President’s Comments
The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is designed to obtain, on an annual basis, information from colleges and universities nationwide about student participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development.
The results will provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending college.
Survey items on *The National Survey of Student Engagement* 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 will 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 intended for use 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.
In the year 2000, 276 colleges and universities participated.

In the spring of 2006, 557 colleges and universities participated.

In the first 6 years over 970 different colleges and universities have participated in NSSE.
Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practices

- Level of Academic Challenge (LAC)
- Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL)
- Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI)
- Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE)
- Supportive Campus Environment (SCE)
Level of Academic Challenge

- Preparing for class
- Number of assigned books, written papers
- Coursework emphasizing analysis, synthesis, judgments, application of theories
- Working harder than you thought
Active and Collaborative Learning

- Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions
- Made a class presentation
- Worked on project with others in class or outside
- Tutored
- Participated in community-based projects
- Discussed class work outside of class
Student-Faculty Interaction

• Discussed
  – Grades or assignments with instructor
  – Career plans with faculty, advisor
  – Ideas from class with faculty outside of class

• Worked with faculty
  – On activities (other than class)
  – On research project

• Received prompt written or oral feedback
Enriching Educational Experiences

- Participation in
  - Co-curricular activities, learning communities
  - Practicum, internships, etc.
  - Study abroad
  - Independent study
  - Senior experience (capstone, senior thesis)
  - Conversations about critical topics
  - Using electronic technology for class purpose

- Degree of contact with diverse students
Supportive Campus Environment

• Campus environment
  – Provides support to succeed academically
  – Helps cope with non-academics
  – Support to thrive socially

• Quality of relationships with
  – Other students
  – With faculty
  – With administrative personnel
NSSE at UNI

- Survey administered in Spring 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First-year</th>
<th>Senior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>2711</td>
<td>3079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate (%)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Basic Demographics: First-year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNI</th>
<th>Carnegie</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% &lt; 23yrs</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Started here</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% full-time</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% live on campus</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% responded by WEB</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Basic Demographics: Senior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNI</th>
<th>Carnegie</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% &lt; 23yrs</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White (non-Hispanic)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Started here</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% full-time</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% live on campus</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% responded by WEB</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are UNI survey scores on Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice different from peer institutions?

Carnegie peers
UNI’s Benchmark Institutions
Selected Iowa Colleges and Universities
Benchmark Schools

- Northern Arizona
- CSU Fresno
- Illinois State
- Indiana State
- Central Michigan
- Univ. of Minnesota - Duluth
- UNC – Greensboro
- Ohio University
- Univ. of North Texas
Iowa Schools

- Clarke College
- Cornell College
- Drake University
- Iowa State
- Luther College
- Morningside College
- Saint Ambrose College
- Waldorf College
Level of Academic Challenge

First | Senior
--- | ---
UNI | C Peer
44 | 56
48 | 54
50 | 52
52 | 50
54 | 52
56 | 54
Level of Academic Challenge

First Senior

UNI Benchmark
Level of Academic Challenge

[Bar chart showing comparison between First and Senior years, with UNI and Iowa institutions.]
Level of Academic Challenge

First-year Seniors

UNI
Carnegie
Benchmarks
Iowa
LAC

• Items UNI was poorer in:
  – Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, methods (F)
  – Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships (F)

• Items UNI was better in:
  – Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings (F)
Active & Collaborative Learning

First Senior

UNI C Peer
Active & Collaborative Learning

![Chart showing comparison between First and Senior phases. The chart includes bars for UNI and Benchmark.](chart-image)
Active & Collaborative Learning

![Bar chart comparing 'First' and 'Senior' grades between UNI and Iowa]
Active & Collaborative Learning

- First-year Seniors
- UNI
- Carnegie
- Benchmarks
- Iowa

Bar chart showing comparison between First-year and Seniors in terms of active and collaborative learning across different categories.
ACL

• Items UNI was poorer in:
  – Tutored or taught other students (F)
  – Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside the class (S)

• Items UNI was better in:
  – Worked with classmates outside class to prepare class assignments (F)
Student-Faculty Interaction

Bar chart showing comparison between First and Senior years for UNI and C Peer interactions.
Student-Faculty Interaction

![Bar chart showing interaction levels for First and Senior students compared to benchmark.](chart.png)
Student-Faculty Interaction
Student-Faculty Interaction

![Bar chart showing student-faculty interaction for first-year and seniors at different institutions.]

- First-year:
  - UNI: 30
  - Carnegie: 35
  - Benchmarks: 40
  - Iowa: 45

- Seniors:
  - UNI: 40
  - Carnegie: 45
  - Benchmarks: 50
  - Iowa: 55
SFI

- Items UNI was poorer in:
  - Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on academic performance (F,S)
Enriching Educational Experiences

![Bar chart showing comparisons between First and Senior years for UNI and C Peer categories.]
Enriching Educational Experiences
Enriching Educational Experiences

![Bar graph comparing First and Senior educational experiences for UNI and Iowa institutions.](image-url)
Enriching Educational Experiences

First-year Seniors
UNI
Carnegie
Benchmarks
Iowa

Graph showing comparisons between first-year and senior students across different categories.
• Items UNI was poorer in:
  – Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity (F, S)
  – Encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds (F)
  – Had a serious conversation with students who are very different from you in terms of religious beliefs, political opinions (F, S)
  – Independent study or self-designed major (S)

• Items UNI was better in:
  – Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc) (S)
Supportive Campus Environment

![Bar Chart]

