

Student Satisfaction Inventory - Institutional Priorities Surveys
SUMMARY
January 29, 2002

3600 students were randomly selected from the total population of 5576 students enrolled for the Fall 2001 semester to participate in the Student Satisfaction Inventory. 500 Institutional Priorities Surveys were distributed to all faculty and staff. The instruments were mailed to all participants in early November.

617 Student Satisfaction Inventories were returned representing a total of 17.14% of those selected for participation and 11.07% of the total student population. 184 Institutional Priorities Surveys were returned representing 37.02% of the total faculty and staff.

10 institutional questions were included in the SSI as well as a coded list of all Tech majors and an optional "comments" section.

All instruments were prepared in December 2001 and sent to the Noel-Levitz company for scoring. The data were returned in paper report format and disk ASCII format in January 2002.

Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI)

Demographic information

A review of the demographic information indicates that more females than males responded to the survey. Females were represented in the survey at 65.80% while as a part of the campus population they represent 52%. 57.89% of the respondents were within the 19-24 age range which compares to 50% of the campus population. Students enrolled full time represented 87.34% of the respondents compared to 81% of our students. Other demographic indicators are listed on pages 2-1 through 2-3 of the full SSI report.

Measurement

Respondents were asked to respond to 83 items using a Likert scale with 1 being low and 7 being high. Respondent were asked to indicate both the importance of the specific expectation and their satisfaction with how that expectation is being met. Mean scores were tabulated for both importance and satisfaction. The difference between these mean scores yields a “performance gap.” Other measures include:

- 9 items that assess pre-enrollment factors
- 3 items that assess overall satisfaction with the institution

Response scores are compared to corresponding national groups.

Composite Scales

Expectation and satisfaction items are grouped into 12 composite scales. These scales are listed in the following chart.

Institutional Summary **Scales: In Order of Importance to Our Students**

Scale	Our Institution Means Arkansas Tech University – 1/2002			National Group Means Four-Year Public Institutions			Mean Difference (Satisfaction)
	Importance	Satisfaction/SD	Performance Gap	Importance	Satisfaction/SD	Performance Gap	Our Inst – Nat'l Group
Academic Advising Effectiveness	6.51	5.66 / 1.06	0.85	6.31	5.07 / 1.34	1.24	0.59 ***
Safety and Security	6.48	4.93 / 1.04	1.55	6.27	4.32 / 1.18	1.95	0.61 ***
Instructional Effectiveness	6.46	5.51 / 0.84	0.95	6.30	5.06 / 0.99	1.24	0.45 ***
Registration Effectiveness	6.32	5.46 / 0.90	0.86	6.16	4.76 / 1.13	1.40	0.70 ***
Student Centeredness	6.28	5.53 / 0.94	0.75	6.02	4.89 / 1.12	1.13	0.64 ***
Recruitment and Financial Aid Effectiveness	6.27	5.33 / 0.98	0.94	6.01	4.59 / 1.15	1.42	0.74 ***
Concern for the Individual	6.26	5.32 / 0.99	0.94	6.06	4.75 / 1.11	1.31	0.57 ***
Campus Climate	6.25	5.50 / 0.84	0.75	6.05	4.87 / 1.02	1.18	0.63 ***
Campus Support Services	6.18	5.43 / 0.90	0.75	6.04	4.99 / 1.00	1.05	0.44 ***
Service Excellence	6.12	5.25 / 0.90	0.87	5.99	4.69 / 1.02	1.30	0.56 ***
Campus Life	5.71	5.14 / 0.93	0.57	5.58	4.68 / 0.98	0.90	0.46 ***
Responsiveness to Diverse Populations		5.34 / 1.21			4.89 / 1.26		0.45 ***

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level
 ** Difference statistically significant at the .01 level
 *** Difference statistically significant at the .001 level

National Group Means are based on 200267 students records.

Copyright 2002, Noel-Levitz Centers, Inc.

All composite scales indicate a significantly higher satisfaction score when compared to national group means. The areas with the greatest performance gap scores are:

Safety and Security	1.55
Instructional Effectiveness	0.95
Recruitment and Financial Aid Effectiveness	0.94
Concern for the Individual	0.94

The areas with the smallest performance gap scores are:

Campus Life	0.57
Student Centeredness	0.75
Campus Climate	0.75
Campus Support Services	0.75

Items that comprise the composite scales with specific individual category analysis are identified on pages 2-18 to 2-32 of the full SSI report.

