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2007 Executive Summary

In the Spring 2007, all of UNL’s first-year and senior students were invited to participate in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE is a national survey for four-year colleges and institutions to assess the extent to which undergraduate students are involved in educational practices empirically linked to high levels of learning and development. UNL has elected to participate in the survey three times. The first participation was in the spring of 2002, the second time in the spring of 2004, and most recently in spring 2007.

This report discusses and explores UNL’s score as compared to scores of peer institution and over time on five clusters of survey items identified by NSSE administrators as benchmarks of effective educational practice.

These five benchmarks are:
1. Active and Collaborative Learning
2. Student-Faculty Interactions
3. Level of Academic Challenge
4. Supportive Campus Environment
5. Enriching Educational Experiences

UNL first-year respondents were at least as engaged as their Big 12 first-year peers and first-year peers at other research institutions (like Carnegie Peers) on four of the five benchmarks: Active and Collaborative Learning, Student-Faculty Interaction, Level of Academic Challenge, and Supportive Campus Environment. On Level of Academic Challenge and Supportive Campus Environment, UNL first-year respondents were significantly more engaged than Big 12 first-year peers. On the fifth benchmark Enriching Educational Experiences, UNL first year respondents were significantly less engaged than Big 12 or Carnegie Peers. In comparison to AAU first year peers, UNL first-year respondents were equally engaged on Supportive Campus Environment benchmark but significantly less engaged on the other four benchmarks. All five benchmark scores for UNL first-year respondents have increased since 2004 and in the case of Student-Faculty Interaction the increase was significant.

UNL senior respondents were as engaged as their Big 12 senior peers and senior peers at other research institutions (like Carnegie Peers) on three of the five benchmarks: Active and Collaborative Learning, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Level of Academic Challenge. On the remaining two benchmarks, Supportive Campus Environment and Enriching Education Experiences, UNL senior respondents were significantly less engaged than Big 12 and Carnegie Peers.
senior peers. In comparison to AAU senior peers, UNL senior peers were as engaged on two of the five benchmarks: Active and Collaborative Learning and Student-Faculty Interaction. On the remaining three benchmarks (Level of Academic Challenge, Enriching Educational Experiences, and Supportive Campus Environment), UNL peers were significantly less engaged than AAU senior peers. Although UNL senior Enriching Education Experience score was significantly lower than peers the item results were mixed. UNL seniors engaged significantly more often in some of these enriching experiences than their senior peers (e.g. internships/practicum, working with faculty on research, culminating senior project). All five benchmark scores for UNL senior respondents have stayed the same since 2004.

Each of the 8 undergraduate colleges and the Division of General Studies received results for their unit to use for assessment purposes at the college/division level. UNL will continue to participate in the NSSE every three years and track the benchmark scores as one method for determining the effectiveness of our efforts to improve undergraduate education at UNL.
NSSE 2007 Survey Overview, Administration & Response Rates

Survey Overview
The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) is specifically designed to assess the extent students are engaged in empirically derived good educational practices and what they gain from their college experience. The main content of the NSSE instrument, The College Student Report, represents student behaviors that are highly correlated with many desirable learning and personal development outcomes of the college experience. Responding to the questionnaire requires that students reflect on what they are putting into and getting out of their college experience. Thus, completing the survey itself is consistent with effective educational practice.

Survey Methodology
In the Spring 2007, UNL participated in the NSSE for the third time. Previously, UNL had participated in 2004 and 2002. In 2007, the entire first-year and senior student population at UNL was contacted about participating in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). NSSE started by selecting a random sample of 3000 first-year students and 3000 senior students from a UNL student population data file based upon undergraduate enrollment in Fall 2007. Each of UNL’s academic colleges was provided the opportunity to oversample the remaining first-year and senior population from its college. All colleges along with Division of General Studies decided to participate in this oversample. In February 2007, all first-year and senior students received personalized emails asking them to complete an on-line version of the survey. When students finished completing the survey (typically 10 minutes or less), their responses were submitted directly to NSSE. The Center for Survey Research (CSR) at Indiana University collected all of the data using techniques based on best practices in large-scale survey research by following up on their initial contact several times via email.

