STATS OF THE WEEK
2016 Student Satisfaction – Level I Analyses
August 26, 2016

I'm back….number time!

As you may recall, in the spring 2016 semester, we administered the Student Satisfaction – Services measure. In spring 2017 we will assess facilities satisfaction. Given the late date, I thought it best to wait until the fall to report the analyses of the data.

Below is a demographic breakdown of the sample. This should assist you in understanding who our students are, or at least, who was included in the sample.

Attached is a copy of the measure with the mean scores for each question placed in the column associated with the responses.

I am going to let you review these, discuss, and think about them for a bit before I provide my input. I found some items to be interesting, discovered some patterns, and had some questions.

Next week I will point out some information that I believe is noteworthy.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Age					
Valid	19 or younger	102	37.6	37.9	37.9
	20-24	80	29.5	29.7	67.7
	25-29	32	11.8	11.9	79.6
	30-34	22	8.1	8.2	87.7
	35-39	10	3.7	3.7	91.4
	40 or older	23	8.5	8.6	100.0
	Total	269	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
Total		271	100.0		

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	106	39.1	39.3	39.3
	Female	164	60.5	60.7	100.0
	Total	270	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		271	100.0		

Marital

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Single	210	77.5	77.8	77.8
	Married	60	22.1	22.2	100.0
	Total	270	99.6	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.4		
Total		271	100.0		

Race

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	White	156	57.6	58.4	58.4
	Black	45	16.6	16.9	75.3
	Hispanic	17	6.3	6.4	81.6
	Asian	11	4.1	4.1	85.8
	Native American'	13	4.8	4.9	90.6
	Other	25	9.2	9.4	100.0
	Total	267	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.5		
Total		271	100.0		

Diploma

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	GED	16	5.9	6.0	6.0
	Diploma	233	86.0	86.9	92.9
	Neither	19	7.0	7.1	100.0
	Total	268	98.9	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.1		
Total		271	100.0		

Major

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	BIT	47	17.3	17.6	17.6
	ES	38	14.0	14.2	31.8
	HU	34	12.5	12.7	44.6
	SS	47	17.3	17.6	62.2
	HS	68	25.1	25.5	87.6
	Und	33	12.2	12.4	100.0
	Total	267	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.5		
Total		271	100.0		

CollegeHrs

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	37	13.7	13.9	13.9
	1-15	75	27.7	28.2	42.1
	16-30	57	21.0	21.4	63.5
	31-45	30	11.1	11.3	74.8
	46-60	26	9.6	9.8	84.6
	61 or more	41	15.1	15.4	100.0
	Total	266	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	5	1.8		
Total		271	100.0		

NumColl

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	173	63.8	64.8	64.8
	1	55	20.3	20.6	85.4
	2 or more	39	14.4	14.6	100.0
	Total	267	98.5	100.0	
Missing	System	4	1.5		
Total		271	100.0		

Graduate

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	This semester	38	14.0	14.1	14.1
	Next semester	27	10.0	10.0	24.2
	1-2 years	127	46.9	47.2	71.4
	2-3 years	50	18.5	18.6	90.0
	more than 3 years	7	2.6	2.6	92.6
	Uncertain	20	7.4	7.4	100.0
	Total	269	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
Total		271	100.0		

Conclusion

Enjoy! Email me anything interesting that stands out to you. We will discuss some comparisons next week.

STATS OF THE WEEK
September 2, 2016

This week's report continues the analyses of the Student Satisfaction – Services from Spring 2016. Below, we begin to compare responses across various groups.

Academic Affairs

As you recall, last week we reviewed the satisfaction scores for the various areas of campus. Included in this were the service scores for the various academic divisions. Since we asked the same questions across the five divisions, I think it is of value to compare responses for each division and question. As you will notice, there are some patterns.

