

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	MTSU Mean	Your first-year students compared with					
		Southeast Public Effect size		Carnegie Effect size		NSSE 2015 & 2016 Effect size	
	Mean	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size	Mean	Effect size
Higher-Order Learning	37.2	38.5	-.09	38.1	-.06	38.8	-.11
Reflective & Integrative Learning	34.0	35.1	-.09	35.1	-.09	35.6 **	-.13
Learning Strategies	37.6	39.6 *	-.14	39.5 *	-.13	39.2	-.11
Quantitative Reasoning	24.7	28.5 ***	-.24	28.7 ***	-.25	28.0 ***	-.21

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

Score Distributions



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

Academic Challenge: First-year students (continued)

Performance on Indicator Items

The table below displays how your students responded to each EI item, and the difference, in percentage points, between your students and those of your comparison group. Blue bars indicate how much **higher** your institution's percentage is from that of the comparison group. Orange bars indicate how much **lower** your institution's percentage is from that of the comparison group.

	MTSU	Percentage point difference ^a between your FY students and		
		Southeast Public	Carnegie	NSSE 2015 & 2016
Higher-Order Learning				
<i>Percentage responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit" about how much coursework emphasized...</i>				
4b. Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	67	-5	-1	-5
4c. Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	66	-5	-1	-6
4d. Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	69	-1	-1	-1
4e. Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	65	-2	-2	-3
Reflective & Integrative Learning				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
2a. Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	50	-2	-1	-4
2b. Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	45	-7	-7	-8
2c. Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	48	-2	-3	-3
2d. Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	61	-1	-1	-2
2e. Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	70	+2	+2	+2
2f. Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	60	-4	-4	-6
2g. Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	74	-1	+1	-3
Learning Strategies				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
9a. Identified key information from reading assignments	74	-3	-2	-4
9b. Reviewed your notes after class	63	-6	-6	-3
9c. Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	59	-6	-5	-4
Quantitative Reasoning				
<i>Percentage of students who responded that they "Very often" or "Often"...</i>				
6a. Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	44	-10	-10	-9
6b. Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	32	-9	-9	-8
6c. Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	33	-7	-8	-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.