

Stats of the Week

Student Satisfaction – Facilities

Level I Analyses

Introduction

Greetings to all the stat geeks out there. This week's report will detail the scores from the 2017 Student Satisfaction – Facilities assessment. Next week, we will begin our comparisons to prior years', but we will first detail the scores for 2017. Did the values change over previous years? Absolutely...but, first things first.

Considerable research indicates that students' perceptions of the quality of facilities is positively correlated with performance. Students who feel better about their surroundings tend to do better and put forth more effort. Further, I now believe that bathrooms are the gateway to a facility's perception. Previously, I was a non-believer. My mistaken perception was that bathrooms are inherently unpleasant places and that people were never "satisfied" with bathrooms, they were just less "unsatisfied". WRONG!!

This week, we will simply compare the satisfaction scores on various factors across the buildings noting the variations. Be aware that some buildings were not renovated so it would be expected that their scores would be lower. Further, the LRC was left off this assessment since our LRC is displaced at this time.

Approximately 240 student measures were counted. Several others were discarded due to nonsensical responses and duplication.

[illegible]

Comments: Remember, dividing the 5 pt. scale into 5 categories of equal size would result in 4.20 and above being “Very Good”, 3.40 – 4.19 being “Good”, and 2.60 – 3.39 being “Acceptable”.

- 1. Cleanliness – every building’s score is above 4.20. Outstanding...*
- 2. Restrooms – most are in the “Very Good” category, or close. The Wellness Centers (not renovated) is the lowest.*
- 3. Interior lighting – remember, we have gone to LED lighting, all except HE are in the “Very Good” category*
- 4. Interior visual appeal – all close to the “Very Good”, with ET and HE being the lowest*
- 5. Interior signage – all good with HE being the lowest*
- 6. General maintenance – all “Very Good”, or very close. Notice a trend...the HS building, which was not renovated, is still among the highest*
- 7. Social gathering places – here is an area where we scored low. If these spaces are important in all buildings, notice that the divisions scored relatively low here*
- 8. Study areas – again, lower scores*
- 9. Classroom appearance – scores here were impressive and close to “Very Good”*
- 10. Classroom comfort – comfort? Chairs and temperature? Again, high scores with SM being lowest*
- 11. Computer labs – high scores with the lower being in CC and HE*
- 12. Science labs – apparently the renovations to the labs has resulted in very satisfied students (note HS)*
- 13. Classroom technology – this is one of the lower scoring areas*
- 14. Parking – always lower, and still one of the lower areas. Surfacing and lighting contribute to this...and students all want to be able to park close...which is impossible. Remember, parking, food, and the bookstore are areas historically disliked around campuses.*
- 15. Exterior lighting – one of the lower areas but still Good*
- 16. Exterior visual appeal – still Good but a lower score. Student like CC and HS.*
- 17. Exterior signage – a lower area...but still Good*

Conclusion

As I mentioned at the beginning, the scores are very impressive. Can we justify the expenditure? I believe we can. Where can we improve and how can we do so? Study areas, gathering places...

Next week we will compare these results to the last three measures and we will be able to measure the degree of improvement. I’m going to look around in the bathrooms...maybe they could serve as gathering places...no, not a good idea. There is a reason why I am a numbers person and not a designer.

Until next week...keep those donations coming.