- The office staff in the _____ Division office is helpful.
    - BIT – 4.02
    - ES – 4.01
    - HS – 3.91
    - HU – 4.16
    - SS – 4.21
    - Mean for all divisions = 4.06

- The _____ academic advisor(s) provide accurate information.
    - BIT – 3.95
    - ES – 4.00
    - HS – 3.88
    - HU – 4.13
    - SS – 4.18
    - Mean for all divisions = 4.03

- The faculty in the _____ division are supportive.
    - BIT – 4.01
    - ES – 3.94
    - HS – 4.00
    - HU – 4.18
    - SS – 4.22
    - Mean for all divisions = 4.07

- The _____ faculty are available to me outside of class.
    - BIT – 3.98
    - ES – 3.79
    - HS – 4.06
    - HU – 4.16
    - SS – 4.20
    - Mean for all divisions = 4.04

- The schedule of classes in the _____ division meets my needs.
    - BIT – 3.81
    - ES – 3.94
    - HS – 4.03
    - HU – 4.15
    - SS – 4.21
    - Mean for all divisions = 4.03

- The ____ labs meet my needs.
    - BIT – 3.76
    - ES – 3.85
    - HS – 3.97
    - HU – 4.08
    - SS – 4.13
    - Mean for all divisions = 3.96

Comment – It should be noted that no question or division scored below the "Agree" category. I believe this is very reassuring. All service scores were either in the "Agree" or "Strongly Agree" categories in relation to the Academic Divisions (this was consistent across most questions and areas of campus).

As you can see, there are some differences on the questions across divisions. Are they noteworthy? I believe any difference is noteworthy, but the question is, are they due to random chance, or is there a reason for the difference? Some interesting observations:

- *The mean score across all divisions were very consistent for each question (3.97 – 4.07).*
- *HU's scores were very consistent varying between 4.08 and 4.16 for the six questions.*
- *SS scored in the "Strongly Agree" category on 4/6 questions, and again, as they have in the past, scored the highest on all questions. They are the only division that scored in the "Strongly Agree" category.*
- *Labs scored the lowest satisfaction and the support of faculty was the highest.*

Comparisons Across Groups

Below, we will begin our analyses of the differences in responses across various demographic groupings. I will only report those where the difference(s) was/were statistically significant and interesting/useful.

Gender
There were three questions where differences were significant.

- Q5 – The Testing Center or E.A.S.T. met my testing needs.
- Q16 – I am interested in intramural sports.
- Q37 – The Health Sciences Division academic advisor(s) provide accurate information.

Report				
Gender		SS5	SA16	HS37
Male	Mean	3.8690	3.2222	4.2222
	N	84	90	36
	Std. Deviation	1.02710	1.30494	.86557
Female	Mean	4.1692	2.6767	3.7412
	N	130	133	85
	Std. Deviation	.91616	1.27653	1.10360
Total	Mean	4.0514	2.8969	3.8843
	N	214	223	121
	Std. Deviation	.97006	1.31284	1.05822

Comment – I have no explanation for the differences on two of the questions, but males are more interested in intramural sports. Not surprising…

Race

Differences were found on six questions

- Q16 – I am interested in intramural sports.
- Q32 – The faculty in the Engineering and Science Division are supportive
- Q46 – The schedule of classes in the Humanities Division meets my needs
- Q50 – The faculty in the Social Sciences Division are supportive.
- Q51 – The Social Sciences faculty are available to me outside of class.
- Q52 – The schedule of classes in the Social Sciences Division meets my needs.

Report

Race		SA16	ES32	HU46	SS50	SS51	SS52
White	Mean	2.9688	4.0154	4.2947	4.3636	4.3196	4.3600
	N	128	65	95	99	97	100
Black	Mean	2.6842	3.3158	3.6562	3.6667	3.6667	3.7333
	N	38	19	32	27	27	30
Hispanic	Mean	3.3571	4.5000	4.1667	4.1818	4.2500	4.4444
	N	14	6	12	11	8	9
Asian	Mean	3.8750	3.8571	4.3333	4.1429	4.3333	4.1429
	N	8	7	6	7	6	7
Native American'	Mean	2.5385	3.8571	4.2222	4.2000	4.4444	4.1000
	N	13	7	9	10	9	10
Other	Mean	2.4500	4.4000	4.2308	4.3333	4.1818	4.0833
	N	20	10	13	12	11	12
Total	Mean	2.9050	3.9386	4.1557	4.2169	4.2025	4.2083
	N	221	114	167	166	158	168

Comment – Vast difference exist among the races in interest in intramural sports. Most of the other questions are somewhat limited by the small number of observations. Look it over…

Number of College Attended

One question, but interesting given past comparisons.

