

Learning Community NSSE Results

The [National Survey of Student Engagement](#) (NSSE) is a nationally normed survey instrument that asks first-year and senior students about their participation in programs and activities relevant to their learning and personal development. At CSU, the NSSE is administered every three to four years with the most current administration occurring during the spring 2019 semester. The purpose of this report is to describe differences in the CSU's first-year NSSE results by learning community status.

Key Findings

- Based on the spring 2019 NSSE data, LC students reported statistically significant higher levels of engagement compared to non-LC students among two of the ten engagement indicator constructs. This is similar to the 2016 results since LC students also scored higher than non-LC students for the Collaborative Learning and Student-Faculty Interactions engagement indicators. However, in 2019 LC students no longer score higher than non-LC students on the Discussions with Diverse Others engagement indicator like they did in 2016.
- Within the quality of interactions construct, about 78% of LC students rate their quality of interactions with student support staff as good, very good, or excellent. This is significantly higher than non-LC students.
- LC students are more likely to either have done, or plan to do high impact activities compared to non-LC students. This includes internships, studying abroad, working with a faculty member on a research project, and completing a culminating senior experience.
- LC students report higher levels of student faculty interactions. For instance, nearly a third of LC students reported doing activities with faculty outside of the classroom often or very often compared to only about 22% of non-LC students.
- LC students reported similar levels of effective teaching practices as non-LC students. For instance, about 80% of LC and non-LC students feel that faculty clearly explain course goals and use examples to illustrate difficult points. However, only 55% of LC and non-LC students feel that they get prompt and detailed feedback on graded work.
- LC students are more likely to reflect on their own identity and participate in a diversity-related club or organization. However, they report lower levels of feeling comfortable being themselves at CSU, a less supportive environment around political affiliation and less institutional emphasis on helping students develop the skills to confront discrimination and harassment.
- LC students are more likely to seek help with coursework from learning support services, friends or other students compared to non-LC students. LC students are less likely to seek help from family members compared to their non-LC peers. About 66% of LC students reported that they often or very often study even when there are more interesting things to do. This is statistically higher than the 59% of non-LC students who reported doing this often or very often.
- Both LC and non-LC students reported high levels of satisfaction with their experience at CSU. For instance, about 9 out of 10 students in each group would rate their entire educational experience as excellent or very good. However, LC students tend to score a bit higher than non-LC on these questions. For instance, 91.5% of LC students said they would choose CSU again compared to 87.8% of non-LC students.
- About 25% of LC students considered leaving the CSU, which is not statistically different than the 27% of non-LC students that considered leaving. Among those that considered leaving, only 11% of LC students felt they needed to leave because of difficulty managing the demands of school and work compared to 20% of non-LC students. Personal reasons were the most common reason that LC students said they considered leaving.

NSSE Sample

Results are displayed by NSSE administration year and by learning community status; only those students who participated in NSSE as first year students are included in this report.

Table 1: Student Demographics by Learning Community Status and NSSE Year

			Headcount	Female	Resident	Racially Minoritized	First Generation	Pell Recipient
NSSE Year	2016	No LC	1049	60.0%	70.1%	21.9%	26.5%	22.5%
		LC	689	63.6%	65.0%	25.5%	25.8%	23.1%
	2019	No LC	1161	62.3%	64.9%	21.4%	20.1%	21.7%
		LC	713	65.1%	64.1%	33.9%	25.5%	24.3%

Learning community students are over-represented in the NSSE sample. About 40% of first-year NSSE respondents are in a learning community compared to only about 35% of all first-time, full-time students. Overall at CSU, the NSSE samples has an overrepresentation of females and higher achieving students (as measured by CSU GPA and high school GPA), but is well represented among first-generation, racially minoritized and Pell grant recipients. Generally, the sample represents the overall population of students at CSU (see the [NSSE 2019 Data Quality Report](#) for more information).

Academic Challenge

The Academic Challenge theme is comprised of four constructs: higher-order learning, reflective and integrative learning, learning strategies, and quantitative reasoning.

Higher-Order Learning

The Higher-Order Learning (HOL) engagement indicator measures how much institutions are emphasizing student engagement in complex cognitive tasks that require more than memorization of facts. Items address to what extent coursework has emphasized memorization, application of knowledge to practical problems, analysis, evaluation of sources, and synthesizing of knowledge into new ideas.