Peer Comparisons
UNL participated, as it did in 2002 and 2004, in the American Association of Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) consortium. A consortium is a group of eight or more participating NSSE colleges or universities that share comparative, aggregated data among their institutions. In addition, consortium members are allowed to ask an additional 20 questions that address unique characteristics of their school. Ten peer AAU institutions participated in the 2007 AAU Consortium. The UNL Board of Regents identifies three of these AAU peers as peer institutions and six of these AAU peers also participated in the 2002 and 2004 NSSE. Click here for a listing of 2002, 2004, and 2007 AAU peer institutions.

In addition to the AAU peer group, UNL also compared their results with other Research I institutional peers and Big 12 institutional peers that participated in the 2007 NSSE survey. All three peer groups are referred to in the survey results section.
Response Rates and Demographics

UNL's response rate of 33% was slightly above the national survey response rate of 26%. For the UNL first-year sample, 32% or 983 students responded. For the UNL senior sample, 34% or 812 senior students responded. The demographics of the respondent group are proportional to the population in regards to race/ethnicity, enrollment status, college enrollment and transfer status. This indicates that responses do not over-represent or under-represent any one group of students within these categories. Female respondents were slightly overrepresented in comparison to the population of first-year and senior students at UNL and senior respondents of nontraditional age (24 years or older) were also slightly overrepresented in comparison to senior population at UNL.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of California - Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado (Boulder)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University – Bloomington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland – College Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri - Columbia</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas - Austin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NSSE 2007 Survey Results

This summary of survey results will focus primarily on five clusters of survey items identified by NSSE administrators as benchmarks of effective educational practice. Each benchmark has a score representing a group of survey items expressed on a 100-point scale. These five benchmarks are:

1. Active and Collaborative Learning
2. Student-Faculty Interaction
3. Level of Academic Challenge
4. Supportive Campus Environment
5. Enriching Educational Experiences

The NSSE represents best practices in undergraduate education but also is designed to apply to a variety of institutional contexts. Therefore, it is important to look at the results in light of UNL’s mission and context including specific programming and institutional initiatives. A contextual interpretation of results accompanies discussion results for each score.

NSSE 2007 - Active and Collaborative Learning

Students learn more when they are intensely involved in their education and asked to think about what they are learning in different settings. Collaborating with others in solving problems or mastering difficult material prepares students for the messy, unscripted problems they will encounter daily during and after college. The following NSSE survey items contribute to the Active and Collaborative Learning Benchmark score:

- Asked questions in class or contributed to class discussions
- Made a class presentation
- Worked with other students on projects during class
- Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments
- Tutored or taught other students
- Participated in a community-based project as part of a regular course
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with others outside of class (students, family members, co-workers, etc.)
2007 ACL Comparison with Peers

UNL first-year score for the Active and Collaborative Learning (ACL) benchmark is similar to Carnegie first-year and Big 12 first-year scores but significantly lower than the AAU first-year score (as noted by the asterisk in the graph above). In comparison to Big 12 first-year respondents, UNL first-year respondents were more likely to ask questions class/contribute to class discussions, have made a class presentation, work with other students on projects during class but less likely to work with classmates outside of class to prepare assignments and tutor/teach other students. UNL first-year respondents were less likely than AAU first-year respondents to ask questions in class/contribute to class discussion, tutor/teach other students, and discuss ideas from readings or classes with others outside of class. On all other ACL items, UNL first-year responses were similar to AAU first-year responses.

2007 ACL Senior Peer Comparison

UNL senior score for ACL benchmark was similar to senior scores for all three peers groups. UNL senior respondents were more likely to have made a class presentation than senior respondents from all three peer groups. This peer difference in making presentations occurred on 2002 and 2004 NSSE as well. Like first-year respondents, senior respondents were more likely than Big 12 senior respondents to ask questions class/contribute to class discussions, have made a class presentation, work with other students on projects during class but less likely to work with classmates outside of class to prepare assignments.

