

INDEX

- Academic Quality Improvement Plan (AQIP), Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association, 27
- Accountability: reporting, 27–28; using NSSE for, 97–106
- Accreditation: and accountability, 97–98; engagement data used in, 21–33
- Actionable assessment data, 83
- Agresti, A., 42
- Ahren, C., 32
- American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), 2, 98, 102–103
- “America’s Best Colleges” report, *U.S. News and World Report*, 103
- Analysis of variance (ANOVA), 42–43, 49
- Analytical intelligence, 107–109
- Assessment, 110; engagement data used in, 21–33; findings, relating to valued goals, 23–25; measures, identifying, 23; principles of undergraduate learning (PULs), 24; and program effectiveness, 25–26; programs/services, using data to improve, 24–25; as worthwhile undertaking, 83
- Association for Institutional Research (AIR), 13–14, 105
- Astin, A. W., 6, 7, 12, 19, 56, 59, 63, 71, 74, 80
- Auburn University, NSSE results, 102
- Bain, K., 63
- Baird, L. L., 13
- Baker, R. W., 58
- Bandura, A., 56
- Banks, J. V., 38
- Banta, T. W., 2, 19, 21, 34, 83, 109, 110
- Barefoot, B. O., 62, 63
- Barnes, G., 19
- Basic statistical comparisons, computing against published norms, 40–41
- Bauer, K. W., 56
- Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE), 8, 35, 55, 108
- Ben-Avie, M., 3, 55, 69, 109
- Bender, B. E., 57
- Bennett, D. C., 99
- Blaich, C., 111
- Bradburn, N. M., 50
- Brand-Gruwel, S., 57, 58
- Braxton, J., 58
- BrckaLorenz, A., 35, 54
- Bridges, B. K., 29–30, 63
- Brigham Young University (BYU), and pre-college data, 67
- Broers, N. J., 57, 58
- Buckley, J., 63
- Building Engagement and Attainment of Minority Students project, 29–30
- Burke, J. C., 98
- Burns, L. D., 56
- California State University, Chico, NSSE results, 102
- Cambridge, B., 29–30
- Ceiling effects, 47
- Center for Postsecondary Research (Indiana University), 35
- Chen, P. D., 3, 35, 54
- Chickering, A. W., 6, 9, 19
- CLASSE, 76–77, 79–80
- Classroom Survey of Student Engagement, 108
- Cohen, J., 41, 51–52
- Cohen’s *d*, 41, 50–51
- Cohort comparisons, 47
- Cole, J. S., 3, 55, 56, 69, 109
- Collapse response categories, for reporting/analysis, 38–39
- Collapsed response percentages, analyzing by year, 50
- College Portrait (VSA reporting template), 103
- College Student Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ), 6–8
- Commission on the Future of Higher Education (Spellings Commission), 1, 2, 7, 35, 97–98
- Concordia College, and sharing of student engagement findings, 78
- Conditional effects, 42
- Connecting the Dots study, 111
- Connolly, M. R., 7

- Contextual intelligence, 110–111
- Contingency effects, 42
- Cooperative Institutional Research Program, 7–8; College Senior Survey, 7; Entering Student Survey, 7
- Cooperative Institutional Research Programs, 47
- Cross-sectional analysis, 48–51
- Cruce, T., 19
- Deep learning, 108
- Dillman, D. A., 37
- DiMaggio, P. J., 101
- Dressell, P., L., 1
- Eaton, J. S., 98
- Edgerton, R. W., 7
- Educational programs, assessment of, 30–31
- Effect size: calculating, 41–42; interpreting, 51–52
- Elliot, E., 19
- Elon University, NSSE results, 102
- Engagement data: accountability reporting, 27–28; assessment measures, identifying, 23; cohort comparisons, 47; collapse response categories for reporting/analysis, 38; cross-sectional analysis, 48–51; effect size, interpreting, 51–52; and goal setting, 21–23; institutional data, determining the quality of, 36–38; institutional examples of NSSE use, 25–33; interaction effects, test for, 42–44; interpreting effective size, 51–52; linking to other school records, 44–46; longitudinal analysis, 47–48; program assessment, 30–31; questions, combining into workable scales, 38–39; strategic planning, 28–30; tips for analyzing, 36–46; used in accreditation, planning, and assessment, 21–25; working with multiple years of, 46–51
- Engagement results, converting into action, 83–96
- Engagement, use of term, 6
- Erickson, B. L., 64
- Ewell, P. T., 7, 19
- Factual intelligence, 107–108
- Faculty: and assessment of student engagement, 72–73; as audience, 77–78; as beneficiaries of assessment knowledge, 79–80; CLASSE, 76–77, 79–80; as data analysts, 78–79; game playing, 71–72; rationale for involvement in assessment, 73–74; roles in assessment (table), 72; as source of data, 74–77; survey of student engagement, 74–76
- Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, 8, 35, 74–76, 108
- Federal Committee on Statistical Methodology, 36
- Finlay, B., 42
- Fort Hays State University, and NSSE, 28
- Gamson, Z. F., 6, 9
- Gardner, J. N., 19
- Garver, A. K., 38, 71, 81, 109
- General Education/Senior Survey, 28
- Goal setting, and engagement data, 21–23
- Gonyea, R. M., 3, 25, 35, 37, 54, 58, 107, 113
- Gordon, J., 88
- Gordon, V. N., 69
- Groves, R. M., 36
- Habley, W. R., 60
- Hampden–Sydney College, NSSE results, 102
- Hansen, M. J., 2, 21, 34, 109, 110
- Hayek, J. C., 63
- Hermans, H., 58
- Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association, Academic Quality Improvement Plan (AQIP), 27
- Hoey, J. J., 88
- Hope College, and sharing of student engagement findings, 78
- Hossler, D., 58
- Howard, J., 58
- Howard, R., D., 1
- Hughes, R., 29
- Humboldt State University, and NSSE, 29
- Hurtado, S., 19
- Illinois State University (ISU): Center for Teaching, Learning and Technology, 79–80; and NSSE, 26; and pre-college data, 67
- Indiana University Center for Postsecondary Research (IUCPR), 8
- Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI), 21, 23, 109; planning, evaluation, and improvement at