Table 2: Engage in Higher-Order Learning (% Often/Very Often)

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
HOL Construct Total Score	37.9	38.6	38.6	39.0
Coursework emphasized: Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	73.2%	76.4%	73.8%	77.2%
Coursework emphasized: Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	71.2%	73.4%	72.0%	72.5%
Coursework emphasized: Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	68.4%	68.2%	72.1%	68.5%
Coursework emphasized: Forming a new idea or understanding from various pieces of information	67.7%	67.9%	70.7%	72.7%

LC students and non-LC students have statistically similar levels of engagement in higher order learning.

Learning Strategies

College students enhance their learning and retention by actively engaging with and analyzing course material rather than approaching learning as absorption. Examples of effective learning strategies include identifying key information in readings, reviewing notes after class, and summarizing course material. Knowledge about the prevalence of effective learning strategies helps colleges and universities target interventions to promote student learning and success.

Table 3: Use of Learning Strategies (% Often/Very Often)

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
LS Construct Total Score	37.5	38.4	37.9	38.0
Identified key information from reading assignments	75.1%	79.6%*	77.9%	76.6%
Reviewed your notes after class	64.9%	62.1%	64.9%	65.4%
Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials	60.8%	57.6%	61.2%	61.0%

* $p < .05$

LC and non-LC students reported using learning strategies at statistically similar levels. Both groups were most likely to identify key information from reading, and least likely to summarize what they learned.

Reflective and Integrative Learning

The central theme of the RIL engagement indicator is to measure how much instructors are motivating students to make connections between course material and the world around them, to reexamine their own beliefs, and to consider other perspectives.

Table 4: Engagement in Reflective & Integrative Learning (% Often/Very Often)

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
RIL Construct Total Score	36.3	36.7	37.3	37.6
Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	61.4%	60.2%	61.3%	62.4%
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	60.0%	57.0%	59.4%	56.6%
Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments	52.3%	54.7%	53.8%	56.1%
Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue	65.0%	65.1%	69.1%	71.2%
Tried to better understand someone else	69.9%	70.7%	77.6%	76.6%
Learned something that changed the way you understand an issue or concept	70.5%	71.2%	70.8%	72.5%
Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	79.1%	79.6%	83.6%	82.5%

LC students engage in reflective and integrative learning practices at statistically similar levels compared to non-LC students. Overall, students are least likely to connect their learning to societal issues and include diverse perspectives in course discussions or assignments. Both groups are most likely to connect ideas from their courses to their own prior experiences and knowledge.

Quantitative Reasoning

Quantitative literacy—the ability to use and understand numerical and statistical information in everyday life— is an increasingly important outcome of higher education. All students, regardless of major, should have ample opportunities to develop their ability to reason quantitatively—to evaluate, support, and critique arguments using numerical and statistical information.

Table 5: Quantitative Reasoning (% Often/Very Often)

	NSSE_YEAR			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
QR Construct Total Score	30.0	30.9	29.9	30.4
Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information (numbers, graphs, statistics, etc.)	55.2%	57.5%	56.3%	56.1%
Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (unemployment, climate change, public health, etc.)	46.0%	43.7%	45.6%	43.4%
Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	44.5%	47.9%	44.9%	46.7%

LC and non-LC students reported using similar levels of quantitative reasoning skills. Quantitative Reasoning is the second lowest rated engagement indicator overall behind student-faculty interaction.

Learning with Peers

The Learning with Peers theme is comprised of two constructs, collaborative learning and discussions with diverse others.

Collaborative Learning

Collaborating with peers in solving problems or mastering difficult material deepens understanding and prepares students to deal with the messy, unscripted problems they encounter during and after college. Working on group projects, asking others for help with difficult material or explaining it to others, and working through course material in preparation for exams all represent collaborative learning activities.

Table 6: Engagement in Collaborative Learning (% Often/Very Often)

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
Collaborative Learning Construct Total Score	34.1	37.7*	35.2	38.7*
Asked another student to help you understand course material	58.1%	67.1%*	63.3%	69.7%*
Explained course material to one or more students	60.9%	70.6%*	65.5%	71.4%*

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Prepared for exams by discussing or working through course material with other students	59.7%	65.6%*	59.2%	65.6%*
Worked with other students on course projects or assignments	52.8%	59.3%*	57.6%	67.3%*

*p<.05

Across both NSSE years, LC students reported significantly higher levels of collaborative learning compared to non-LC students overall, as well as for each individual item.

Discussions with Diverse Others

Colleges and universities afford students new opportunities to interact with and learn from others with different backgrounds and life experiences. Interactions across difference, both inside and outside the classroom, confer educational benefits and prepare students for personal and civic participation in a diverse and interdependent world.