Trend in ACL since 2002 NSSE

Over time UNL ACL first-year and senior scores have increased although not significantly so (see chart below). Survey items contributing to this increase include:

- For UNL first-year respondents, participation in a community-based project as part of a course has increased significantly over time.
- For UNL senior respondents, participation in having made a class presentation and working with students in projects during class has increased significantly over time.
Trend in ACL since 2002

Contextual Interpretation of ACL Results
UNL ACL score indicates that UNL students are appropriately engaged in active and collaborative learning activities when compared to their peers. UNL first-year and senior scores compare favorably with Big 12 and Carnegie peers. Although a lower first-year score compared to AAU first-year peers may suggest room for improvement, UNL seniors compare favorably with AAU senior peers on ACL. On the specific ACL activity of making oral presentation UNL respondents stand out when compared to their peers by consistently being engaged in this activity. Institutional emphasis of this important skill continues with UNL's new general education program, Achievement-Centered Education (ACE), which has a learning outcome that emphasizes the importance of oral/visual communication.

**NSSE 2007 - Student-Faculty Interaction**
Students learn firsthand how experts think about and solve practical problems by interacting with faculty members inside and outside the classroom. As a result, their teachers become role models, mentors, and guides for continuous, life-long learning. The following NSSE survey items contribute to the Student-Faculty Interaction score:

- Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor
- Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor
- Discussed ideas from your readings or classes with faculty members outside of class
- Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student-life activities, etc.)
- Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on your academic performance
- Worked with a faculty member on a research project outside of course or program requirements
2007 SFI Comparison with Peers

UNL first-year score for the Student-Faculty Interaction (SFI) benchmark is similar to Carnegie and Big 12 first-year scores but significantly lower than the AAU first-year score (as noted by the asterisk in the graph above). In comparison to Big 12 first-year respondents, UNL first-year respondents were more likely to receive prompt feedback from faculty on their academic performance but less likely to talk about career plans with faculty/advisor and work with faculty members on activities other than coursework. UNL first-year respondents were less likely than AAU first-year respondents to discuss ideas from class with faculty outside of class, work with faculty members on activities other than coursework, and work with faculty member on a research project outside of course or program requirements. Although the number of UNL first-year respondents who "had" worked on research projects was lower than AAU first-year respondents the percentage of UNL first-year respondents that "planned" to work on a research project was slightly higher than first-year response of all three peer groups. On all other SFI items, first-year responses were similar to AAU first-year responses.

2007 SFI Senior Peer Comparison

The UNL senior score for the SFI benchmark was similar to senior scores for all three peers groups. UNL senior respondents were more likely to have worked on research projects with faculty outside of course/program requirements than Big 12 and Carnegie peers. This peer difference in working on a research project occurred on 2002 and 2004 NSSE as well. Senior respondents were more likely than Carnegie senior peers to work with faculty member on activities other than coursework and less likely than Big 12 senior respondents to talk about career plans with faculty/advisor or receive prompt feedback from faculty on academic work.

Trend in SFI since 2002 NSSE

Since 2004 the first-year SFI score has increased significantly (see chart below). Although there was a decrease in the first-year score between 2002 and 2004, 2002 sample was significantly
smaller than 2007 and 2004 samples making 2002 comparison less reliable. Survey items contributing significantly to this increase include discussing grades/assignments with an instructor and talking about career plans with faculty/advisor. Note the discussing career plans is an activity that UNL first-year respondents participated less often than peers but UNL is seeing an increase in first-year participation in this activity over time. The senior SFI score has not changed significantly over time (see chart below) but senior respondents participation with faculty on activities other than coursework has increased significantly since 2002.