- **First Senior UNI Peer**
  - Score: 59.5

- **First Senior C Peer**
  - Score: 57.5
Supportive Campus Environment

First Senior

UNI Benchmark
Supportive Campus Environment

First Senior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNI</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supportive Campus Environment

![Bar Chart]

- **First-year**: UNI (56), Carnegie (62), Benchmarks (58), Iowa (64)
- **Seniors**: UNI (54), Carnegie (60), Benchmarks (56), Iowa (62)
SCE

• Items UNI was poorer in:
  – Relationships with faculty members (F) (effect size = .19)
Overall how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?
According to NSSE report, “Over the years, our analysis and other research has shown that the between-institution variance is consistently much smaller than the within-institution variance. In other words, the largest differences in student engagement occur among students, not between institutions.”
At UNI:

- In all measures except SCE seniors scored higher on benchmarks than did first-year students
- No relationship was found between gender, age, part-time/full-time, or where started on benchmarks
- No big effect of ACT except at very high end
- Positive relationship between expected grades and EEE, but not SCE
Cluster Analysis

- Cluster analysis is an exploratory data analysis tool for solving classification problems. Its object is to sort cases (people, things, events, etc) into groups, or clusters, so that the degree of association is strong between members of the same cluster and weak between members of different clusters.

- 234 Seniors only
## Cluster Summaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\text{KM-K-Means}$</th>
<th>Level of Academic Challenge</th>
<th>Active &amp; Collaborative Learning</th>
<th>Student &amp; Faculty Interaction</th>
<th>Enriching Educational Experiences</th>
<th>Supportive Campus Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster-1</td>
<td>38.07</td>
<td>33.79</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>21.13</td>
<td>44.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster-2</td>
<td>70.67</td>
<td>69.84</td>
<td>67.90</td>
<td>56.72</td>
<td>77.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster-3</td>
<td>48.58</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>57.58</td>
<td>45.63</td>
<td>51.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster-4</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>46.20</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>46.53</td>
<td>66.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster-5</td>
<td>65.25</td>
<td>55.18</td>
<td>48.04</td>
<td>36.10</td>
<td>65.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster-6</td>
<td>62.70</td>
<td>46.17</td>
<td>27.54</td>
<td>31.12</td>
<td>44.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Characteristics of Student Clusters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students in this group do not participate in any academic activities or efforts and prefer to stay aloof from faculty as well as diverse learning activities.</td>
<td>Withdrawn and Alienated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Students are intensely involved in academic efforts and enriching educational experiences inside and outside the classroom.</td>
<td>Highly Engaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Students in this category are moderately involved in academic and educationally enriching experiences. They actively participate in collaborative learning and interact well with faculty.</td>
<td>Collaborative and Homogeneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Students experience diverse educational and social opportunities and believe the campus is generally supportive. However, they are not actively engaged in academic efforts and do not interact with faculty.</td>
<td>Diverse, but Academically Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Students in this group are typical of students in the Highly Engaged group in academic efforts and collaborative learning, but do not experience diverse learning environment and interact less with faculty.</td>
<td>Homogeneous and Interpersonally Cohesive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Students are highly involved in academically challenging efforts, but in a less collaborative learning environment. Also students are generally withdrawn from diverse educational experiences and student-faculty interaction.</td>
<td>Academically Challenging, but Interpersonally Fragmented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clusters by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academically Challenging, but Interpersonally Fragmented</td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and Homogeneous</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse, but Academically Withdrawn</td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Engaged</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous and Interpersonally Cohesive</td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn and Alienated</td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institution reported: Gender

- Female
- Male
Clusters by the Quality of Academic Advising

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Proportion</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academically Challenging, but Interpersonally Fragmented</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.66</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative and Homogeneous</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse, but Academically Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Engaged</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneous and Interpersonally Cohesive</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.53</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn and Alienated</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.95</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?

- Excellent
- Fair
- Good
- Poor
- Null
Conclusions from cluster analysis

At UNI

• Gender and transfer status has little or no effect on student engagement.
• There appear to be differences in the level of student engagement depending on ethnicity, but sample sizes are small.
• Part-time students are less engaged than Full-time students.
Conclusions from cluster analysis

At UNI

- Experiences with students of different religious beliefs, political opinions or personal values are highly related to student engagement.
- Quality academic advising is highly associated with student engagement.
- Staying in the residence halls or closer to campus has a positively associated with student engagement.
Conclusions from cluster analysis

At UNI

- Students who use electronic medium (list serve, chat group, internet, instant messaging, etc.) to discuss or complete assignments are generally highly engaged, or homogeneous and collaborative.
- Students’ positive education experiences are generally tied to more learning opportunities outside the class room than direct academic experiences.
Conclusions from cluster analysis

At UNI

- Students in Business are overall less engaged, but academically put in more effort.
- Education students are highly engaged and generally homogeneous and interpersonal.
- Students in Natural Sciences are either withdrawn or academically do not participate in challenging efforts.
- Students in Social Sciences are more collaborative and homogeneous.
- Humanities and Fine Arts students are represented in every cluster group at UNI.
• Ending on a good note......
How would you evaluate your entire educational experience at this institution? (mean response to item #13)
If you could start over again, would you go to the same institution you are now attending? (mean response to item #14)
Conclusions

• UNI looks better when compared to benchmarks than entire Carnegie classification

• Still, generally lower on all benchmarks of effective educational practice – most notably for first-year students.
Recommendations

• Need to validate current findings with 2007 NSSE results
• Compare present survey results with those from FSSE
• Review first-year programs – both academic and student support services
• Consider review of specific target areas – e.g., diversity, LAC content, specific colleges