Table 7: Discussions with Diverse Others (% Often/Very Often)

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
DDO Construct Total Score	39.9	42.4*	40.4	40.9
Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	65.3%	75.0%*	68.1%	69.7%
Had discussions with people from an economic background other than your own	71.0%	76.2%*	76.3%	74.2%
Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	70.8%	76.9%*	73.1%	74.4%
Had discussions with people with political views other than your own	72.1%	72.9%	69.1%	67.9%

*p<.05

In 2016, LC students reported more frequent discussions with diverse others in comparison to non-LC students; in 2019, students reported similar levels. Having discussions with people of a different race or ethnicity and with people with different political views decreased among LC students between 2016 and 2019. For non-LC students, the frequency of these discussions increased across years for each question with the exception of those with different political views.

Experiences with Faculty

The Experiences with Faculty theme is comprised of two constructs, student-faculty interaction and effective teaching practices.

Student-Faculty Interaction

Interactions with faculty can positively influence the cognitive growth, development, and persistence of college students. Through their formal and informal roles as teachers, advisors, and mentors, faculty members model intellectual work, promote mastery of knowledge and skills, and help students make connections between their studies and their future plans.

Table 8: Engagement with Faculty (% Often/Very Often)

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
SFI Construct Total Score	21.2	23.3*	22.5	24.7*
Talked about career plans with a faculty member	36.3%	40.8%	41.3%	45.8%
Worked with a faculty member on activities other than coursework (committees, student groups, etc.)	20.3%	24.4%*	22.3%	27.5%*
Discussed course topics, ideas, or concepts with a faculty member outside of class	24.7%	29.5%*	27.6%	29.0%
Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member	27.1%	31.2%	31.2%	34.3%

* $p < .05$

LC students reported statistically higher levels of engagement with faculty compared to non-LC students, particularly around working with a faculty member outside the classroom for both NSSE years. In 2016, LC students reported higher levels of discussing course material with faculty outside of the classroom.

Effective Teaching Practices

Student learning is heavily dependent on effective teaching. Organized instruction, clear explanations, illustrative examples, and effective feedback on student work all represent aspects of teaching effectiveness that promote student comprehension and learning.

Table 9: Instructor Use of Effective Teaching Practices (% Quite a bit/Very Much)

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
ETP Construct Total Score	37.8	38.0	38.4	38.0
Instructors: Clearly explained course goals and requirements	80.0%	82.6%	81.0%	79.4%
Instructors: Taught course sessions in an organized way	77.7%	78.6%	76.5%	77.1%
Instructors: Used examples or illustrations to explain difficult points	76.4%	80.5%*	79.1%	77.8%
Instructors: Provided feedback on a draft or work in progress	58.3%	57.3%	61.4%	59.4%
Instructors: Provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments	55.0%	56.7%	56.7%	55.7%

* $p < .05$

LC students' classroom experiences are very similar to non-LC students. Just over half of students report receiving timely feedback about their work, but feel that course goals and requirements were made clear and courses were well taught.

High Impact Practices

Due to their positive associations with student learning and retention, certain undergraduate opportunities are designated "high-impact." High-Impact Practices (HIPs) share several traits: They demand considerable time and effort, facilitate learning outside of the classroom, require meaningful

interactions with faculty and students, encourage collaboration with diverse others, and provide frequent and substantive feedback.

Table 6: High Impact Practices (% Plan to do, Done, or in Progress)

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
Internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement	86.5%	89.7%	83.4%	87.7%*
Learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together	38.2%	70.3%*	34.4%	70.7%*
Study abroad program	49.7%	52.2%	47.3%	59.9%*
Work with a faculty member on a research project	44.4%	53.9%*	42.0%	56.0%*
Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, portfolio, etc.)	64.6%	73.2%*	60.6%	73.2%*
About how many of your courses at this institution have included a community-based project (service-learning)? (Some/Most/All)	7.6%	7.9%	10.1%	10.0%

* $p < .05$

LC students report statistically higher levels of engagement in high impact practices compared to non-LC students. LC students are more likely to engage (or plan to engage) in internships, study abroad, research projects with faculty, and culminating senior experiences. They indicate similar levels of service learning as non-LC students.