**Trend in SFI since 2002**

**Contextual Interpretation of SFI Results**

NSSE results suggest that Student-Faculty Interaction is valued and emphasized at UNL. UNL first-year and senior scores compare favorably with Big 12 and Carnegie peers. Although a lower first-year score compared to AAU first-year peers may suggest room for improvement, UNL seniors compare favorably with AAU senior peers on SFI. In addition, first-year engagement in SFI has increased significantly since 2004. Results since 2002 testify to the contribution of initiatives like UCARE that intentionally pair students with faculty to work on research projects. Although results suggest that first-year students may not be as engaged in research as their first-year peers, closer examination of results suggest that UNL first-year students are more likely to "plan" to work with faculty on research than their peers and students are following through on these plans given higher percentages of UNL senior respondents have been involved in research than their peers. This result indicates UNL is successfully creating a distinctive campus culture where undergraduates enter expecting and desiring to be involved in faculty research.

**NSSE 2007 - Level of Academic Challenge**

Challenging intellectual and creative work is central to student learning and collegiate quality. Colleges and universities promote high levels of student achievement by emphasizing the importance of academic effort and setting high expectations for student performance. The following NSSE survey items contribute to the Level of Academic Challenge score:
• Preparing for class (studying, reading, writing, rehearsing, etc. related to academic program)
• Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings
• Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more; number of written papers or reports of between 5 and 19 pages; and number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages
• Coursework emphasizing analysis of the basic elements of an idea, experience or theory
• Coursework emphasizing synthesis and organizing of ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships
• Coursework emphasizing the making of judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods
• Coursework emphasizing application of theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations
• Working harder than you thought you could to meet an instructor’s standards or expectations
• Campus environment emphasizing time studying and on academic work

2007 LAC Comparison with Peers

UNL first-year score for the Level of Academic Challenge (LAC) benchmark is significantly higher than the Big 12 first-year score and similar to the Carnegie first-year score but significantly lower than AAU first-year (as noted by the asterisks in the graph above). In comparison to all peer groups UNL first-year respondents were more likely to have more writing assignments but less likely to believe courses emphasized higher order thinking skills (analysis, synthesis, making judgments, application). These peer differences in emphasis of higher order thinking skills and number of writing assignments occurred on 2002 and 2004 NSSE as well. In comparison with Big 12 first-year respondents, UNL first-year respondents were more likely to have more reading assignments but less likely to spend time preparing for class. In comparison with AAU first-year respondents, UNL first-year respondents were less likely to spend time preparing for class.
2007 LAC Senior Peer Comparison
UNL senior score for LAC benchmark was similar to Carnegie and Big 12 peer scores and significantly lower than the AAU peer score (as noted by the asterisk in the graph above). Like first-year respondents, in comparison to all peer groups, UNL senior respondents were more likely to have more writing assignments but less likely to believe courses emphasized higher order thinking skills (analysis, synthesis, making judgments, application). These peer differences in emphases of higher order thinking skills and number of writing assignments occurred on 2002 and 2004 NSSE as well. In comparison with AAU senior respondents, UNL senior respondents were less likely to have more reading assignments.

Trend in LAC since 2002 NSSE
Over time, UNL LAC score has not changed significantly (see chart below). Although there was a decrease in the first-year score between 2002 and 2004, 2002 sample was significantly smaller than 2007 and 2004 samples making 2002 comparison less reliable. Only one item showed significant change in 2007. First-year respondents in 2007 more likely to believe UNL emphasizes spending significant amount of time studying than did 2004 and 2002 first-year respondents.

Contextual Interpretation of LAC Results
Although UNL responses regarding how much respondents believe their courses emphasize higher order thinking skills might be cause for concern, the amount of writing students are asked to complete suggests they may engage in higher order thinking skills more often than they realize. This result prompts two questions; One, how do students know when their course is emphasizing higher order thinking skills? Two, isn't use of higher order thinking skills necessary in completing most writing assignments? UNL’s new general education program, Achievement-Centered Education (ACE) may possibly improve students' understanding and awareness of higher order thinking skills. The student learning outcomes of the new ACE program clearly state the use of higher order thinking skills (e.g. evaluate, incorporate, solve). The sharing of these
outcomes with students at the institutional-level (undergraduate bulletin and orientations) and at the course-level (syllabi) will improve students understanding of how their courses are emphasizing these important skills.

