

STATS OF THE WEEK
Student Satisfaction -- Facilities
August 22, 2014

Introduction

The measure of student satisfaction is composed of two parts – facilities and services. The data were collected from students during the spring 2013 and 2014 semesters. Samples sizes of 646 and 605 students have completed the facilities and services measures, respectively, over the last two years. In 2014, approximately 300 students completed the measures. Some data was analyzed using just the 2014 respondents, but most were analyzed combining the two years, if appropriate. The data derived is shown on the following page. The scores indicate the mean score from all respondents on the item.

Comments: On a 5 point scale, equally dividing each category, Very Poor would include scores between 1.0 – 1.79, Poor 1.8 – 2.59, Acceptable 2.6 – 3.39, Good 3.4 – 4.19 and Very Good 4.2 – 5.0. As noted, generally the RSC ratings of the facilities fall in the Good category. The exceptions are Social Gathering Places in SS, SM and ET, and the restrooms across campus except HS (new building). Further, the only Very Good ratings related to Cleanliness, in some areas. The scores received by the restrooms should not be surprising. Note, the new HS building's restrooms were not rated Very Good. My experience is that restrooms are never rated highly, but ours clearly are in the need of improvement. Cleanliness? The facilities are rated fairly high, which may be a surprise to some. I would conclude that our renovation will address many of these issues. It will be very interesting to see how the ratings change as the renovation progresses.

Looking at the data across facilities, note that the HS, LRC, and the Wellness center are rated the highest. You can look across the rows to see which buildings are rated high and low for each measure, but I did not note any significant pattern or concern.

<p>Please rate the facilities on the right using the following scale by placing the number associated with your opinion in the appropriate box.</p> <p>5 – Very Good 4 – Good 3 – Acceptable 2 – Poor 1 – Very Poor No knowledge – Leave Blank</p>	Business Building	Humanities Building	Social Sciences Building	Science and Math Building	Engineering Technology Building	Health Sciences Building	Allied Dental Education Building	Wellness Center	Administration Building	Student Center (Cafeteria & Bookstore) Building	Student Services Building	Communications Center	LRC-Library	Health/Environmental Science Building
1. Cleanliness	4.08	4.05	4.05	4.00	4.06	4.36	4.11	4.31	4.33	4.12	4.21	4.13	4.24	4.21
2. Exterior visual appeal	3.65	3.70	3.73	3.68	3.68	4.12	3.83	3.90	3.86	3.81	3.91	3.98	3.84	3.84
3. Interior visual appeal	3.56	3.63	3.59	3.54	3.55	4.05	3.65	4.00	3.90	3.82	3.85	3.80	3.82	3.76
4. Social gathering spaces	3.48	3.41	3.39	3.39	3.34	3.88	3.56	3.96	3.64	3.98	3.83	3.79	3.98	3.75
5. Study areas	3.55	3.53	3.49	3.55	3.40	3.94	3.60	3.80	3.59	3.85	3.67	3.79	4.10	3.73
6. Classroom technology	3.91	3.64	3.66	3.73	3.75	3.88	3.81	3.98	3.80	3.79	3.83	3.89	4.01	3.89
7. Effective signage	3.72	3.72	3.75	3.72	3.66	3.90	3.65	3.83	3.85	3.86	3.88	3.85	3.89	3.78
8. Restrooms	3.01	3.01	2.94	3.01	3.17	3.61	3.21	3.33	3.47	3.44	3.47	3.41	3.25	3.32
9. General maintenance	3.84	3.84	3.78	3.84	3.79	4.08	3.80	4.01	3.91	3.89	3.99	3.86	3.86	3.90
10. Classroom appearance	3.68	3.61	3.62	3.66	3.64	3.95	3.68	3.87	3.75	3.69	3.72	3.68	3.87	3.66
11. Classroom comfort	3.72	3.68	3.69	3.72	3.72	4.05	3.69	4.01	3.83	3.81	3.80	3.76	3.93	3.84
12. Computer labs	3.91	3.81	3.82	3.88	3.76	4.01	3.68	4.05	3.91	3.82	3.84	3.77	4.09	3.88
13. Parking	3.52	3.53	3.46	3.49	3.57	3.48	3.37	3.65	3.54	3.57	3.56	3.55	3.55	3.42
14. Exterior lighting	3.68	3.67	3.69	3.65	3.65	3.89	3.60	3.80	3.72	3.64	3.70	3.58	3.73	3.61
15. Interior lighting	3.98	3.93	3.95	3.91	3.91	4.02	3.80	4.05	3.96	3.89	3.96	3.94	3.91	3.88

Facilities by Graduation Date

The State Regent's Office and Higher Learning Commission require us to measure our graduates' views and learning on various expected outcomes, as determined by us. Our process utilizes a very simple strategy – we assess a random sample of students and include a question regarding their expected graduation date. Those who respond that they are expecting to graduate in the current semester are treated as the “Graduates”. We use their responses to describe our graduates and this allows us to compare the graduates' responses to the rest of campus to see if their views differ and/or appear to change over time.