- Q33 – The Engineering Science Division faculty are available to me outside of class.

Report

ES33

NumColl	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
0	3.6607	56	.99593
1	3.6667	24	1.34056
2 or more	4.3684	19	.76089
Total	3.7980	99	1.07836

Comment – The more colleges a student has attended, or more points of comparison, the more the students believe the faculty are available outside of class. Hmmm…compared to other

colleges, those with experience at other schools apparently feel ES faculty are more available than those at the other schools they attended.

Conclusion

This wraps up this week's comparisons. Next week, I will compare the responses to the questions over time. For those questions that were asked in past years, has there been significant changes? We will report and discuss those that have seen an increase or decrease. Thank you for your help and support…

STATS OF THE WEEK
Level III Analyses
September 9, 2016

This week's report continues the analyses of the Student Satisfaction – Services Assessment from Spring 2016. This report will focus on comparing the responses over time for the various academic divisions. We have assessed services four times beginning in 2013. We did not assess facilities this year as we have decided to alternate between facilities and services assessment each year.

Prepare yourself….the data presented below is some good stuff…so, take a deep breath and dive in. There are some very, very interesting trends, differences, and similarities to take notice of.

Student Services

Here is the bad news. The questions in this section were significantly changed from previous measures, and the scale is totally different. With that, there is nothing to compare in this section.

Academic Affairs

- #1 – The office staff in the _____ Division office is helpful.
- #2 – The _____ academic advisor(s) provide accurate information.
- #3 – The faculty in the _____ division are supportive.
- #4 – The _____ faculty are available to me outside of class.
- #5 – The schedule of classes in the _____ division meets my needs.
- #6 – The _____ labs meet my needs.

Business Division

Year		1	2	3	4	5	6
2013	Mean	3.7048	3.6857	3.8716	3.7870	3.7297	
	N	105	105	109	108	111	
	Std. Deviation	.84266	.83567	.83998	.85436	.87330	
2014	Mean	3.6903	3.6582	3.8199	3.7025	3.6709	3.8529
	N	155	158	161	158	158	170
	Std. Deviation	.95732	.97597	.92120	.96769	.97382	.95868
2015	Mean	3.9444	3.9497	3.9881	3.9295	3.8817	4.0485
	N	162	159	168	156	169	227
	Std. Deviation	.96040	.91954	.89569	.97128	.96249	.97415
2016	Mean	4.0189	3.9510	4.0095	3.9800	3.8137	3.7640
	N	106	102	105	100	102	89
	Std. Deviation	.95599	1.07517	.89330	.95325	1.00228	1.05553
Total	Mean	3.8371	3.8092	3.9190	3.8410	3.7759	3.9280
	N	528	524	543	522	540	486
	Std. Deviation	.94437	.96091	.89322	.94757	.95724	.98909

Comments: For the most part, BIT scores have increased consistently over time. All scores declined in 2014 compared to 2013, but they tend to increase in 2015 and 2016. The exceptions to this deal with the scheduling of classes and the labs (2013 lab question was not included). The largest gain since 2013 deals with the office staff and the academic advisement. Overall, these data indicate that student satisfaction with the services provided by the BIT division have improved since 2013. Again, what happened in 2014? Note, BIT scores increased in 5/5 areas over 2013, and on 4/6 questions since 2015. Is this consistent across all divisions? Yet to be discovered…. Good work, BIT!!