Table 7: Number of High-Impact Practices Completed

		NSSE Year							
		2016				2019			
		No LC	LC	No LC	LC	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Number of high-impact practices for first-year students marked	0	470	49.3%	131	20.8%	489	48.1%	140	21.9%
	1	427	44.8%	289	45.9%	457	44.9%	308	48.2%
	2	49	5.1%	187	29.7%	59	5.8%	174	27.2%
	3	8	0.8%	22	3.5%	12	1.2%	17	2.7%
Engaged in 1 or more HIP		484	50.7%	498	79.1%	528	51.9%	499	78.1%

LC students engage in more high-impact practices compared to non-LC students by their first spring term by nearly 30 percentage points for both 2016 and 2019.

Campus Environment

The Campus Environment theme is comprised of two constructs, quality of interactions and supportive environment.

Quality of Interactions

College environments characterized by positive interpersonal relations promote student learning and success. Students who enjoy supportive relationships with peers, advisors, faculty, and staff are better able to find assistance when needed, and to learn from and with those around them.

Table 8: Quality of Interactions (% Good, Very Good, Excellent)

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
QI Construct Total Score	42.5	43.6	44.2	44.3
Quality of interactions with students	81.4%	86.1%*	82.4%	82.7%
Quality of interactions with academic advisors	73.7%	77.0%	79.8%	80.4%
Quality of interactions with faculty	72.8%	76.1%	80.2%	82.0%
Quality of interactions with student services staff	69.7%	75.5%*	73.6%	78.2%*
Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices	65.4%	68.3%	75.0%	73.4%

* $p < .05$

LC students reported significantly higher quality of interactions with student services staff, higher quality of interactions with students in 2016, and similar quality with others on campus (students, faculty, academic advisors).

Supportive Environment

Institutions that are committed to student success provide support and involvement across a variety of domains, including the cognitive, social, and physical. These commitments foster higher levels of student performance and satisfaction. This Engagement Indicator summarizes students' perceptions of how much an institution emphasizes services and activities that support their learning and development.

Table 9: How much does your institution emphasize: (% Quite a bit/Very Much)

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
SE Construct Total Score	38.4	39.5	38.0	38.9
Institutional emphasis: Providing support to help students succeed academically	81.3%	83.0%	78.3%	82.5%*
Institutional emphasis: Using learning support services (tutoring services, writing center, etc.)	80.7%	80.8%	78.6%	81.4%
Institutional emphasis: Encouraging contact among students from different backgrounds (social, racial/ethnic, religious, etc.)	62.4%	64.4%	64.7%	67.5%
Institutional emphasis: Providing opportunities to be involved socially	76.4%	79.3%	73.4%	76.2%
Institutional emphasis: Providing support for your overall well-being (recreation, health care, counseling, etc.)	77.1%	81.5%*	77.8%	78.1%
Institutional emphasis: Helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)	50.2%	48.9%	45.6%	47.0%
Institutional emphasis: Attending campus activities and events (performing arts, athletic events, etc.)	70.2%	71.7%	66.0%	66.1%

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Institutional emphasis: Attending events that address important social, economic, or political issues	56.1%	59.8%	50.2%	51.6%

* $p < .05$

Overall, LC students reported similar levels of institutional emphasis on a supportive environment. LC students report slightly higher institutional emphasis for providing academic support in 2019, and higher emphasis for their overall well-being in 2016. Across both groups, students report the lowest levels of emphasis for helping to manage non-academic responsibilities, and the highest levels for providing academic support and using learning support services.

Student Satisfaction

	NSSE Year			
	2016		2019	
	No LC	LC	No LC	LC
Headcount	1049	689	1161	713
If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution? (% Probably yes/Definitely yes)	88.8%	90.6%	87.8%	91.5%*
Do you intend to return to this institution next year? (% Probably yes/Definitely yes)			95.0%	96.3%
How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution?	87.6%	90.6%	88.7%	91.6%

* $p < .05$

Both LC and non-LC students reported high levels of satisfaction with their experience at CSU.

First Year Experiences

First Year-Experiences is a topical module that was appended to the 2019 survey. These items focus on academic perseverance, help-seeking behaviors, and institutional commitment.

Table 11: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Quite a bit/Very Much) 2019 Only

	No LC	LC
Headcount	1161	713
Construct Average Score	2.8	2.8
Studied when there were other interesting things to do	59.1%	66.1%*
Found additional information for course assignments when you didn't understand the material	69.9%	72.8%
Participated in course discussions, even when you didn't feel like it	48.5%	52.0%
Asked instructors for help when you struggled with course assignments	43.7%	45.5%
Finished something you had started when you encountered challenges	83.1%	85.8%
Stayed positive, even when you did poorly on a test or assignment	67.0%	69.0%

* $p < .05$

Overall, LC students reported higher levels of engagement with their courses compared to non-LC students. LC students reported statistically higher levels of studying when there were other things to do.