The score for amount of time spent studying is understood better when responses to other questions are examined. Student responses to amount of time studying suggests that although students are not studying as much as is recommended (60% spend 11 hours or more a week). When asked how much UNL emphasizes spending time studying a higher percentage, and large majority of respondents, say UNL emphasizes spending a significant amount (80%). Two possible reasons for this difference include: students may think that amount of time they are spending is significant, or they may realize they are not studying as much as is recommended.

**NSSE 2007 - Supportive Campus Environment**

Students perform better and are more satisfied at colleges that are committed to their success and cultivate positive working and social relations among different groups on campus. The following NSSE survey items contribute to the Supportive Campus Environment score:

- Campus environment provides the support you need to help you succeed academically
- Campus environment helps you cope with your non-academic responsibilities (work, family, etc.)
- Campus environment provides the support you need to thrive socially
- Quality of relationships with other students
- Quality of relationships with faculty members
- Quality of relationships with administrative personnel and offices

**2007 SCE Comparison with Peers**

![Graph showing comparison of Supportive Campus Environment scores for UNL, AAU, Carnegie Peers, Big 12, and UNL for First Year and Senior years.]

**2007 SCE First-Year Peer Comparison**

UNL first-year score for the Supportive Campus Environment (SCE) benchmark is similar to AAU and Carnegie peer first-year scores but significantly lower than the Big 12 first-year score (as noted by the asterisks in the graph above). In comparison to all peer groups, UNL first-year
respondents were more likely to have a positive relationship with administrative personnel and staff but less likely to perceive that the institution emphasizes help in coping with non-academic responsibilities. Peer differences on these two survey questions were similar on 2002 and 2004 NSSE. In comparison with Big 12 first-year respondents, UNL first-year respondents were less likely to perceive institutional emphasis on providing help needed to succeed academically and providing help needed to thrive socially.

2007 SCE Senior Peer Comparison
UNL senior score for the SCE benchmark is significantly lower than senior scores for all three peer groups (as noted by the asterisk in the graph above). In comparison to all peer groups, UNL senior respondents were less likely to perceive the institution emphasizes support needed to succeed academically, help in coping with non-academic responsibilities, and support needed to thrive socially. Peer differences on these two survey questions were similar on 2002 and 2004 NSSE. In comparison with Big 12 senior respondents, UNL senior respondents were less likely to have a positive relationship with other student, faculty, and administrative personnel/offices.

Trend in SCE since 2002 NSSE
Over time the UNL SCE first-year score has not increased significantly, however, there is a clear upward trend in this score since 2002 (see chart below). Perceptions about support to succeed academically, help in coping with non-academic responsibilities, and support to thrive socially contributed to the increase in the SCE score over time. The UNL SCE senior score has not changed significantly over time and there is no clear trend. Senior responses regarding quality relationships with other students, faculty, and administrative personnel/office were lower in 2007 than in 2004.

Trend in SCE since 2002
Contextual Interpretation of SCE Results
Although the SCE score results suggest UNL could improve support provided students, the increase in first-year student perceptions of support occurring since 2002 signal that recommendations for improving students transitions into UNL outlined in Transition to University Taskforce report "Everyone a Teacher, Everyone a Learner" may be contributing to a more supportive campus environment. The senior score on this benchmark will be tracked on future NSSE surveys to determine if the increased emphasis on support occurring in the last couple years leads to a higher senior score as the cohort of first-year students who benefitted from those changes become seniors.

