

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.

Comparison Group
The comparison group featured in this report is

SE Land-grants

See your *Selected Comparison Groups* report for details.

This *Snapshot* is a concise collection of key findings from your institution's NSSE 2021 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	Engagement Indicator	Your students compared with SE Land-grants	
		First-year	Senior
Academic Challenge	Higher-Order Learning	--	--
	Reflective & Integrative Learning	--	▼
	Learning Strategies	--	▲
	Quantitative Reasoning	--	--
Learning with Peers	Collaborative Learning	▼	▼
	Discussions with Diverse Others	▼	--
Experiences with Faculty	Student-Faculty Interaction	--	--
	Effective Teaching Practices	--	▼
Campus Environment	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 higher ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
- No significant difference.
- ▼ Your students' average was significantly lower ($p < .05$) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.
- ▼ Your students' average was significantly lower ($p < .05$) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.

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.




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.


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^a 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 SE Land-grants


Instructors taught in a way that aligns with how you prefer to learn^c

Instructors explained in advance the criteria for successfully completing assignments^c

Quality of interactions with other administrative staff and offices (...) ^d (QI)

Summarized what you learned in class or from course materials^b (LS)

Discussed your academic performance with a faculty member^b (SF)



Lowest Performing Relative to SE Land-grants


Assigned more than 50 pages of writing^e

Discussions with... People with religious beliefs other than your own^b (DD)

Explained course material to one or more students^b (CL)

Spent more than 15 hours per week preparing for class

Worked with other students on course projects or assignments^b (CL)



Percentage Point Difference with SE Land-grants

Senior

Highest Performing Relative to SE Land-grants


Extent to which courses challenged you to do your best work^d

Institution emphasis on helping you manage your non-academic responsibilities (...) ^e (SE)

Reviewed your notes after class^b (LS)

Instructors provided feedback on a draft or work in progress^c (ET)

I feel valued by this institution.^h (SB)



Lowest Performing Relative to SE Land-grants

Worked with other students on course projects or assignments^b (CL)

Participated in a study abroad program (HIP)

Worked with a faculty member on a research project (HIP)

Completed a culminating senior experience (...) (HIP)

Participated in an internship, co-op, field exp., student teach., clinical placemnt. (HIP)



Percentage Point Difference with SE Land-grants

a. The items on this page come from the Engagement Indicators (EIs), High-Impact Practices (HIPs), Sense of Belonging (SB), the academic challenge questions on page 2, and four additional questions about effective teaching (new in 2021). 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.

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.

h. Combination of students responding "strongly agree" or "agree."

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)	Percentage of Seniors Responding "Very much" or "Quite a bit"
Thinking critically and analytically	84%
Working effectively with others	77%
Analyzing numerical and statistical information	74%
Acquiring job- or work-related knowledge and skills	69%
Writing clearly and effectively	69%
Speaking clearly and effectively	69%
Understanding people of other backgrounds (econ., racial/ethnic, polit., relig., nation., etc.)	66%
Developing or clarifying a personal code of values and ethics	66%
Solving complex real-world problems	66%
Being an informed and active citizen	58%

Satisfaction with MSU

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



Administration Details

Response Summary

	Count	Resp. rate	Female	Full-time
First-year	548	19%	66%	70%
Senior	906	17%	101%	76%

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

Additional Questions

Your institution did not choose to administer additional questions. In future administrations, you may customize NSSE by participating in a topical module or a consortium. See our website for more information. nsse.indiana.edu

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