . 23 |

First-Year
Senior
$\qquad$

$\qquad$




## Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL) Items

Students learn more when they are intensely involved in their education and asked to think about what they are learning in different settings. Collaborating with others in solving problems or mastering difficult material prepares students for the messy, unscripted problems they will encounter daily during and after college.

- Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions
- Made a class presentation
- Worked with other students on projects during class
- Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments
- Tutored or taught other students
- Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)
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## Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI)

## Benchmark Comparisons

HWS compared with:

|  | HWS | Selected Peers |  |  | Carnegie Peers |  |  | NSSE 2007 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Class | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Sig ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Effect <br> Size | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $s i g^{\text {b }}$ | Effect <br> Steco | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $s i g^{\text {b }}$ |  |
| First-Year | 38.0 | 35.8 | * | . 13 | 36.9 |  | . 06 | 32.8 | *** | . 29 |
| Senior | 55.5 | 50.9 | ** | . 21 | 49.9 | *** | . 26 | 41.2 | *** | . 69 |
|  | Year |  |  |  |  |  | nior |  |  |  |



$\qquad$



## Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI) Items

Students learn firsthand how experts think about and solve practical problems by interacting with faculty members inside and outside the classroom. As a result, their teachers become role models, mentors, and guides for continuous, life-long learning.

- Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor
- Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class
- Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student-life activities, etc.)
- Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance
- Worked with a faculty member on a research project outside of course or program requirements

[^2]National Survey of Student Engagement

## Supportive Campus Environment (SCE)

## Benchmark Comparisons



## Supportive Campus Environment (SCE) Items

Students perform better and are more satisfied at colleges that are committed to their success and cultivate positive working and social relations among different groups on campus.

- Campus environment provides the support you need to help you succeed academically
- Campus environment helps you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)
- Campus environment provides the support you need to thrive socially
- Quality of relationships with other students
- Quality of relationships with faculty members
- Quality of relationships with administrative personnel and offices
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## Interpreting the Top 10\% and Top 50\% Comparisons

This section of the NSSE Benchmark Comparisons report allows you to estimate the performance of your average student in relation to the average student attending two different institutional peer groups identified by NSSE for their high levels of student engagement: (a) those with benchmark scores placing them in the top $50 \%$ of all NSSE schools in 2007 and (b) those with benchmark scores in the top $10 \%$ for $2007 .{ }^{\text {a }}$ These comparisons allow an institution to determine if their engagement of their students differs in significant, meaningful ways from these high performing peer groups.

## Example

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 悉 } \\ & \vdots \\ & ~ \end{aligned}$ |  | NSSEville <br> State | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NSSE } 2007 \\ & \text { Top 50\% } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { NSSE } 2007 \\ & \text { Top } 10 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LAC | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ 57.1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ 55.8 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{*}{\mathrm{Sig}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effect size } \\ .10 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean } \\ 60.5 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{* * *}{\mathrm{Sig}}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Effect size } \\ -0.28 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | ACL | 50.3 | 45.8 | *** | . 28 | 50.7 |  | -0.02 |
|  | SFI | 37.3 | 37.2 |  | . 01 | 42.0 | *** | -0.24 |
|  | EEE | 21.8 | 30.0 | *** | -. 63 | 34.4 | *** | -0.98 |
|  | SCE | 60.9 | 64.7 | *** | -. 21 | 69.7 | *** | -0.49 |

## NSSEville State CAN conclude...

- The average score for NSSEville State first-year students is slightly above (i.e., small positive effect size) that of the average student attending NSSE 2007 schools that scored in the top $50 \%$ on Level of Academic Challenge (LAC).
- The average NSSEville State first-year student is as engaged (i.e., not significantly different) as the average student attending NSSE 2007 schools that scored in the top $10 \%$ on Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL).
- It is likely that NSSEville State is in the top $50 \%$ of all NSSE 2007 schools for first-year students on Level of Academic Challenge (LAC) and Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL). ${ }^{\text {a,b }}$


## NSSEville State CANNOT conclude ${ }^{\text {a }}$...

- NSSEville State is in the top half of all schools on the Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI) benchmark for first-year students. ${ }^{\text {b }}$
- NSSEville State is a "top ten percent" institution on Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL) for first-year

```
students. }\mp@subsup{}{}{\textrm{b}
```

For additional information on how to understand and use the Top $50 \%$ and Top $10 \%$ section of the benchmark report, see www.nsse.iub.edu/2007_Institutional_Report/.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Precision-weighted means (produced by Hierarchical Linear Modeling) were used to determine the top $50 \%$ and top $10 \%$ institutions for each benchmark, separately for first-year and senior students. Using this method, benchmark scores of institutions with relatively large standard errors are adjusted substantially toward the grand mean of all students, while those with smaller standard errors receive smaller corrections. Thus, schools with less stable data, though they may have high scores, may not be identified among the top scorers.
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## NSSE 2007 Benchmark Comparisons <br> With Highly Engaging Institutions Hobart and William Smith Colleges