The questions where significant differences ($p < .05$) were found using a simple one-way ANOVA included: BIT5 (BIT building Q# 5), HU3, HU5, HU9, HU15, SM9, SM12, ET6, ET9, and WC5.

Comment: The common theme regarding questions #5 and #9 for each building was that the graduates rated the Study Areas and General Maintenance lower than future graduates. Evidently, experience lead to the student being less satisfied with the study areas and maintenance in some buildings. The isolated differences found in the other questions indicated similar patterns – current graduates rated the areas lower than future graduates. This tells us that those with more experience with the campus rated these areas and buildings lower than those with less experience. I would place greater credibility in these issues raised by these data items, as a result.

Facilities by Gender

The items with a significant difference between genders included: HU4, SS2, HS (almost all), DH12, SC4, 6, 11, 12, SSB6, 10, LRC8, and HE2, 4, 6, 9, 11, 12.

Comment: In all cases except one, the females rated the facility significantly higher than the males on the item measured. In the HS and HE buildings, one could assume that since the females dominate enrollment in the HS programs, their views on the buildings are based on greater experience. We did ask the students to only answer questions relevant to buildings they are familiar with, but I am not sure if this occurred. The only question where the difference was significant and males rated the item higher was LRC8. Males rated the restrooms significantly higher than the females in the LRC. Why? Who knows? Possibly a random chance difference. Maybe the men's restrooms in the LRC are better, and the women's are worse. Someone else can help me with this one.

Facilities by # Colleges Attended

Here, I compared their levels of satisfaction to the number of colleges they attended. We categorized the students into three groups: 0, 1, and 2 or more colleges attended.

Comment: On 117/210 (56%) of the measurements, those who had not attended another school rated the item/building higher than those who have attended at least one other school. Now, why is this so interesting? It provides evidence that those students who have experience with other schools rate our buildings lower than those who have been to no other college. (i.e. experience with other schools lower their satisfaction with our facilities). In other words, our facilities are less satisfying to our students than the other school's facilities. Hmmm...can you say renovation? Now, another interesting fact will come into play next week when I report services satisfaction...the opposite occurs. Those with more college campus experiences rate RSC services higher than those with no college experience. That's for next week, though.

Facilities by Race

This comparison primarily compared differences across race; however, after my initial analysis I reduced the analysis to blacks and whites due to the limited numbers of other races and the lack of differences. The samples included 436 white respondents and 84 black respondents. The questions where differences existed were: BIT2, 3, HU2, 3, 13, SM3, ET2, HS13, DH3, LRC3, HE3, and HE5.

Comment: On all items, the white respondents' ratings were significantly lower than the blacks'. The items where the significant differences existed related to exterior visual appeal, interior visual appeal, parking, and study areas. I am not sure whether or not I can explain or understand why the difference existed. That said, I do not believe a major area of concern exists.

Facilities by Year

The analyses compare the responses across all measurements for the two years this measure has been conducted. In essence, I looked for differences between 2013 and 2014 for each item and building. The items where differences were found include: BIT5, HU5, 9, 15, SS15, SM 3, 5, 6, 9, 12, ET6, 9, 15, WC4, 6, SSB3, 4, 8, 9, COM5, and LRC4, 5, 6.

Comment: In each case, the student ratings in 2014 were significantly higher than those in 2013. Study areas were rated higher in some cases (did something change?), classroom technology, and some lighting. If we made changes, then it appears as if it was for the better. If not, then the differences were random chance differences.

Conclusion

It appears as if many of the areas of concern addressed in this analysis may be improved upon by the renovation. It will be very interesting to see how these items change over time. Will the renovation initially diminish satisfaction due to the inconveniences? I did not notice anything that was terribly alarming, but, the comparisons made related to college experience were enlightening to me...students who have a point of comparison regarding other college campuses rate our facilities lower.

Next week we will look at our student perception of our services. The tables for 2013 and 2014, and this report will be permanently stored on the internal webpage under "Assessment". Enjoy!