- (chart), 22–23; program assessment, 30–31; student learning goals, 24; Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program, 25
- Institute for Effective Educational Practice, founding, 10
- Institutional researchers, 107–108
- Intelligence: analytical, 107–109; contextual, 110–111; factual, 107–109; issues, 109–111; organizational, 107, 109–111; technical, 107–109
- Involvement in Learning* report (National Institute of Education), 6
- Iowa State University, Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching, 80
- Issues intelligence, 109–110; and substantive/procedural problems, 109
- Jaccard, J., 43
- Joint effects, 42
- Jones, D. P., 7
- Kennedy, J., 19
- Kennedy, M., 3, 55, 69, 109
- Kinzie, J., 3, 56, 63, 83, 96, 110
- Kirschner, P., 58
- Knight, W., E., 1
- Konings, K. D., 57, 58
- Korkmaz, A., 35, 37, 54
- Kuh, G. D., 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 19, 20, 25, 29–30, 30, 36, 38, 58, 63, 73, 74, 95, 104, 107, 110, 111, 112, 113
- Lambert, A. D., 35, 54
- Law School Survey of Student Engagement, 8, 35
- Lee, J. J., 56, 59
- Leegwater, L. H., 29–30
- Liang, Q., 56
- Light, R., 19
- Longitudinal analysis, 47–48
- Ludlum, J., 88
- Lumina Foundation for Education, 30
- Maki, P. L., 100
- March, J. G., 101
- Marchase, T., 19
- Massa-McKinley, R., 32
- McCormick, A. C., 3, 19, 97, 105, 106, 111
- McNeil, O. V., 58
- McPherson, P., 35
- Meester, M., 58
- Merwin, J. C., 6
- Middelbeek, E., 58
- Miller, T. E., 57
- Mississippi State University (MSU), and NSSE, 26
- Moderating effects, 42
- Muffo, J., 112
- Multiyear analysis, approaches to, 47
- Multiyear research questions, 48–49
- Murtaugh, P. A., 56
- National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), 98, 102–103
- National Institute of Education, 6
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), 1, 5–20, 21, 36, 37, 71, 98, 108; abridged story of, 7–9; accountability reporting, 27–28; active and collaborative learning (benchmark), 17; advocacy efforts, 10–11; benchmarks, 13, 16–18; campus environment (benchmark), 18; consortium and system participation (2000–2008), 15–16; construct, 6–7; converting engagement results into action, 83–96; educational experiences (benchmark), 18; Institute for Effective Educational Practice, founding of, 10; and institutional accreditation, 26; and Institutional Research Office, 13–14; level of academic challenge (benchmark), 16–17; online surveys, 112; organizational intelligence, 107, 109–111; Pace University, 89–94; *Pocket Guide to Choosing a College: Are You Asking the Right Questions*, 10–11; practical use of results, 83; prerresults phase, planning action during, 84–89; process indicators, 9; psychometrics, 13; purposes/philosophy, 9–13, 110; questionnaire, structure of, 11–13; results, use of, 9–10; scale scores, computing, 38–40; scalelets, 13, 38; strategic planning, 28–30; and student experience quality/educationally purposeful activities, 26; student-faculty interaction (benchmark), 17–18; using for accountability/transparency, 97–106; Web site, 111
- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSEE) Action Team, 29, 55; administration principles, 32–33; data analysis/interpretation, 35–54
- Nelson Laird, T. F., 3, 13, 38, 71, 73, 81, 109