|  |  | HWS <br> Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | HWS compared with |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | NSSE 2007Top $50 \%$ | NSSE 2007Top 10\% |  |  |
|  |  | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Sig ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Effect size ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Mean ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Sig ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Effect size ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
|  | LAC |  | 58.0 | 55.3 | *** | . 21 | 57.8 |  | . 02 |
|  | ACL |  | 44.3 | 45.3 |  | -. 06 | 48.7 | *** | -. 25 |
|  | SFI | 38.0 | 37.1 |  | . 05 | 40.4 | ** | -. 12 |
|  | EEE | 32.6 | 29.5 | *** | . 23 | 32.4 |  | . 01 |
|  | SCE | 65.2 | 65.2 |  | . 00 | 68.2 | ** | -. 16 |
| $\begin{gathered} .0 \\ \text { E. } \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | LAC | 63.3 | 58.8 | *** | . 33 | 63.1 |  | . 02 |
|  | ACL | 54.0 | 54.3 |  | -. 02 | 57.8 | ** | -. 22 |
|  | SFI | 55.5 | 47.4 | *** | . 38 | 54.1 |  | . 07 |
|  | EEE | 55.0 | 45.6 | *** | . 54 | 50.3 | *** | . 27 |
|  | SCE | 64.9 | 63.1 |  | . 09 | 66.3 |  | -. 08 |




This display compares your students with those attending schools that scored in the top $50 \%$ and top $10 \%$ of all NSSE 2007 institutions on the benchmark.


Level of Academic Challenge
(LAC)

Student-Faculty Interaction $100 \longrightarrow($ SFI )


First-Year
Senior
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## First-Year Students



[^6]
# NSSE 2007 Benchmark Comparisons <br> Detailed Statistics and Effect Sizes ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> Hobart and William Smith Colleges 

## Seniors

|  |  |  | n Stati |  |  | Distrib | tion S | tistics |  |  | Refere <br> mpari | Group <br> Statist |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | centil |  |  | Deg. of | Mean |  | Effect |
|  |  | Mean | SD ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | SEM ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 5th | 25th | 50th | 75th | 95th | Freedom ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | Diff. | Sig. ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | size ${ }^{\text {g }}$ |
| LEVEL OF ACADEMIC CHAL | NGE (LA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HWS | ( $\mathrm{N}=223$ ) | 63.3 | 12.5 | . 8 | 43 | 56 | 64 | 72 | 84 |  |  |  |  |
| Selected Peers |  | 63.7 | 12.7 | . 3 | 42 | 56 | 64 | 73 | 82 | 2,023 | -. 4 | . 684 | -. 03 |
| Carnegie Peers |  | 59.8 | 13.6 | . 1 | 36 | 51 | 60 | 70 | 81 | 20,606 | 3.5 | . 000 | . 26 |
| NSSE 2007 |  | 55.6 | 14.2 | . 0 | 32 | 46 | 56 | 65 | 78 | 223 | 7.7 | . 000 | . 54 |
| Top 50\% |  | 58.8 | 13.8 | . 0 | 36 | 50 | 59 | 69 | 81 | 112,932 | 4.5 | . 000 | . 33 |
| Top 10\% |  | 63.1 | 13.4 | . 1 | 40 | 54 | 64 | 73 | 84 | 16,504 | . 2 | . 802 | . 02 |
| ACTIVE AND COLLABORAT | LEARN | CL) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HWS | ( $\mathrm{N}=231$ ) | 54.0 | 16.7 | 1.1 | 29 | 43 | 52 | 67 | 81 |  |  |  |  |
| Selected Peers |  | 50.6 | 15.5 | . 4 | 29 | 38 | 48 | 62 | 76 | 2,129 | 3.4 | . 002 | . 22 |
| Carnegie Peers |  | 52.8 | 16.3 | . 1 | 29 | 43 | 52 | 62 | 81 | 21,435 | 1.2 | . 273 | . 07 |
| NSSE 2007 |  | 50.1 | 17.3 | . 0 | 24 | 38 | 48 | 62 | 81 | 416,344 | 3.9 | . 001 | . 23 |
| Top 50\% |  | 54.3 | 16.9 | . 0 | 29 | 43 | 52 | 67 | 86 | 121,319 | -. 3 | . 777 | -. 02 |
| Top 10\% |  | 57.8 | 17.5 | . 1 | 29 | 48 | 57 | 71 | 90 | 25,507 | -3.8 | . 001 | -. 22 |
| STUDENT-FACULTY INTERA | TION (SFI) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HWS | ( $\mathrm{N}=225$ ) | 55.5 | 22.4 | 1.5 | 22 | 39 | 56 | 72 | 94 |  |  |  |  |
| Selected Peers |  | 50.9 | 21.4 | . 5 | 17 | 33 | 50 | 67 | 89 | 2,038 | 4.6 | . 003 | . 21 |
| Carnegie Peers |  | 49.9 | 21.5 | . 1 | 17 | 33 | 50 | 67 | 89 | 20,772 | 5.7 | . 000 | . 26 |
| NSSE 2007 |  | 41.2 | 20.7 | . 0 | 11 | 28 | 39 | 56 | 80 | 398,957 | 14.3 | . 000 | . 69 |
| Top 50\% |  | 47.4 | 21.2 | . 1 | 17 | 33 | 44 | 61 | 83 | 94,108 | 8.1 | . 000 | . 38 |
| Top 10\% |  | 54.1 | 21.6 | . 2 | 22 | 39 | 56 | 72 | 94 | 11,727 | 1.5 | . 316 | . 07 |
| ENRICHING EDUCATIONAL | XPERIEN | EEE) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HWS | ( $\mathrm{N}=221$ ) | 55.0 | 17.4 | 1.2 | 25 | 43 | 56 | 68 | 81 |  |  |  |  |
| Selected Peers |  | 54.9 | 15.7 | . 4 | 27 | 44 | 55 | 65 | 80 | 267 | . 2 | . 885 | . 01 |
| Carnegie Peers |  | 49.5 | 17.8 | . 1 | 19 | 37 | 50 | 62 | 78 | 20,334 | 5.5 | . 000 | . 31 |
| NSSE 2007 |  | 39.9 | 17.8 | . 0 | 11 | 26 | 39 | 52 | 70 | 387,891 | 15.2 | . 000 | . 85 |
| Top 50\% |  | 45.6 | 17.5 | . 0 | 17 | 33 | 46 | 58 | 75 | 150,744 | 9.5 | . 000 | . 54 |
| Top 10\% |  | 50.3 | 17.5 | . 1 | 21 | 39 | 50 | 62 | 79 | 30,092 | 4.8 | . 000 | . 27 |
| SUPPORTIVE CAMPUS ENVI | ONMENT |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HWS | ( $\mathrm{N}=221$ ) | 64.9 | 17.2 | 1.2 | 36 | 53 | 67 | 78 | 94 |  |  |  |  |
| Selected Peers |  | 62.0 | 16.1 | . 4 | 33 | 53 | 64 | 72 | 89 | 1,967 | 2.9 | . 013 | . 18 |
| Carnegie Peers |  | 62.1 | 17.9 | . 1 | 31 | 50 | 63 | 75 | 92 | 20,063 | 2.8 | . 021 | . 16 |
| NSSE 2007 |  | 56.9 | 19.1 | . 0 | 25 | 44 | 58 | 69 | 89 | 382,078 | 8.0 | . 000 | . 42 |
| Top 50\% |  | 63.1 | 18.5 | . 1 | 31 | 50 | 64 | 75 | 94 | 98,719 | 1.7 | . 162 | . 09 |
| Top 10\% |  | 66.3 | 18.6 | . 1 | 33 | 53 | 67 | 81 | 94 | 24,789 | -1.4 | . 265 | -. 08 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ All statistics are weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Standard Deviation is a measure of the average amount the individual scores deviate from the mean of all the scores in the distribution.
${ }^{\text {c }}$ The $95 \%$ confidence interval for the population mean it is equal to the sample mean plus/minus the product of 1.96 times the standard error of the mean.
${ }^{d}$ A percentile is the point in the distribution of student-level benchmark scores at or below which a given percentage of benchmark scores fall.
degrees of freedom used to compute the t -tests. Values vary for the total Ns due to weighting and the equal variance assumption.
${ }^{\mathrm{f}}$ Statistical significance represents the probability that the difference between the mean of your institution and that of the comparison group occurred by chance.