Overall, less than half of students reported asking instructors for help when they needed it; students reported the highest levels for finishing something they started when they encountered challenges.

Table 12: During the current school year, how difficult have the following been for you? (% Quite a bit/Very Much) 2019 Only

	No LC	LC
Headcount	1161	713
Construct Total Score	3.2	3.2
How difficult: Learning course material	52.4%	50.2%
How difficult: Managing your time	56.6%	55.8%
How difficult: Getting help with school work	31.8%	32.3%
How difficult: Interacting with faculty	31.2%	32.1%

Both LC and non-LC students reported similar levels of difficulty for each item. Students reported the least difficulty with interacting with faculty, and the highest level of difficulty with time management.

Table 13: During the current school year, about how often have you sought help with coursework from the following sources? (% Quite a bit/Very Much) 2019 Only

	No LC	LC
Headcount	1161	713
Construct Total Score	2.1	2.1
Sought help from: Faculty members	26.0%	29.2%
Sought help from: Academic advisors	18.0%	21.4%
Sought help from: Learning support services (tutoring, writing center, success coaching, etc.)	22.5%	29.4%*
Sought help from: Friends or other students	71.6%	76.1%*
Sought help from: Family members	27.5%	20.2%*
Sought help from: Other persons or offices	11.4%	10.7%

* $p < .05$

LC students are significantly more likely to seek help from learning support services and other students, and less likely to seek help from family members. Overall, students are most likely to seek help from their peers, and least likely to seek help from other persons or offices.

Table 14: During the current school year, have you seriously considered leaving this institution? 2019 Only

	No LC	LC
Headcount	1161	713
During the current school year, have you seriously considered leaving this institution?	27.1%	24.8%

About 25% of LC and non-LC students reported seriously considering leaving CSU.

Table 15: If yes, why did you consider leaving? (Select all that apply) 2019 Only

	No LC	LC
Headcount	1161	713
Considered leaving: Academics are too difficult	17.2%	15.0%
Considered leaving: Academics are too easy	5.7%	6.5%
Considered leaving: Other academic issues (major not offered, course availability, advising, credit transfer, etc.)	15.3%	15.7%
Considered leaving: Financial concerns (costs or financial aid)	47.7%	48.4%

	No LC	LC
Considered leaving: To change your career options (transfer to another school or program, military service, etc.)	16.4%	17.0%
Considered leaving: Difficulty managing demands of school and work	20.2%	11.1%*
Considered leaving: Too much emphasis on partying	5.7%	3.3%
Considered leaving: Not enough opportunities to socialize and have fun	11.1%	10.5%
Considered leaving: Relations with faculty and staff	4.6%	5.2%
Considered leaving: Relations with other students	20.2%	26.1%
Considered leaving: Campus climate, location, or culture	24.0%	22.2%
Considered leaving: Unsafe or hostile environment	3.1%	1.3%
Considered leaving: Personal reasons (family issues, physical or mental health, homesickness, stress, etc.)	50.0%	45.1%
Considered leaving: A reason not listed above, please specify:	13.0%	10.5%

* $p < .05$

Among those who considered leaving, the most common reason is financial concerns, closely followed by personal reasons.

Table 16: How important is it to you that you graduate from this institution? (Somewhat important, important, very important) 2019 Only

	No LC	LC
Headcount	1161	713
How important is it to you that you graduate from THIS INSTITUTION?	86.8%	87.1%

Both LC and non-LC students reported similar levels of importance related to graduating from CSU at about 87%.

Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity

The Inclusiveness and Engagement with Cultural Diversity module examines environments, processes, and activities that reflect the engagement and validation of cultural diversity and promote greater understanding of societal differences. CSU appended this module to the core survey for the 2019 administration.

Table 17: During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following? (% Quite a bit/Very Much) 2019 Only

	No LC	LC
Headcount	1161	713
Construct Total Score	2.6	2.6
Coursework emphasis: Developing the skills necessary to work effectively with people from various backgrounds	48.9%	49.8%
Coursework emphasis: Recognizing your own cultural norms and biases	53.4%	55.5%
Coursework emphasis: Sharing your own perspectives and experiences	61.1%	59.9%
Coursework emphasis: Exploring your own background through projects, assignments, or programs	43.6%	48.0%
Coursework emphasis: Learning about other cultures	50.1%	48.8%
Coursework emphasis: Discussing issues of equity or privilege	52.1%	51.3%
Coursework emphasis: Respecting the expression of diverse ideas	65.7%	64.4%

LC students report similar levels of diversity emphasis across experiences in their coursework. Students reported the highest levels of emphasis for respecting the expression of diverse ideas, and the lowest overall for exploring their own backgrounds through projects, assignments, or programs.