Engineering Science

Year		1	2	3	4	5	6
2013	Mean	3.8165	3.7778	3.8087	3.7456	3.7917	3.8393
	N	109	108	115	114	120	112
	Std. Deviation	.72220	.84647	.80454	.75036	.80852	.77754
2014	Mean	3.7765	3.7976	3.8786	3.8294	3.7514	3.7542
	N	170	168	173	170	173	179
	Std. Deviation	.93425	.92574	.92902	.95475	.99508	1.01446
2015	Mean	3.9811	3.9871	4.0698	4.0242	3.9884	4.0545
	N	159	155	172	165	172	165
	Std. Deviation	.94448	.94654	.85554	.92362	.93025	.93218
2016	Mean	4.0090	4.0000	3.9391	3.7900	3.9381	3.8500
	N	111	107	115	100	113	100
	Std. Deviation	.96762	1.03705	1.01986	1.07586	1.02018	1.06719
Total	Mean	3.8907	3.8885	3.9339	3.8634	3.8668	3.8777
	N	549	538	575	549	578	556
	Std. Deviation	.90964	.94278	.90632	.93469	.94817	.96206

Comments: The scores in ES are very similar to BIT with most scores improving over time. However, there are some differences. The faculty scores on #3 and #4 increased until 2016 when it did show a decline. As with BIT, the schedule and the lab scores declined in 2016 as compared to 2015. ES scores increased in 6/6 areas since 2013 and 2/6 areas compared to 2015. Their largest gain was in their advisement area. Look these over….interesting stuff. Does anyone see anything else noteworthy??

Health Sciences

Year		1	2	3	4	5	6
2013	Mean	3.8471	3.6711	3.8994	3.9211	3.9119	4.0132
	N	157	152	159	152	159	151
	Std. Deviation	.90699	1.12630	.92226	.86527	.91668	.85625
2014	Mean	3.7857	3.7305	3.8521	3.8476	3.7904	3.8012
	N	168	167	169	164	167	166
	Std. Deviation	.98578	1.11635	1.00387	.92408	1.02870	1.01635
2015	Mean	4.0000	3.8429	3.9910	3.9437	4.0369	3.9952
	N	219	210	223	213	217	207
	Std. Deviation	1.05795	1.16120	.99544	1.09313	1.01312	1.09942
2016	Mean	3.9062	3.8770	4.0000	4.0614	4.0256	3.9714
	N	128	122	121	114	117	105
	Std. Deviation	1.11141	1.05688	1.00830	.95273	1.01252	1.04198
Total	Mean	3.8929	3.7803	3.9360	3.9347	3.9424	3.9444
	N	672	651	672	643	660	629
	Std. Deviation	1.01867	1.12290	.98290	.97576	.99758	1.01506

Comments: The scores here follow a different pattern than the previous two divisions. The office staff score declined in 2014, increased in 2015, and fell again in 2016. The academic advisor score increased consistently. The faculty score increased in most years, but as with the other divisions, they are fairly consistent. As with the other divisions, 2014 was not a good year. Why? Construction starting? Drought? Leap year? The class schedule and lab scores showed a slight decline…but consistent with BIT and ES – an interesting trend. Note that HS scores increased in 5/6 areas over 2013 and in 3/6 areas compared to 2015. Their largest gains since 2013 are in the advisement area. Do you notice this consistent gain? Something is going on here…

Humanities

Year		1	2	3	4	5	6
2013	Mean	3.8431	3.9320	3.9938	3.9141	3.9527	
	N	153	147	160	163	169	
	Std. Deviation	.84384	.80801	.81261	.81951	.79290	
2014	Mean	3.8689	3.8678	3.9840	3.9247	3.9839	3.9333
	N	183	174	188	186	186	180
	Std. Deviation	.89213	.94947	.90439	.86664	.86665	.97224
2015	Mean	4.1304	4.0814	4.2000	4.0317	4.1633	4.0778
	N	184	172	200	189	196	180
	Std. Deviation	.79228	.79788	.74348	.89267	.76720	.93627
2016	Mean	4.1635	4.1307	4.1771	4.1595	4.1538	4.0811
	N	159	153	175	163	169	148
	Std. Deviation	.84848	.92262	.88249	.90898	.93223	.94411
Total	Mean	4.0029	4.0015	4.0927	4.0057	4.0653	4.0276
	N	679	646	723	701	720	508
	Std. Deviation	.85531	.87780	.84111	.87666	.84380	.95212