Individual items

The top ten items in order of importance to our students are listed in the following chart.

Institutional Summary
Items: In Order of Importance to Our Students

Item	Our Institution Means Arkansas Tech University – 1/2002			National Group Means Four-Year Public Institutions			Mean Difference (Satisfaction)
	Importance	Satisfaction/SD	Performance Gap	Importance	Satisfaction/SD	Performance Gap	Our Inst – Nat'l Group
8. The content of the courses within my major is valuable.	6.70	5.60 / 1.16	1.10	6.56	5.28 / 1.37	1.28	0.32 ***
33. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about requirements in my major.	6.70	5.92 / 1.29	0.78	6.50	5.35 / 1.67	1.15	0.57 ***
81. The major I am really interested in is available at Tech. (Campus item)	6.68	5.79 / 1.63	0.89				
7. The campus is safe and secure for all students.	6.67	5.90 / 1.10	0.77	6.45	5.21 / 1.46	1.24	0.69 ***
34. I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts.	6.65	5.52 / 1.43	1.13	6.53	4.61 / 1.84	1.92	0.91 ***
68. Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their field.	6.65	5.92 / 1.04	0.73	6.50	5.51 / 1.31	0.99	0.41 ***
6. My academic advisor is approachable.	6.64	5.84 / 1.36	0.80	6.42	5.27 / 1.71	1.15	0.57 ***
16. The instruction in my major field is excellent.	6.64	5.59 / 1.20	1.05	6.53	5.23 / 1.41	1.30	0.36 ***
69. There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.	6.62	5.55 / 1.36	1.07	6.42	5.23 / 1.53	1.19	0.32 ***
58. The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent.	6.57	5.50 / 1.21	1.07	6.48	5.12 / 1.42	1.36	0.38 ***

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level
 ** Difference statistically significant at the .01 level
 *** Difference statistically significant at the .001 level

National Group Means are based on 200267 students records.

Copyright 2002, Noel-Levitz Centers, Inc.

One item had a performance gap score where satisfaction exceeded expectations. Item #9 “A variety of intramural activities are offered” had an importance score of 4.72 with a satisfaction score of 5.33. All other items had scores where expectations exceeded satisfaction and resulted in a range of performance gap scores from 0.02 to 3.05.

Items With Performance Gap Scores Exceeding .99 Are As Follows:

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Performance gap score</u>
21. The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	3.05
38. There is an adequate selection of food in the cafeteria.	1.43
23. Living conditions in the residence halls are comfortable (adequate space, lighting, heat, air, etc.).	1.42
73. Student activities fees are put to good use.	1.42
17. Adequate financial aid is available for most students.	1.38
25. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.	1.24
71. Channels for expressing student complaints are readily available.	1.24
57. I seldom get the “run- around” when seeking information on this campus.	1.20
49. There are adequate services to help me decide on a career.	1.19
47. Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course.	1.18
53. Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.	1.18
28. Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.	1.14
34. I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts.	1.13
36. Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.	1.13

80. I know where to go to find a part-time or full-time job on or off campus. (Campus item)	1.11
8. The content of the courses within my major is valuable.	1.10
58. The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent.	1.07
69. There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.	1.07
16. The instruction in my major field is excellent.	1.05
59. This institution shows concern for students as individuals.	1.04

Items With Performance Gap Scores Less Than .50 Are As Follows:

9. A variety of intramural activities are offered.	-0.61
31. Males and females have equal opportunities to participate in intercollegiate athletics.	0.02
52. The student center is a comfortable place for students to spend their leisure time.	0.09
79. Tech Fit resources and services are adequate. (Campus item)	0.19
51. The institution has a good reputation within the community.	0.23
24. The intercollegiate athletic programs contribute to a strong sense of school spirit.	0.26
54. Bookstore staff are helpful.	0.27
72. On the whole, the campus is well-maintained.	0.33

46. I can easily get involved in campus organizations.	0.39
75. The Arka Tech is informative and interesting. (Campus item)	0.42
56. The student handbook provides helpful information about campus life.	0.43
78. Web registration is valuable. (Campus item)	0.44
50. Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.	0.48
30. Residence hall staff are concerned about me as an individual.	0.48

Pre-enrollment Factors

Nine items were used to assess pre-enrollment factors. These items were scored for importance only. The items are ranked in the following order.

