

STUDENT SATISFACTION INVENTORY – 2004

1. The data collected addresses information relating to what university group or situation?

- *All UND students (full and part time, undergraduate, graduate, and professional levels) in Spring 2004*
- *Sample Size – 3,076*
 - *Response Rate – 30%*

2. How often is this tool used and analyzed? What time of year?

- *Has been used two times now*
 - *Fall 2002 and Spring 2004*
- *There is no indication as to how the response rate of 2004 compares with 2002*
 - *However, the 2002 survey was not web-based, while the 2004 survey was, and the 2004 survey contained an additional 10 questions.*
- *Other than the 3-semester interim between the first two surveys, there is no indication in the survey summary or materials as to the expected regularity in conducting this survey. It is merely stated that the survey was first administered in 2002 as “a requirement of all NDUS institutions.”*

3. To whom does the assessment group believe that an analysis of this report would be beneficial (in order to have reliable information to ‘close the loop’ on the assessment process)?

- *All University administrators*
- *UND Assessment Committee*
- *All academic programs*
- *All academic advisors and student organization advisors*
- *UND Senate*
- *Other offices whose services are implicated by this Survey:*
 - *Admissions*
 - *Affirmative Action Office and Title IX officer*
 - *Athletic Programs*
 - *Bursar*
 - *Campus Police*
 - *Campus Shuttle Bus*
 - *Career Service Office*
 - *Children’s Center*
 - *Computer Center*

- *Connect UND Office and UND web administrators*
- *Counseling Center*
- *Crisis Coordination Team*
- *Dining Services and Food Court services*
- *Disability Support Services*
- *Housing Office*
- *International Center*
- *International Programs*
- *Learning Services Office*
- *Libraries (Chester Fritz, medical, law)*
- *Multicultural Awareness Center*
- *Native American Programs*
- *Publicity/Press offices or Information Services*
- *Recreational, intramural programs*
- *Registrar's Office*
- *Student Academic Services*
- *Student Financial Aid Office*
- *Student Health*
- *Student Union*
- *UND Bookstore*
- *Traffic Office*
- *Veteran Services*
- *Wellness Center*
- *Women's Center*

4. Who is responsible to provide the assessment group the information for this report?

- *Office of Institutional Research*

5. What UND student learning goals are being assessed?

The SSI includes questions that seek information about the student's demographics, as well as the student's perception of the institution, the institutional climate, the institution's commitment to specific populations, factors that played into the student's decision to enroll at the institution, and overall satisfaction with the institution. More specifically in terms of the institutional qualities being assessed, twelve composite scales were used: academic advising effectiveness, campus climate, campus life, campus support services, concern for the individual, instructional effectiveness, recruitment and financial aid effectiveness, registration effectiveness, safety and security, service excellence, student centeredness, and responsiveness to diverse populations. In short, the survey items did not expressly target student learning, but rather focused much more generally on student satisfaction with institutional services. While some of the questions (for example, those asking about advising or instructional effectiveness) arguably might indirectly reflect on student learning, they ask about the delivery of services in a general way, rather than relating the question to what the student may have learned from such

services. In that respect, there is no discernable way to relate this survey to student learning, much less to specific aspects of student learning.

6. What evidence is provided or should be provided to support the group's findings?

- *Nothing, apart from the report on the survey as delivered by OIR.*

7. What evidence does the assessment group believe should be collected/compiled for the focused visit or the next accreditation visit?

- *Providing a response rate for the 2002 survey might be helpful for comparison in how well the institution is tracking performance on this survey.*
- *The results on this survey may be very helpful to outside evaluators in viewing student satisfaction with service delivery, but unless the survey is modified to reflect questions that more specifically ask questions about student learning, it cannot provide even discernable indirect support for such learning.*
- *A regular schedule for conducting the survey should be established.*

8. Is this tool a direct measure, an indirect measure, or a non-measure of student learning?

- *non-measure*

9. Does this tool empower individuals or the university to better understand and assess student learning at the university? If so, how?

- *No, not without specific questions calling for responses that relate to student learning.*

10. Is there a better way to obtain or report the data to be analyzed?

- *Create some additional questions that more specifically ask about the student's perception of his/her learning experience, rather than only focusing on satisfaction with general services delivery. If possible, also relate these questions to the more specific student learning goals for the institution and its general education requirements.*

11. At what level of assessment is the tool being used; beginning level, making progress level, or maturing stage of continuous improvement? Is there any evidence to support the assessment group's deduction?

- *In terms of assessing student learning, this tool is not even at the beginning level.*

- *In terms of assessing other service-delivery goals of the University, it appears that this tool is in its beginning level, having only been used once before and being used in comparison with other institutions within the NDUS.*

12. Does the tool reflect a culture of assessment at UND?

- *To the extent that (1) the survey is a fairly comprehensive – albeit general – assessment of service delivery, and (2) ten questions have been added to the instrument for this second round of assessment, and (3) the University – for this second round of assessment – created a web-based approach to hopefully improve the gathering and amount of data generated, this tool does reflect a culture of assessment.*
- *To the extent that this survey does not make a more direct connection to student learning, which is a core goal of the University, this tool does not provide as much support for the culture of assessment as it could.*

13. Does the tool need increased university or administrative support or faculty involvement in order to make it more useable or effective?

- *The survey would better serve student learning assessment if at least some of the questions were better tailored, with the input of faculty, administrators, and student representatives.*
- *The response rate of the survey might be better supported if, along with the multiple email reminders, the administration would issue a more public statement of institutional support for this survey (and other worthy surveys).*
- *The administration of the survey would be better served if a regular schedule (eg. every other year) for the survey were identified.*

14. Does the assessment group need any administrative insight or guidance in order to analyze the tool effectively?

- *No.*

15. What value does the group place on this tool for helping to achieve the university's assessment plan?

- *Could be a more valuable tool for assessment if it incorporated student learning, but even if that does happen, it will ultimately be only a secondary and indirect measure of such learning. It is a more valuable tool for assessing other goals of the University.*

16. What are the findings of the assessment of this assessment tool?

- *The SSI is not presently a tool for measuring student learning, but could have some value in that regard (although as an indirect and limited measure) if – as described above – specific questions were added or existing questions were modified, and if more effort were made to generate a better response rate.*
- *The SSI does seem to be a fairly comprehensive and useful tool for assessing general delivery of services at the University.*

17. Review Summary

- *See #16 above.*

18. Recommendations of the Reviewers

- *Administration should identify a regular schedule for administering this survey instrument.*
- *With input from faculty, administrators, and student representatives, questions on this survey should be added or modified to better relate to student learning, particularly as reflected in the University's institutional and general education goals.*
- *Along with multiple email reminders, top levels of University administration should issue public statement about the survey, in support of the survey, to keep constituents informed, and in an effort to generate a greater response rate by students.*
- *After the survey has been conducted, OIR should report the survey results to all departments, officers, offices, organizations, and service providers identified in Question #3 above, so that those entities can analyze and use the data.*

Submitted by:

Alexandra Burbach
Barbara Voglewede

Date of Submission:

January 9, 2006