

STUDENT SATISFACTION INVENTORY REPORT – April, 2006

The Noel-Levitz “Student Satisfaction Inventory” (NL-SSI) was first implemented at GOCC in December 2003 and most recently in April 2006. This survey instrument was chosen because of

- 1) its proven record of reliability and validity, and
- 2) its unique ability to discern both the students’ view of their college’s strengths and shortcomings - as well as the areas *matter*ing most to them.

Such assessments – typically done every two years -- are valuable tools in Glen Oaks’ Academic Quality Improvement Project whose mission it is to under gird college accreditation. They provide a roadmap for the campus identifying trends and initiating change that will likely have a long-term impact on student enrollment and retention. In addition to finding how well we meet our students’ expectations, it also measures our scores against both national responses and responses of a comparison group of community colleges chosen for their similarity to us. Since the SSI was implemented here originally in 2003, this current study now has a point of comparison.

To evaluate student satisfaction, a 20-minute on-line survey polled a full spectrum of students: day, evening, commuter, all age groups, all programs and degrees. Twelve categories with 5-15 questions each -- covering courses, services and facilities – winnowed out specific strengths and areas of concern. Following are summaries of findings for GOCC as a whole and a separate page specific to Student Services. A Scoring Key is included explaining the instrument’s scoring.

DEMOGRAPHICS

The percentages below representing the 189 students polled in 2006 were rounded up. Of these -
Gender: 61% female & 39% male with 52% aged 19-24 and another 21% aged 25-34.

Class level: 50% one year or less, 39% 2 years, 9% 3 years and 2% at 4 years or more.

Enrollment status: 72% day, 27% evening and 1% weekend students / 72% full-time, 28% part-time

Employment: 27% were unemployed and 73% worked while attending college

School of Choice: 66% reported GOCC was their 1st choice; 18% said 2nd choice, 16% said 3rd choice. [Our levels of student satisfaction are likely impacted by the large percentage viewing GO as their first choice. Investing in promotion could upgrade us to first position with the remaining 34%.]

Educational Goal: 51 % saw earning a 2-year Associate Degree as their goal, 28% planned to transfer, and 21% attended for a variety of reasons: pleasure, were self employed, job related, etc.

SCORING KEY

	<u>HIGHEST</u>	<u>LOWEST</u>
<u>IMPORTANCE / SATISFACTION SCALE</u> : Potentially:	7.00	.01
<u>Range of IMPORTANCE scores assigned by GO students</u> :	6.23	5.66
<u>Range of SATISFACTION scores assigned by GO students</u> :	5.47	4.77

GAP PERFORMANCE SCALE: Largest Gap (1.05) Academic Advising

(GAP: level of Importance students give an area

MINUS the level of Satisfaction students feel.) to

(The smaller a Performance Gap, the better the

College is doing to meet students’ expectations.)

Smallest Gap (.65) Academic Services

MEAN DIFFERENCE: Measurement between GOCC & Comparison Colleges. If POSITIVE number, GO students are MORE satisfied than Comparison Group. If NEGATIVE, LESS satisfied.

STUDENT SATISFACTION INVENTORY REPORT - April, 2006

Glen Oaks Community College – Comparison Groups

The chart below lists the survey's 12 categories, listed from the highest Performance Gaps to the lowest. This shows us which areas have the largest discrepancy between what students see as important and how well they think we meet their most important needs.

Comparing Glen Oaks to other “like” colleges shows our students’ three highest areas of Importance match those of both the seven chosen community colleges and the national comparison groups. It is also interesting that these areas’ Gap scores (Importance minus Level of Satisfaction) are nearly identical, being a miniscule .08 to .14 of a point from one another. This seems to indicate that students universally have similar educational priorities, and, likewise, academia is being graded about the same across the board for its efforts to meet those expectations. Note that the last item, “Response to Diverse Populations,” is formatted by Noel-Levitz so that respondents only give a level of Satisfaction score, not a level of Importance. This is why a Performance Gap score cannot be listed.

LARGE--SMALL PERFORMANCE GAPS	CATEGORIES	IMPORTANCE LEVEL	SCORE	SATIS- FACTION SCORE	MEAN DIFF. SCORE
1 (1.05)	Acad. Advising/Counseling	3	6.19	5.14	.01
2 (1.01)	Admissions and Financial Aid	4	6.15	5.14	.11
3 (0.97)	Concern for the Individual	5	6.13	5.16	.01
4 (0.95)	Instructional Effectiveness	1	6.23	5.28	-.05
5 (0.93)	Safety and Security	10	5.96	5.03	.19
6 (0.89)	Campus Support Services	11	5.66	4.77	-.11
7 (0.85)	Registration Effectiveness	2	6.21	5.36	.04
8 (0.84)	Campus Climate	8	6.00	5.16	-.05
9 (0.78)	Service Excellence	7	6.02	5.24	.08
10 (0.77)	Student Centeredness	9	5.99	5.22	-.06
11 (0.65)	Academic Services	6	6/12	5.47	.13
	Response to Diverse Populations			5.45	.06

OVERALL FINDINGS

- **STRENGTHS** (16) outweighed **GOCC CHALLENGES** (12)
- **OVERALL SATISFACTION**: Glen Oaks student scores are about ¼ of a point below scores of their peers when asked if their educational experience here met their expectations (4.5 of 7), to rate their overall satisfaction (5.28) and, if they had to do it over, would they enroll here (5.33).
- **COMPARISONS** For all 12 measured areas, the Mean Difference between Glen Oaks’ scores and those of both its seven similar community colleges (“Requested Group”) and national comparison groups showed responses were nearly identical. Our best area, **SAFETY**, (also seen as one of the least important) was 1/5 of a point higher than others which would indicate students feel safe at Glen Oaks, an important promotional point. Our lowest (Student Centeredness) fell about 1/5 of a point below the average. **TACTIC**: Increase friendliness; be more welcoming to students
- **INSTRUCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**, rated by Glen Oaks students as the most Important aspect of college, also received the highest score of the entire survey for one of its 14 responses citing the “quality of instruction received is excellent.” Still, the category as a whole had the 4th largest gap between Importance and Satisfaction which means they think we can still improve. **TACTIC**: Give student feedback earlier in the semester – especially if performance is poor.

