A Summary of Student Engagement Results

Student engagement represents two critical features of collegiate quality. The first is the amount of time and effort students put into their studies and other educationally purposeful activities. The second is how institutional resources, courses, and other learning opportunities facilitate student participation in activities that matter to student learning. NSSE surveys undergraduate students in their first and final years to assess their levels of engagement and related information about their experience at your institution.

This Snapshot is a concise collection of key findings from your institution’s NSSE 2017 administration. We hope this information stimulates discussions about the undergraduate experience. Additional details about these and other results appear in the reports referenced throughout.

### Engagement Indicators
Sets of items are grouped into ten Engagement Indicators, organized under four broad themes. At right are summary results for your institution. For details, see your Engagement Indicators report.

#### Theme
- **Academic Challenge**
- **Learning with Peers**
- **Experiences with Faculty**
- **Campus Environment**

#### Engagement Indicator

- **Higher-Order Learning**
- **Reflective & Integrative Learning**
- **Learning Strategies**
- **Quantitative Reasoning**
- **Collaborative Learning**
- **Discussions with Diverse Others**
- **Student-Faculty Interaction**
- **Effective Teaching Practices**
- **Quality of Interactions**
- **Supportive Environment**

#### Key:
- ▲ Your students’ average was significantly higher ($p < .05$) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.
- ▼ Your students’ average was significantly lower ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
- ▼ No significant difference.

#### High-Impact Practices
Due to their positive associations with student learning and retention, special undergraduate opportunities are designated “high-impact.” For more details and statistical comparisons, see your High-Impact Practices report.

#### First-year
- Learning Community, Service-Learning, and Research w/Faculty

#### Senior
- Learning Community, Service-Learning, Research w/Faculty, Internship, Study Abroad, and Culminating Senior Experience

---

**Comparison Group**
The comparison group featured in this report is Urban 21 & Gr Cities. See your Selected Comparison Groups report for details.
Academic Challenge: Additional Results

The Academic Challenge theme contains four Engagement Indicators as well as several important individual items. The results presented here provide an overview of these individual items. For more information about the Academic Challenge theme, see your Engagement Indicators report. To further explore individual item results, see your Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons, the Major Field Report, the Online Institutional Report, or the Report Builder—Institution Version.

Time Spent Preparing for Class
This figure reports the average weekly class preparation time for your students compared to students in your comparison group.

Reading and Writing
These figures summarize the number of hours your students spent reading for their courses and the average number of pages of assigned writing compared to students in your comparison group. Each is an estimate calculated from two or more separate survey questions.

Challenging Students to Do Their Best Work
To what extent did students' courses challenge them to do their best work? Response options ranged from 1 = "Not at all" to 7 = "Very much."

Academic Emphasis
How much did students say their institution emphasizes spending significant time studying and on academic work? Response options included "Very much," "Quite a bit," "Some," and "Very little."
Item Comparisons

By examining individual NSSE questions, you can better understand what contributes to your institution’s performance on the Engagement Indicators. This section displays the five questions on which your students scored the highest and the five questions on which they scored the lowest, relative to students in your comparison group. Parenthetical notes indicate whether an item belongs to a specific Engagement Indicator or is a High-Impact Practice. While these questions represent the largest differences (in percentage points), they may not be the most important to your institutional mission or current program or policy goals. For additional results, see your Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons report.

First-year

**Highest Performing Relative to Urban 21 & Gr Cities**
- Assigned more than 50 pages of writing
- About how many courses have included a community-based project (service-learning)? (HIP)
- Instructors provided feedback on a draft or work in progress (ET)
- Instructors provided prompt and detailed feedback on tests or completed assignments (ET)
- Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue (…) (QR)

**Lowest Performing Relative to Urban 21 & Gr Cities**
- Included diverse perspectives (…) in course discussions or assignments (RI)
- Explained course material to one or more students (CL)
- Worked with other students on course projects or assignments (CL)
- Extent to which courses challenged you to do your best work (CL)
- Quality of interactions with students (QI)

Senior

**Highest Performing Relative to Urban 21 & Gr Cities**
- Spent more than 15 hours per week preparing for class
- Quality of interactions with academic advisors (QI)
- Spent more than 10 hours per week on assigned reading
- Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices (…) (QI)
- About how many courses have included a community-based project (service-learning)? (HIP)

**Lowest Performing Relative to Urban 21 & Gr Cities**
- Discussions with… People of a race or ethnicity other than your own (DD)
- Discussions with… People with religious beliefs other than your own (DD)
- Quality of interactions with students (QI)
- Institution emphasis on attending campus activities and events (…) (SE)
- Completed a culminating senior experience (…) (HIP)

---

a. The displays on this page draw from the items that make up the ten Engagement Indicators (EIs), six High-Impact Practices (HIPs), and the additional academic challenge items reported on page 2. Key to abbreviations for EI items: HO = Higher-Order Learning, RI = Reflective & Integrative Learning, LS = Learning Strategies, QR = Quantitative Reasoning, CL = Collaborative Learning, DD = Discussions with Diverse Others, SF = Student-Faculty Interaction, ET = Effective Teaching Practices, QI = Quality of Interactions, SE = Supportive Environment. HIP items are also indicated. Item numbering corresponds to the survey facsimile included in your Institutional Report and available on the NSSE website.

b. Combination of students responding “Very often” or “Often.”

c. Combination of students responding “Very much” or “Quite a bit.”

d. Rated at least 6 on a 7-point scale.

e. Percentage reporting at least “Some.”

f. Estimate based on the reported amount of course preparation time spent on assigned reading.

g. Estimate based on number of assigned writing tasks of various lengths.
How Students Assess Their Experience

Students' perceptions of their cognitive and affective development, as well as their overall satisfaction with the institution, provide useful evidence of their educational experiences. For more details, see your Frequencies and Statistical Comparisons report.

Perceived Gains Among Seniors

Students reported how much their experience at your institution contributed to their knowledge, skills, and personal development in ten areas.

### Perceived Gains (Sorted highest to lowest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage of Seniors Responding &quot;Very much&quot; or &quot;Quite a bit&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with others</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing numerical and statistical information</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding people of other backgrounds (econ., racial/ethnic, polit., relig., nation., etc.)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving complex real-world problems</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an informed and active citizen</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Satisfaction with UW-Milwaukee

Students rated their overall experience at the institution, and whether or not they would choose it again.

#### Percentage Rating Their Overall Experience as "Excellent" or "Good"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW-Milwaukee</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 21 &amp; Gr Cities</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Percentage Who Would "Definitely" or "Probably" Attend This Institution Again

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UW-Milwaukee</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban 21 &amp; Gr Cities</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Administration Details

### Response Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Resp. rate</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First-year</td>
<td>1,428</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1,783</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See your Administration Summary and Respondent Profile reports for more information.

Additional Questions

Your institution administered the following additional question sets:

- **Academic Advising**
- **University of Wisconsin Comprehensives**

See your Topical Module and Consortium reports for results.

What is NSSE?

NSSE annually collects information at hundreds of four-year colleges and universities about student participation in activities and programs that promote their learning and personal development. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending their college or university. Institutions use their data to identify aspects of the undergraduate experience that can be improved through changes in policy and practice.

NSSE has been in operation since 2000 and has been used at more than 1,600 colleges and universities in the US and Canada. More than 90% of participating institutions administer the survey on a periodic basis.

Visit our website: nsse.indiana.edu