NSSE 2007 - Enriching Educational Experiences
Complementary learning opportunities enhance academic programs. Diversity experiences teach students valuable things about themselves and others. Technology facilitates collaboration between peers and instructors. Internships, community service, and senior capstone courses provide opportunities to integrate and apply knowledge. The following NSSE survey items contribute to the Enriching Educational Experiences score:

- Participating in co-curricular activities (organizations, publications, student government, sports, etc.)
- Practicum, internship, field experience, co-op experience, or clinical assignment
- Community service or volunteer work
- Foreign language coursework and study abroad
- Independent study or self-designed major
- Culminating senior experience (capstone course, senior project or thesis, comprehensive exam, etc.)
- Serious conversations with students of different religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values
- Serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity
- Using electronic technology to discuss or complete an assignment
- Campus environment encouraging contact among students from different economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds
- Participate in a learning community or some other formal program where groups of students take two or more classes together
2007 EEE Comparison with Peers

UNL first-year score for the Enriching Educational Experiences (EEE) benchmark is significantly lower than first-year scores for all three peers groups (as noted by the asterisks in the graph above). UNL first-year responses contributing significantly to this difference include: participation in learning communities, foreign language coursework, serious conversations with students of different backgrounds, institutional emphasis encouraging contact with students of different backgrounds, and use of electronic medium to discuss/complete an assignment. Peer differences regarding contact with students of difference backgrounds, participation in foreign language coursework occurred on 2002 and 2004 NSSE as well.

2007 EEE Senior Peer Comparison

UNL senior for the EEE benchmark was significantly lower than senior scores for all three peers groups (as noted by the asterisks in the graph above). UNL senior responses contributing significantly to this difference include: participation in co-curricular activities, community service/volunteer work, foreign language coursework, serious conversations with student of different backgrounds, institutional emphasis on encouraging contact with students of different backgrounds, and using electronic medium to discuss/complete an assignment. Like UNL first-year respondents, UNL seniors were more likely to participate in independent study/self-designed major and a culminating senior experience than senior respondents in all three peer groups. Peer differences regarding contact with students of difference backgrounds, and participation independent study/self-designed majors occurred on 2002 and 2004 NSSE as well.

Trend in EEE since 2004 NSSE (2002 data for this benchmark is not available)

Over time UNL EEE score has not changed significantly (see chart below). However, on several items first-year participation has increased including foreign language coursework, use of
electronic medium for assignments, and perceived institutional emphasis on encouraging contact with students of different backgrounds.

**Trend in EEE since 2004**

![Bar chart comparing EEE results for first year and senior students between 2004 and 2007.]

**Contextual Interpretation of EEE Results**

The EEE benchmark is derived from a very diverse group of items. On some of those UNL compares very favorably to its peers and on others UNL respondents do not participate as much as their peers. One of those activities in which participation is lower than peers is interaction with students of different backgrounds. One factor that limits opportunity for UNL students is the student body at UNL is a less diverse student body than its peer institutions specifically regarding race/ethnicity. UNL does emphasize interaction with diverse ideas and individuals of different backgrounds in a variety of other ways including reading of diverse texts, interactions with diverse faculty, and diverse ideas of speakers. UNL is planning to build a new multicultural center which may increase opportunities UNL students have to interact with others of different backgrounds.
NSSE 2007 Conclusions - Results Summary

The NSSE offers a tool for gathering information with a wide range of uses and provides an important occasion to re-frame local conversations about collegiate quality. In particular, results are expected to be useful to institutions themselves in improving undergraduate education. As discussed in the results section, it is most useful for UNL to contextualize the results for gauging the degree to which they foster practices consistent with its particular institutional characteristics and commitments, and to improve performance.

In summary, UNL first-year respondents were at least as engaged as their Big 12 first-year peers and first-year peers at other research institutions (like Carnegie Peers) on four of the five benchmarks: Active and Collaborative Learning, Student-Faculty Interaction, Level of Academic Challenge, and Supportive Campus Environment. On Level of Academic Challenge and Supportive Campus Environment, UNL first-year respondents were significantly more engaged than Big 12 first-year peers. On the fifth benchmark Enriching Educational Experiences, UNL first-year respondents were significantly less engaged than Big 12 or Carnegie Peers. In comparison to AAU first-year peers, UNL first-year respondents were equally engaged on Supportive Campus Environment benchmark but significantly less engaged on the other four benchmarks. All five benchmark scores for UNL first-year respondents have increased since 2004 and in the case of Student-Faculty Interaction the increase was significant.