- **REGISTRATION**, 2nd in Importance / #7 Gap (.85 moderate). Q8-Establish convenient class times; Q15: Experience conflicts when registering. *TACTIC*: Host Focus Groups to discover convenient class times and specific conflicts experienced.
- **ADVISING/COUNSELING**: 3rd in Importance/ #1 Gap (largest). Q40- Staff aren't familiar with transfer requirements; Q47-Inadequate services to help plan a career; Q48 - Staff don't treat students as individuals; Q52-GO doesn't do all it can to help students reach their educational goals. *TACTIC*: Staff in-service sensitivity training coupled with solutions to other challenges mentioned.
- **FINANCIAL AID**: 4th in Importance/ #2nd largest Gap. Q7 – There is inadequate financial aid available; Q20 - Financial aid officers are not helpful. *TACTIC*: Locate local businesses, foundations and individuals who could sponsor a student or provide GO with scholarships /more financial aid options available; host FOCUS GROUPS to explore how we can be more helpful.

NOEL LEVITZ SSI REPORT – INTERNAL FINDINGS – APRIL, 2006

2003	Most Important Aspects	2006
Instruction Registering Ac. Advising/Counseling Paying for classes	Top 4 areas remained the same	Instruction Registering Academic Advising / Counseling Admissions / Financial Aid

2003	Most Satisfied Aspects	2006
Instruction Academic Services Services for diverse populations		Academic Services Responsive to Diversity* Registration

Best Met Expectations

2003	(Small Gap bet. Importance & Satisfaction)	2006
Academic Services Support Services Registration/Paying for classes Paying for courses Campus Climate		Academic Services Student Centeredness Service Excellence Campus Climate Registration

Least Met Expectations

2003	(Largest Gap bet. Importance & Satisfaction)	2006
Registration/Paying for Courses Ac. Advising/Counseling Admissions/Financial Aid Instruction Campus Climate Customer Service		Academic Advising/Counseling Admissions/Financial Aid Concern for the Individual Instruction Safety & Security Support Services

2003	GOCC's Strengths	2006
Instruction quality Academic Advising/Counseling Campus Climate		Instruction quality Helps dev.student success skills Faculty's knowledge Intellectual growth here

2003	GOCC'S Challenges	2006
Registering/Paying for Courses Admissions/Financial Aid Academic Advising/Counseling Instruction Campus Climate	Classes: Registration: Financial Aid: AC. ADVSG: Faculty:	Inconvenient times; more variety Conflicts; staff not helpful Inadequate aid available; Advisors not helpful; Students not seen as individuals; Help needed to reach acad.goal; Inadequate career dev.services; Learn transfer requirements Earlier notice of poor performance

EXTERNAL FINDINGS

Per the "Scale Report," where GOCC scored high – and where it scored low - compared to other community colleges. We also scored high or low compared nationally.

Higher Scores: #34 Adequate/accessible computer labs, #41 Quality Admissions staff

Lower Scores: #69 Better course variety, (#46 & 65) Quicker notification of poor performance, #47 Improve career-decision services, #68 Improve campus maintenance

STUDENT SATISFACTION INVENTORY REPORT - March, 2006

Student Services - 2006

Comparisons to Similar Community Colleges:

ADMISSIONS:

Staff in Admissions are seen as highly knowledgeable (#41). Glen Oaks' Gap (.67) between Importance (6.22) and Satisfaction (5.55) was lower than both the national norm and our chosen 7 community colleges comparison group. This indicates Admissions' good job.

***COUNSELING - CAREER DEVELOPMENT:**

Students see a need for better providing "adequate services to help (them) decide upon a career." (#47) Our Gap score is larger than that of both the nation and comparison 2-yr. colleges.

LOWER SATISFACTION THAN NATIONAL COMPARISON GROUP:

- Inadequate services to help students decide upon a career. (#47)

IMPORTANT AREAS:

Students view four areas as more important than both outside comparison groups.

- Convenient ways to pay school bills (#51)
- Financial Aid counselors are helpful (#20)
- Help in deciding career (#47)
- Reasonable billing policies (#60)

STUDENT SERVICES' STRENGTHS

- # 80 GO helps me develop the skills I need to be successful
- # 72 I am sufficiently challenged by the academic program offered by GOCC
- # 74 GOCC's website is easy to use.
- # 6 Approachable academic advisors
- # 41 Admissions staff are knowledgeable
- # 36 Students made to feel welcome

STUDENT SERVICES' CHALLENGES

2003 AREAS

2006 – Specific Challenges

REGISTRATION:	#15 Unable to register for needed classes with few conflicts
FINANCIAL AID:	#20 Counselors need to increase their helpfulness # 7 Inadequate financial aid is available for most students
COUNSELING:	#48 Increase treatment of students as "individuals" #16 Show better our concern for students as individuals #52 Increase tactics to help students reach educational goals #47 Increase services to help students decide a career* #40 Increase knowledge on other schools' transfer
CAMPUS CLIMATE	#16 Show better our concern for students as individuals #52 Increase ways to help students reach educational goals