[^0]:    ${ }^{a}$ Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}} * \mathrm{p}<.05^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.01^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.001$ (2-tailed).
    ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

[^1]:    ${ }^{a}$ Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}} * \mathrm{p}<.05^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.01^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.001$ (2-tailed).
    ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

[^2]:    ${ }^{a}$ Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}} * \mathrm{p}<.05^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.01^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.001$ (2-tailed).
    ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

[^3]:    ${ }^{a}$ Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}} * \mathrm{p}<.05^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.01^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.001$ (2-tailed).
    ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

[^4]:    ${ }^{b}$ NSSE does not publish the names of the top $50 \%$ and top $10 \%$ institutions because of our commitment not to release individual school results and because of issues raised in our policy against the ranking of institutions.

[^5]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}} * \mathrm{p}<.05^{* *} \mathrm{p}<.01^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<.001$ (2-tailed).
    ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

[^6]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ All statistics are weighted by gender, enrollment status, and institutional size.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Standard Deviation is a measure of the average amount the individual scores deviate from the mean of all the scores in the distribution.
    ${ }^{\text {c }}$ The $95 \%$ confidence interval for the population mean it is equal to the sample mean plus/minus the product of 1.96 times the standard error of the mean.
    ${ }^{d}$ A percentile is the point in the distribution of student-level benchmark scores at or below which a given percentage of benchmark scores fall.
    ${ }^{e}$ Degrees of freedom used to compute the $t$-tests. Values vary for the total Ns due to weighting and the equal variance assumption.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{f}}$ Statistical significance represents the probability that the difference between the mean of your institution and that of the comparison group occurred by chance.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{g}}$ Effect size is calculated by subtracting the comparison group mean from the school mean, and dividing the result by the standard deviation of the comparison group.