Comments: Hmmmm…. HU increased every year on Q1, Q4, and Q6, and comparing their scores across the board in 2016 to 2013 is interesting. Yes, 2014 was a bad year, but their scores improved in most areas in 2014. Their largest gains in 2016 as compared to 2013 was in the office staff and the availability of faculty. Note that their scores improve in 5/5 areas over 2013 (and considerably in all areas), and in 4/6 areas over 2015. Their 2016 scores were among the highest so far and are improving. I know Professor Knox is going to analyze this and share some more interesting comparisons… At first glance, I would estimate that their average gain in 2016 as compared to 2013 is the highest for all division. Impressive…and good work.

Social Sciences

Year		1	2	3	4	5	6
2013	Mean	4.0562	3.9548	4.0783	4.0121	4.0355	3.9111
	N	160	155	166	165	169	135
	Std. Deviation	.78706	.89980	.76270	.80386	.79353	.74780
2014	Mean	3.9385	3.9175	4.0148	3.9400	3.9756	3.9227
	N	195	194	203	200	205	194
	Std. Deviation	.90035	.92372	.84711	.90582	.92057	.97598
2015	Mean	4.1526	4.1167	4.1168	4.0628	4.1077	4.1462
	N	190	180	197	191	195	171
	Std. Deviation	.88064	.91098	.86400	.91550	.88731	.91826
2016	Mean	4.2108	4.1788	4.2202	4.2013	4.2118	4.1259
	N	166	151	168	159	170	143
	Std. Deviation	.84431	.93869	.87839	.91941	.88504	.91826
Total	Mean	4.0858	4.0368	4.1035	4.0476	4.0785	4.0249
	N	711	680	734	715	739	643
	Std. Deviation	.86217	.92270	.84237	.89222	.87841	.90825

Comments: First, remember that SS has scored the highest every year in most areas. This comparison is measuring the changes across the years for each division. SS has improved in 6/6 areas over 2013 and 5/6 over 2015. Their largest gains over 2013 are in the advisement, faculty availability, and the lab areas. Again, 2014 was their worst year. The scores are impressive and their gains have been consistent. One statistical reality may eventually set in…the ceiling effect. Can their scores continue to rise? They are up to the challenge…

Conclusion

The data presented are not intended to create an atmosphere of competition or denote any area or division negatively. As I have stated before, all the scores presented were positive ant there were major areas of concern. However, when we compare changes across divisions, it does indicate some differences that should be evaluated. I will let each of you determine how to utilize this to reinforce what you are doing or decide if

some modifications may be in order. We should all understand that some perceptions are hard to change and that some may be a function of the courses taught in the area, but we can work to make potential improvements.

Next week we will analyze the LRC, Wellness Center, Administrative Services, and the overall campus. Good work and until next week….keep those suggestions coming.

STATS OF THE WEEK
Level III Analyses
September 16, 2016

This week's report continues the analyses of the Student Satisfaction – Services Assessment from Spring 2016. This report will focus on comparing the responses over time for the LRC, Wellness Center, Administrative Services, and the overall campus.

Learning Resources Center

There were four questions pertaining to the LRC on the most recent measure. Remember, the response scale is 1 – 5, Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

1. The personnel in the Learning Resources Center (LRC) is helpful.
2. The Learning Resources Center (LRC) staff provide accurate information.
3. The LRC's tutoring services meet my needs.
4. The LRC's testing services meet my needs.