1. Financial aid	6.27
2. Cost	6.21
3. Academic reputation	5.89
4. Geographic setting	5.52
5. Personalized attention prior to enrollment	5.45
6. Size of institution	5.39
7. Campus appearance	5.31
8. Recommendations from family/friends	4.77
9. Opportunity to play sports	3.01

Overall Satisfaction With The Institution

Three summary items were used to assess overall satisfaction with the institution. These items were all significantly higher than national group comparisons.

Summary Items

	Our Institution Arkansas Tech University – 1/2002	National Group Four-Year Public Institutions	Mean Difference
Summary Item	Group Mean / SD	Group Mean / SD	Our Institution – National Group
So far, how has your college experience met your expectations? 1=Much worse than expected, 7=Much better than expected	4.89 / 1.19	4.38 / 1.24	0.51 ***
Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience here thus far. 1=Not satisfied at all, 7=Very satisfied	5.74 / 1.09	5.09 / 1.43	0.65 ***
All in all, if you had to do it over, would you enroll here again? 1=Definitely not, 7=Definitely yes	5.95 / 1.40	5.18 / 1.77	0.77 ***

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level
 ** Difference statistically significant at the .01 level
 *** Difference statistically significant at the .001 level

National Group Averages are based on 200267 students records.

Copyright 2002, Noel-Levitz Centers, Inc.

Institutional Priorities Survey (IPS)

Demographic Information

Of the 184 respondents, 181 or 99.45% were full-time employees. They are represented by position type as follows:

	N	%
Faculty	86	47.51
Administration	38	20.99
Staff	57	31.49
No response	<u>3</u>	<u>0.01</u>
	184	100.00

Respondents by rank are:

	N	%
Professor	21	21.21
Associate Professor	32	32.32
Assistant Professor	33	33.33
Instructor / Lecturer	13	13.13
Adjunct	<u>0</u>	<u>00.00</u>
Total	99	100.00

Other demographic indicators are listed on Page 2 –1 of the full IPS report.

Measurement

Respondents were asked to respond to 50 items using a Likert scale with 1 being low and 7 being high. Respondents scored each item for:

- Importance (indicating how important it is that the expectation be met for students)
- Agreement (indicating the extent to which they agree that Tech has met the expectation)

Mean scores are computed for each response and the difference between the mean scores for importance and agreement yield a performance gap score. Other measures include:

- 9 items that assess pre-enrollment factors
- 3 items that assess overall satisfaction with the institution

Response scores are compared to corresponding national groups.

Composite Scales

Importance and agreement items are grouped into 12 composite scales. These scales are listed in the following chart:

Institutional Summary **Scales: In Order of Importance to Our Personnel**

Scale	Our Institution Means Arkansas Tech University – 1/2002			National Group Means Four-Year Public Institutions (IPS)			Mean Difference (Agreement)
	Importance	Agreement/SD	Performance Gap	Importance	Agreement/SD	Performance Gap	Our Inst – Nat'l Group
Concern for the Individual	6.60	5.42 / 1.02	1.18	6.50	4.99 / 1.11	1.51	0.43 ***
Instructional Effectiveness	6.56	5.53 / 0.85	1.03	6.49	5.14 / 0.93	1.35	0.39 ***
Academic Advising	6.53	5.47 / 0.89	1.06	6.44	5.01 / 1.09	1.43	0.46***
Campus Climate	6.52	5.54 / 0.84	0.98	6.42	4.98 / 0.98	1.44	0.56 ***
Recruitment & Financial Aid	6.51	5.37 / 0.93	1.14	6.45	4.75 / 1.19	1.70	0.62 ***
Service Excellence	6.48	5.30 / 1.03	1.18	6.39	4.68 / 1.19	1.71	0.62 ***
Student Centeredness	6.47	5.54 / 1.00	0.93	6.35	4.96 / 1.14	1.39	0.58 ***
Campus Support Services	6.45	5.34 / 1.04	1.11	6.35	4.78 / 1.17	1.57	0.56 ***
Safety and Security	6.38	5.27 / 1.04	1.11	6.34	4.76 / 1.19	1.58	0.51 ***
Registration Effectiveness	6.32	5.41 / 0.89	0.91	6.20	4.80 / 1.13	1.40	0.61 ***
Campus Life	6.19	5.14 / 1.11	1.05	6.01	4.81 / 1.21	1.20	0.33 ***
Responsiveness to Diverse Populations		5.33 / 1.13			4.98 / 1.25		0.35 ***