UNL senior respondents were as engaged as their Big 12 senior peers and senior peers at other research institutions (like Carnegie Peers) on three of the five benchmarks: Active and Collaborative Learning, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Level of Academic Challenge. On the remaining two benchmarks, Supportive Campus Environment and Enriching Education Experiences, UNL senior respondents were significantly less engaged than Big 12 and Carnegie senior peers. In comparison to AAU senior peers, UNL senior peers were as engaged on two of the five benchmarks: Active and Collaborative Learning and Student-Faculty Interaction. On the remaining three benchmarks (Level of Academic Challenge, Enriching Educational Experiences, and Supportive Campus Environment), UNL peers were significantly less engaged than AAU senior peers. Although UNL senior Enriching Education Experience score was significantly lower than peers the item results were mixed. UNL seniors engaged significantly more often in some of these enriching experiences than their senior peers (e.g. internships/practicum, working with faculty on research, culminating senior project). All five benchmark scores for UNL senior respondents have stayed the same since 2004.

UNL will continue to participate in the NSSE every three years and track the benchmark scores as one method for determining the effectiveness of our efforts to improve undergraduate education at UNL.
NSSE 2007 Conclusions - Dissemination, Discussions and Follow-up Projects

NSSE Results were disseminated at the institutional and college level. Each of the eight undergraduate colleges and the Division of General Studies received results for their unit to use for assessment purposes at the college/division level. In addition, the 2007 NSSE results were shared with several individuals and groups across campus. These discussions were used to build awareness and facilitate discussions about UNL’s goals for the undergraduate educational experience and to determine how well we are achieving those goals based on the NSSE evidence.

NSSE survey continues to provide an instructive way to look at and talk about teaching and learning at UNL. Trends over the last three NSSE surveys strengthen knowledge about where students are appropriately engaged and about areas of improvement at UNL. For example one noted area of improvement is in the amount of time spent working. On NSSE in 2002, 2004, and 2007 UNL respondents spent significantly more time working off campus than their peers. To further understand this result, the Office of Undergraduate Studies is working with a small group of campus administrators and faculty to determine if unmet financial need is a factor in how much time students spend working and to determine the impact of time spent working has on each of the five benchmarks. Study will also consider impacts on student perceptions of learning, satisfaction with experiences, GPA's, and retention.

NSSE 2007 Conclusions - Campus Discussions

- Dr. Barbara Couture, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (September 2007)
  Discussed institutional-level results and plan for dissemination.
- Dr. Juan Franco, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (September 2007)
  Discussed institutional-level results and possible follow-up studies.
- University-Wide Assessment Committee (September 2007)
  Discussed institutional results and their contextualization.
- Dean's Council (November 2007)
  Discussed key institutional results and the use of results at the college level.
- Enrollment Management Council (November 2007)
  Discussed key institutional results.
- Advising, Admission and Retention Group (November 2007)
  Discussed key institutional results.
- Dr. Debra Mullen, Associate Dean of College of Education and Human Sciences (November 2007)
  Discussed college-level results.
- Craig Munier, Director of Scholarships & Financial Aid
  Juan Franco, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
  Ron Roeber, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
  Mary Werner, Assistant Director of Institutional Research and Planning
Rita Kean, Dean of Undergraduate Studies (December 2007)
Discussed potential model for studying of financial need and amount of time spent working.

- Dr. Cal Garbin, Professor of Psychology (January 2008)
  Discuss study of financial need and amount of time spent working.

- College of Arts and Sciences Chairs and Directors (January 2008)
  Discussed college-level results.

- College of Engineering Associate Dean staff (January 2008)
  Discussed college-level results.

- All 8 Undergraduate Colleges (February 2008)
  Received a report of college-level results.

- Programs in Office of Undergraduate Studies (March 2008)
  Received a report of program-level results.

- Advertising Program Sequence (April 2008)
  Discussed college-level results.

- Department of Communications Studies (April 2008)
  Discussed college-level results.