Learning Resources Center

Year		1	2	3	4
2013	Mean	4.2963	4.2365	4.0977	
	N	243	241	174	
	Std. Deviation	.72916	.78400	.89746	
2014	Mean	4.2246	4.1661	3.9099	4.0602
	N	285	277	233	249
	Std. Deviation	.89527	.89758	1.02366	.90272
2015	Mean	4.3397	4.3248	4.1928	4.2751
	N	315	311	223	269
	Std. Deviation	.84585	.83512	.98344	.88022
2016	Mean	4.1317	4.0920	4.0234	4.0709
	N	167	163	128	141
	Std. Deviation	.94774	.93498	1.03075	1.00460
Total	Mean	4.2624	4.2208	4.0554	4.1502
	N	1010	992	758	659
	Std. Deviation	.85376	.86100	.98982	.92099

Comments: The scores are fairly consistent across all questions and years (testing was not measured in 2013). There was a decline in 2014 (sound familiar?) then an increase in 2015, and another decline in 2016. We must all recognize that the displacement of the LRC personnel, resources, and equipment has created issues with student service. You may recall, and notice, that the LRC has scored in the highest category, Strongly Agree, on several questions over the years. The 2016 scores declined in 3/3 areas since 2013 and 4/4 areas since 2015…but, they were high to begin with, and are still comparatively high.

Wellness Center

1. The schedule of classes in the Wellness Center meets my needs.
2. The staff who work at the Wellness Center is helpful.

Wellness Center

Year		1	2
2013	Mean	4.0205	4.2400
	N	146	150
	Std. Deviation	.93565	.73895
2014	Mean	3.8410	4.0663
	N	195	196
	Std. Deviation	1.10778	.95041
2015	Mean	3.9787	4.2322
	N	188	211
	Std. Deviation	1.06453	.99432
2016	Mean	4.1111	4.2042
	N	126	142
	Std. Deviation	1.02155	.93429
Total	Mean	3.9725	4.1817
	N	655	699
	Std. Deviation	1.04450	.92089

Comments: Again, the scores are consistent and follow a similar pattern. Decrease in 2014, increase, then decrease. Notice that the satisfaction with the schedule of classes was the highest in 2016. The 2016 satisfaction scores increased in 1/2 scores compared to 2013 and similarly compared to 2015. Nothing too alarming here….

Administrative Services

1. The services provided by the Cashiers office meet my needs.
2. I feel safe when I am on campus.
3. Campus security is visible.
4. The cafeteria menu meets my needs.
5. The vending machines meet my needs.
6. The staff at the bookstore is helpful.

Administrative Services

Year		1	2	3	4	5	6
2013	Mean	3.9714	4.1020	3.5737	3.5349	3.4711	3.9959
	N	245	255	251	172	225	241
	Std. Deviation	.77565	.78707	1.12319	1.01679	1.05234	.87796
2014	Mean	3.9789	4.0533	3.6429	3.4580	3.4635	4.0445
	N	285	300	294	238	274	292
	Std. Deviation	.92286	.96276	1.17932	1.06948	1.17379	.88985
2015	Mean	4.1049	4.2301	3.7254	3.6913	3.6146	4.1794
	N	324	352	346	230	314	340
	Std. Deviation	.89448	.89053	1.18800	1.20965	1.17532	.91538
2016	Mean	4.1131	4.1573	3.5714	3.6688	3.6316	4.2311
	N	221	248	238	157	209	238
	Std. Deviation	.96336	.91957	1.28983	1.23199	1.21020	1.00272
Total	Mean	4.0428	4.1403	3.6377	3.5834	3.5460	4.1152
	N	1075	1155	1129	797	1022	1111
	Std. Deviation	.89278	.89640	1.19427	1.13626	1.15724	.92379

Comments: There are some interesting trends here in some areas that are usually not very popular. Satisfaction with the cashiers has increased every year since 2013 and are at a high level, presently. Student's perceptions of their own safety are inconsistent – down in 2014, up in 2015, and down in 2016, but nothing alarming. Student perceptions of the visibility of security increased in 2014 and 2015, but declined considerably in 2016. Satisfaction with the cafeteria's menu is consistent, as is their view of the vending machines, although they did increase in 2015 and increased slightly in 2016. Lastly, satisfaction with the staff in the bookstore has risen consistently and are in the Strongly Agree, or highest category in 2016. Good work, Jason and your staff!! Overall, these areas are some of the areas that historically score low….food, bookstore, and parking are usually low in student satisfaction, but analyzing trends does give some indication of the direction we are moving.

Overall Campus

These questions address a wide assortment of areas…faculty, activities, LMS, WiFi, webpage, technology, and the college. Several of these questions were added later so there is no score for the earlie4 years.