Table 18: How much does your institution emphasize the following? (% Quite a bit/Very Much) 2019 Only

	No LC	LC
Headcount	1161	713
Construct Total Score	3.1	3.1
Institutional emphasis: Demonstrating a commitment to diversity	76.9%	77.5%
Institutional emphasis: Providing students with the resources needed for success in a multicultural world	73.5%	75.3%
Institutional emphasis: Creating an overall sense of community among students	78.1%	78.9%
Institutional emphasis: Ensuring that you are not stigmatized because of your identity (racial/ethnic, gender, religious affiliation, sexual orientation, etc.)	79.3%	79.2%
Institutional emphasis: Providing information about anti-discrimination and harassment policies	79.9%	77.6%
Institutional emphasis: Taking allegations of discrimination or harassment seriously	81.5%	79.9%
Institutional emphasis: Helping students develop the skills to confront discrimination and harassment	73.6%	68.8%*

* $p < .05$

LC students reported slightly lower levels of institutional emphasis on helping students develop skills to confront discrimination and harassment; this question had the lowest endorsement overall. LC students reported similar levels compared to non-LC students across the remaining items. In general, students reported a high level of institutional emphasis around diversity.

Table 19: How much does your institution provide a supportive environment for the following forms of diversity? (% Quite a bit/Very Much) 2019 Only

	No LC	LC
Headcount	1161	713
Construct Total Score	3.1	3.0
Supportive environment: Racial/ethnic identity	83.9%	81.7%
Supportive environment: Gender identity	87.9%	87.0%
Supportive environment: Economic background	66.4%	62.2%
Supportive environment: Political affiliation	59.6%	52.2%*
Supportive environment: Religious affiliation	67.7%	63.7%
Supportive environment: Sexual orientation	86.0%	84.3%
Supportive environment: Disability status	77.5%	74.3%

* $p < .05$

LC students feel the least supported around their political affiliation, with a statistically lower rating compared to non-LC students. LC and non-LC students reported feeling similar levels of support across the other identities, with the highest level reported for gender identity, sexual orientation, and racial/ethnic identity.

Table 20: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? (% Agree/Strongly Agree) 2019 Only

	No LC	LC
Headcount	1161	713
Construct Total Score	3.1	3.1
Agree/Disagree: I feel comfortable being myself at this institution.	92.9%	90.0%*
Agree/Disagree: I feel valued by this institution.	81.6%	81.6%
Agree/Disagree: I feel like part of the community at this institution.	81.8%	83.5%

* $p < .05$

Both LC and non-LC students report high levels of belongingness; however, LC students reported a lower level of comfort being themselves at CSU compared to non-LC students.

Table 212: During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? (% Often/Very Often) 2019 Only

	No LC	LC
Headcount	1161	713
Construct Total Score	1.8	2.0*
Attended events, activities, or presentations that reflect an appreciation for diverse groups of people	35.3%	39.5%
Participated in the activities of centers related to specific groups (racial-ethnic, cultural, religious, gender, LGBT, etc.)	21.7%	23.2%
Participated in a diversity-related club or organization	16.1%	22.0%*
Participated in a demonstration for a diversity-related cause (rally, protest, etc.)	11.9%	11.2%
Reflected on your cultural identity	29.9%	41.0%*

* $p < .05$

LC students reported higher levels of participation in diversity-related organizations and reflection on their own cultural identity, with a higher overall total score. Very few (~11-12%) students reported attending a demonstration for a diversity-related cause.

Conclusions

Students who participate in learning communities report similar, if not slightly higher, levels of student engagement. In terms of engagement constructs, belonging to an LC is associated with greater collaborative learning as well as student-faculty interaction. LC students also report a higher level of either having done in or planning to do in high-impact practices.

In general, first-year students report their overall experience as positive. LC students are more likely to seek help with coursework from learning support services, friends or other students, and less likely to seek help from family members. They also report higher levels of studying even when there were other interesting things to do.

LC students are more likely to reflect on their own identity and participate in a diversity-related club or organization. However, they report lower levels of feeling comfortable being themselves at CSU, a less supportive environment around political affiliation, and less institutional emphasis on helping students develop the skills to confront discrimination and harassment.