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level
 ** Difference statistically significant at the .01 level
 *** Difference statistically significant at the .001 level

National Group Means are based on 11861 personnel records.

Copyright 2002, Noel-Levitz Centers, Inc.

All composite scales indicate a significantly higher agreement score when compared to national group means. The areas with the greatest performance gap scores are:

Concern for the Individual	1.18
Service Excellence	1.18
Recruitment & Financial Aid	1.14
Campus Support Services	1.11
Safety & Security	1.11

The areas with the smallest performance gap scores are:

Registration Effectiveness	0.91
Student Centeredness	0.93
Campus Climate	0.98

Items that comprise the composite scales with individual analysis are identified on pages 2-14 to 2-27 of the full IPS report.

Individual Items

The top eleven items in order of importance to our personnel are listed in the following chart.

Institutional Summary Items: In Order of Importance to Our Personnel

Item	Our institution Means Arkansas Tech University – 1/2002			National Group Means Four-Year Public Institutions (IPS)			Mean Difference (Agreement)
	Importance	Agreement/SD	Performance Gap	Importance	Agreement/SD	Performance Gap	Our Inst – Nat'l Group
6. The campus is safe and secure for all students.	6.73	5.85 / 1.13	0.88	6.71	5.18 / 1.40	1.53	0.67 ***
22. Academic advisors are knowledgeable about requirements for majors within their area.	6.71	5.62 / 1.10	1.09	6.58	5.08 / 1.41	1.50	0.54 ***
46. Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their field.	6.70	6.05 / 0.99	0.65	6.67	5.67 / 1.19	1.00	0.38***
5. Academic advisors are approachable.	6.69	5.43 / 1.14	1.26	6.63	5.02 / 1.39	1.61	0.41 ***
18. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.	6.69	5.32 / 1.34	1.37	6.63	5.03 / 1.38	1.60	0.29 ***
12. The instruction in major fields is excellent.	6.68	5.60 / 1.07	1.08	6.64	5.14 / 1.30	1.50	0.46 ***
1. The campus staff are caring and helpful.	6.66	5.51 / 1.20	1.15	6.62	5.14 / 1.37	1.48	0.37 ***
2. Faculty care about students as individuals.	6.64	5.46 / 1.19	1.18	6.54	5.08 / 1.33	1.46	0.38 ***
7. The content of the courses within each major is valuable.	6.64	5.77 / 0.97	0.87	6.58	5.23 / 1.24	1.35	0.54 ***
30. Students are made to feel welcome on this campus.	6.64	5.87 / 1.12	0.77	6.45	5.16 / 1.39	1.29	0.71***
39. The quality of instruction students receive in most of their classes is excellent.	6.64	5.52 / 1.13	1.12	6.62	5.08 / 1.32	1.54	0.44***

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level
 ** Difference statistically significant at the .01 level
 *** Difference statistically significant at the .001 level

National Group Means are based on 11861 personnel records.

Copyright 2002, Noel-Levitz Centers, Inc.