- Nickerson, R. S., 58
- Niskodé-Dossett, A. S., 38, 71, 81, 109
- Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, 28
- Nonresponse bias, 36–37
- Norfolk State University, and NSSE, 30
- Oklahoma State University, 28; NSSE results, 102
- Olson, J. M., 57
- Online surveys, 112
- Organizational intelligence, 107, 109–111
- Ormrod, J. E., 56
- Pace, C. R., 6, 7, 8, 12, 13
- Pace, R. C., 29
- Pace University, 83; appointment of NSSE ambassadors, 95; connecting student engagement results to real campus problems, 95; disseminating data in small doses, 94–95; educational effectiveness, comprehensive action to improve, 89–94; finding relevancy and enticing with results, 94; improved student perceptions of campus administration, 94; in-depth analyses/multiyear studies, 95; infusion of data into continuous improvement processes, 95; Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research (OPAIR), 89–92; and sharing of student engagement findings, 78; Sophomore Working Group, 90–91
- Palomba, C. A., 83
- Pascarella, E. T., 5, 6, 10, 12, 19, 36, 42, 60, 62, 64, 111
- Pattengale, J., 91
- Peace College, and sharing of student engagement findings, 77
- Pedhazur, E. J., 59
- Pennipede, B. S., 3, 83, 96, 110
- Peters, C. B., 64
- Pew Charitable Trusts, 7
- Pike, G. R., 2, 6, 12, 13, 19, 21, 34, 38, 109, 110
- Pintrich, P. R., 57
- Planning: engaging data used in, 21–33; stakeholders in process, 23
- Powell, W. W., 101
- Pre-college data: attitudes about college, 56–57; Brigham Young University (BYU), 67; expectations, 56–60; Illinois State University, 67; institutional examples, 64–67; role in assessing student engagement in college, 55–70; student high school experiences, 56–57; using to improve the student experience, 60–64
- Principles of undergraduate learning (PULs), assessing, 24
- Procedural issues, 109
- Program assessment, 30–31
- Proportional representation, 37–38
- Public disclosures, professional norms to guide, 99
- Public reporting, considerations for, 104–105
- Pusser, B., 63
- Questions, combining into workable scales, 38–39
- Reflective accountability, 97–106; action, 100–101; analysis, 100; data relevance/quality/usefulness, 100; defined, 98–99; implications, 105–106; interest in and attention to objective performance information, 100; NSSE results, reporting, 102–103; public reporting possibilities, range of, 101–105
- Regression analysis, 49–50
- Response rate, 36–37
- Robbins, S. B., 56
- Rodriguez, D. P., 25
- Roesse, N. J., 57
- Ryan, H. G., 32
- Salant, P., 37
- Sampling error, 37
- Sarraf, S. A., 35, 54
- Scalelets, 13, 38, 108
- Schneider, D. J., 56
- Schreiner, L. A., 91
- Schuh, J. H., 6, 7, 57
- Schunk, D. H., 57
- Schuster, J., 56
- Schwarz, M. J., 13
- Schwarz, N., 50
- Seifert, T. A., 19, 111
- Shoup, R., 13, 35, 38, 54
- Shulenburg, D., 35
- Siryk, B., 58
- Skidmore College, and NSSE, 26
- Smallwood, R., 27, 71, 81, 109

- South Dakota Board of Regents, 28; accountability reporting, 27–28
- South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, and sharing of student engagement findings, 78
- Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 27
- Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU), and pre-college data, 64–66
- Spellings Commission, 7, 35, 97–98, 102
- Statistical comparisons, computing against published norms, 40–42
- Strategic planning, 28–30
- Strommer, D. W., 64
- Student engagement, 5, 71–81, *see also* National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): assessment of, 72–73; Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement (BCSSE), 3, 8, 35, 55, 108; Classroom Survey of Student Engagement, 108; Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, 8, 35, 74–76, 108; Law School Survey of Student Engagement, 8, 35; sharing of student engagement findings, 77–78; survey of, 74–76
- Student engagement data, *See* Engagement data
- Substantive issues, 109
- Sudman, S., 50
- Suskie, L., 83, 84
- Swing, R., 60, 62
- t*-tests, calculating, 40–41
- Technical intelligence, 107–109
- Teeter, D., 19
- Terenzini, P. T., 1, 4, 5, 6, 10, 12, 19, 36, 42, 62, 64, 107, 108, 111
- Themed learning communities (TLCs), 30–32
- Tinto, V., 6, 12, 29, 60, 63
- Transparency, using NSSE for, 97–106
- Turrisi, R., 43
- Tyler, R. L., 6
- Umbach, P. D., 73
- University Assessment Steering Committee, Fort Hays State University, 28
- University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa, and NSSE, 27
- University of Central Oklahoma, and NSSE, 29
- University of Georgia, and sharing of student engagement findings, 78
- University of Maine at Farmington, and pre-college data, 66–67
- University of Texas–Austin, and NSSE, 35
- University of Wisconsin System, 27; accountability reporting, 27
- University of Wisconsin–Green Bay (UWGB), and pre-college data, 66
- University of Wisconsin–Whitewater, NSSE results, 102
- USA TODAY, NSSE benchmark data, 103–104
- van Merriënboer, J. J. G., 57, 58
- Vesper, N., 7, 58
- Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA), 1, 98; reporting template, 103
- Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education, 111
- Washington State University, and sharing of student engagement findings, 77
- Wawrzynski, M. R., 73
- Weighting, 37–38
- Whitt, E. J., 6, 7
- Wilensky, H. L., 107
- Williams, J. M., 35, 54, 58
- Wolniak, G. C., 19
- Zanna, M. P., 57
- Zeckhauser, R., 97
- Zeckhauser, S., 97
- Zhao, C., 30