1. The faculty are helpful and supportive.
2. The faculty care about my academic success.
3. The information I receive regarding campus activities is adequate.
4. It is easy for me to self-enroll via the OASIS system.
5. I understand how to use D2L Brightspace.
6. There are adequate services on campus to help me use D2L.
7. The WiFi system meets my needs.
8. The RSC webpage meets my needs.
9. RSC social media (Twitter, Instagram, Facebook) meets my needs.
10. I would recommend Rose State College to others.

Overall Campus

Year		1	2	3	4	5
2013	Mean	4.2401	4.1079		4.0077	4.4152
	N	279	278		260	277
	Std. Deviation	.74648	.85557		1.00190	.72045
2014	Mean	4.2219	4.1158		3.8172	4.3258
	N	311	311		290	310
	Std. Deviation	.80260	.89051		1.13044	.84779
2015	Mean	4.2521	4.1506		4.0393	4.3750
	N	353	352		305	352
	Std. Deviation	.84032	.90742		1.03162	.81037
2016	Mean	4.2308	4.1734	4.1000	4.1009	4.3984
	N	247	248	240	218	246
	Std. Deviation	.91030	.95981	.95418	1.08568	.87822
Total	Mean	4.2370	4.1362	4.1000	3.9842	4.3764
	N	1190	1189	240	1073	1185
	Std. Deviation	.82393	.90170	.95418	1.06712	.81484

Comments: Question 1, faculty support, has not changed much at all over four years, but, the value is very high so there is not much room for improvement. Faculty concern about success, Q2, has steadily risen over the four years. Q3 is new this year. Student perception of the dissemination of information appears to be adequate. OASIS and self-enrolling satisfaction dipped in 2014, but has climbed both years since. Lastly, D2L and student understanding how to use D2l has remained very, very high. Good stuff…I will let your area analyze this how you want, but, not a lot of change and nothing alarming as far as I can tell.

Overall Campus

Year		6	7	8	9	10
2013	Mean	4.2047	3.6385			
	N	254	260			
	Std. Deviation	.85131	1.32399			
2014	Mean	3.9516	3.3800			4.1743
	N	289	300			304
	Std. Deviation	.98834	1.41028			.85550
2015	Mean	4.2229	3.4942			4.3526
	N	314	346			346
	Std. Deviation	.98291	1.43101			.84267
2016	Mean	4.1903	3.4492	4.0126	3.9128	4.3128
	N	226	236	239	195	243
	Std. Deviation	.95410	1.42080	1.01865	1.11114	1.02496
Total	Mean	4.1394	3.4877	4.0126	3.9128	4.2811
	N	1083	1142	239	195	893
	Std. Deviation	.95458	1.40093	1.01865	1.11114	.90244

Comments: Again, #6 addresses the services available for using D2L. The satisfaction score took a dip in 2014 (bad year, 2014), but has recovered to a very high score. Student satisfaction with our WIFI remains low. I do not know what students expect. Maybe the login procedure agitates them. Satisfaction with the RSC Webpage is relatively high, but Tweeter and Facegram, less so. I need to work on my twitting skills. The last question is my favorite. I believe this question envelopes the entire campus, all offices, all facilities, and all classes. Would a student recommend RSC to others? The score remains very high in the Strongly Agree category. This, to me, is the most telling. Good work, campus!!

Conclusion

This wraps up this year's analyses of Student Satisfaction – Services. If you have any needs for additional analyses, or suggestions, come by and let's talk.

As you may know, we are presently collecting student data via the Educational Demographics measure. Thank you to everyone who is helping collect this information. In the spring, we will be measuring Student Satisfaction – Facilities which will be interesting given the many changes on campus. Also, in the spring, we will be measuring the general education outcome, Quantitative Reasoning, again.

Next week, I will provide some information regarding the number of majors and graduates for all programs across campus. This is a report I prepare every year that provides an indication as to the trends in popularity of programs and changes over the years. Keep those donations coming….hunting season is rapidly approaching.