Items With Performance Gap Scores Exceeding .99 Are As Follows:

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Performance gap score</u>
38. Students seldom get the “run-round” when seeking information on this campus.	1.87
10. Financial aid awards are announced to students in time to be helpful in college planning.	1.54
25. Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.	1.53
24. Students are able to register for classes they need with few conflicts.	1.51
33. There are adequate services to help students decide upon a career.	1.49
4. Financial aid counselors are helpful.	1.44
42. There is a strong commitment to racial harmony on this campus.	1.38
18. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.	1.37
17. Living conditions in the residence halls are comfortable.	1.35
41. Adjunct faculty are competent as classroom instructors.	1.29
5. Academic advisors are approachable.	1.26
29. Academic support services adequately meet the needs of students.	1.24
50. Student activities fees are put to good use.	1.22
31. Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in their courses.	1.20
2. Faculty care about students as individuals.	1.18
9. Billing policies are reasonable.	1.18

15. Academic advisors help students set goals to work toward.	1.18
37. Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach their courses.	1.15
1. The campus staff are caring and helpful.	1.15
11. Academic advisors are concerned about students' success as individuals.	1.13
39. The quality of instruction students receive in most of their classes is excellent.	1.12
22. Academic advisors are knowledgeable about requirements for majors within their area.	1.09
28. There is a commitment to academic excellence on this campus.	1.09
12. The instruction in major fields is excellent.	1.08
16. The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	1.03
40. This institution shows concern for students as individuals.	1.02
21. Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.	1.02

Items With A Performance Gap Scores Less Than .50 Are As Follows:

34. Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.	0.19
45. Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment.	0.44

Pre-enrollment Factors

Nine items were used to assess pre-enrollment factors. These items were scored for importance only. The items are ranked in the following order.

- | | |
|--|------|
| 1. Cost as a factor | 6.41 |
| 2. Financial aid | 6.16 |
| 3. Geographic setting | 5.91 |
| 4. Personalized attention | 5.87 |
| 5. Recommendations from family/friends | 5.73 |
| 6. Academic reputation | 5.61 |
| 7. Size of institution | 5.55 |
| 8. Campus appearance | 5.53 |
| 9. Opportunity to play sports | 4.07 |

Overall Satisfaction With The Institution

Three summary items were used to assess how our personnel believe students at Tech would respond to their overall satisfaction with the institution. These items were all significantly higher than national group comparisons.

Summary Items

	Our institution Arkansas Tech University – 1/2002	National Group Four-Year Public Institutions (IPS)	Mean Difference
Summary Item	Group Mean / SD	Group Mean / SD	Our Institution – National Group
So far, how has your college experience met your expectations? 1=Much worse than expected, 7=Much better than expected	4.63 / 0.93	4.29 / 0.90	0.34***
Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience here thus far. 1=Not satisfied at all, 7=Very satisfied	5.59 / 0.90	5.04 / 1.18	0.55 ***
All in all, if you had to do it over, would you enroll here again? 1=Definitely not, 7=Definitely yes	5.89 / 1.02	5.28 / 1.30	0.61 ***

* Difference statistically significant at the .05 level
 ** Difference statistically significant at the .01 level
 *** Difference statistically significant at the .001 level

National Group Averages are based on 11861 personnel records.

Copyright 2002, Noel-Levitz Centers, Inc.

Common Items To SSI And IPS With Performance Gap Scores Exceeding .99 Are As Follows:

<u>Item #</u>			<u>Performance gap score</u>	
	SSI	IPS	SSI	IPS
21.	16.	The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	3.05	1.03
23	17.	Living conditions in the residence halls are comfortable (adequate space, lighting, heat, air etc.)	1.42	1.35
73.	50.	Student activities fees are put to good use.	1.42	1.22
25.	18.	Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.	1.24	1.37
57.	38.	Students seldom get the “run-around” when seeking information on this campus.	1.20	1.87
49.	33.	There are adequate services to help students decide on a career.	1.19	1.49
47.	31.	Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course.	1.18	1.20
53.	36.	Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.	1.18	1.15
28.	21.	Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.	1.14	1.02
34.	23.	Students are able to register for classes with few conflicts.	1.13	1.51
36.	25.	Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.	1.13	1.53
58.	39.	The quality of instruction students receive in most of their classes is excellent.	1.07	1.12
16.	12.	The instructions in major fields is excellent.	1.05	1.08

59.	40.	This institution shows concern for students as individuals.	1.04	1.02
-----	-----	---	------	------

Common Items To SSI And IPS With Performance Gap Scores Less Than .50 Are As Follows:

SSI	IPS		SSI	IPS
50.	34.	Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.	0.48	0.19