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SSI Background
This report provides an analysis of the results of the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) survey administered to random samples of University of San Francisco students. The SSI\(^1\) is a student satisfaction survey administered annually by more than 200 universities and colleges nation-wide. The primary purpose of the SSI is to provide university administrators with insight into what issues are important to students and how satisfied they are with institutional operations. USF has been administering the SSI since 2006 to both traditional-age undergraduate students and graduate students (see Appendix A for brief data profile). This report will focus on the data for traditional undergraduate students only.

SSI Design
The SSI includes more than 100 statements that are tailored to capture various aspects of the university life. For example, “Residence hall regulations are reasonable,” “The instruction in my major field is excellent,” etc. A responding student needs to provide a personal level of importance and a personal level of satisfaction to each statement. Both, level of importance and level of satisfaction, are measured by a seven-point Likert scale with a score of one (1) being equal to “Not at All Important/Satisfied,” a score of four (4) being equal to “Neutral,” and a score of seven (7) being equal to “Very Important/Satisfied.” Based on those two scores, an institutional performance gap is calculated by subtracting the satisfaction score from the importance score. The wider the gap between the two scores on the same item, the worse the institutional performance on the item. The individual questions are also combined into twelve specific areas such as campus life, instructional effectiveness, campus climate, etc. (see Appendix B for the list of areas). Finally, at the end of the survey, students may express their overall satisfaction with their college experience measured by the following three items: 1) So far, how has your college experience met your expectations?; 2) Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience here thus far.; 3) All in all, if you had it to do over again, would you enroll here?.

SSI Results
The following sections provide an analysis of the SSI results organized into the following sections: a) areas that students rank as the most important, b) areas that students feel the least satisfied with, c) areas that have the widest performance gap, d) students rank of their overall experience, and e) a comparison of USF results to national results. Dashboard charts are presented for visual representation of these results and show the trends from year to year as well as the gap between level of importance, level of satisfaction, and the national norm group.

\(^1\) The SSI was developed by Noel-Levitz - a highly reputable higher education consulting firm - and is administered annually by more than 200 colleges and Universities nation-wide.
- **Areas of the Most Importance**

  *Instructional Effectiveness* and *Academic Advising Effectiveness* indices scored the highest (6.48 and 6.39) among the twelve areas on the scale of student importance in the spring 2012 survey results (see Appendix C for the list of the top five most important individual items). Over the last six years, USF performance gap for these two areas has slightly narrowed down to 0.85, showing a somewhat greater student satisfaction. Nevertheless, USF should continue to target these areas in order to improve student-learning outcomes. For example, an analysis of the individual items comprising the index of *Instructional Effectiveness* reveals that students, on average, are more satisfied with the quality of instruction, contents of the courses within their majors, and the overall expertise of the faculty than with the timeliness of the faculty-provided feedback on student progress in a course and faculty taking into consideration student differences as they teach a course. An analysis of the individual items comprising the index of *Academic Advising Effectiveness* shows that, on average, students express a lower satisfaction with helpfulness of academic advisors in setting up goals to work toward, even though there has been a slight improvement in this area over the last six years (an increase from 4.86 to 5.07).

- **Areas of the Least Satisfaction**

  *Campus Life* and *Service Excellence* indices received the lowest overall scores on the student satisfaction scale (see Appendix C for the list of the top five individual items of most dissatisfaction). Within the *Campus Life* index, students express the most dissatisfaction with the selection of food in the cafeteria and living conditions in residence hall. Over the last six years, the satisfaction scores on these two items have remained flat. In contrast, there has been a slight improvement, over the last six years, with respect to students’ satisfaction with the usage of student activities fees (an increase from 4.59 to 4.70). While, the overall score for the *Service Excellence* index has increased from 5.12 in 2006 to 5.34 in 2012, with the most improvement achieved from 2011 to 2012 (5.20 v. 5.34), several individual items within the index deserve additional attention and scrutiny. Specifically, students continue to express dissatisfaction over the perceived lack of availability of channels for expressing student complaints (score of 4.83) and getting the “run-around” when seeking information. This suggests a communication gap between the USF management and the student body and the need to continue to work collaboratively with the student representatives in order to address these areas.

- **Areas with the Widest Performance Gap**

  *Safety and Security* and *Recruitment and Financial Aid Effectiveness* indices received a performance gap score above 1-point (the higher the score, the greater the gap between how important the area is to students and how satisfied students are with the area). Over the last six years, *Safety and Security* has made a significant improvement narrowing the performance gap from 2.18 in 2006 to 1.12 in 2012 (See Appendix C rankings of the most improved areas over the last six years). To a large degree, the performance gap in this area is explained by the lack of student parking. The performance gap narrows from 1.12 to 0.75 when this item is excluded from the index. However, USF should continue to make improvements in how quickly security staff respond in emergencies. While the
performance gap on this particular item has narrowed from 1.71 in 2006 to 1.04 in 2012, it warrants future action.

Separating admission-related items from financial aid-related items provides a greater insight into the performance gap in the area of Recruitment and Financial Aid Effectiveness. According to the spring 2012 survey results, the performance gap for Financial Aid Effectiveness is 1.57 while the performance for Recruitment Effectiveness is 0.87. Over the last six years, the performance gap for Financial Aid Effectiveness has improved slightly (1.63 in 2006 v. 1.57 in 2012). However, all three individual items – a) helpfulness of financial aid counselors, b) timeliness of the award announcement, and c) financial aid availability – continue to display a greater than 1-point gap between the level of importance and the level of satisfaction.

- **Overall Satisfaction**
  Student responses to the overall satisfaction questions have been stable over the past six years and there is no institutional performance gap on these items. However, student positive responses to whether they would enroll at USF if they had the opportunity to do it over again have been steadily declining since 2006. While there are no statistically significant differences on the year-to-year comparison as well as for 2012 versus 2006 comparison, the decline is of concern and should not be ignored. Also, while prior to 2012 USF has always scored higher than the national average on each of the three overall satisfaction items, the results of the 2012 survey are at the national averages.

- **Comparison to national results**
  We also examined the comparison between a SSI national norm group and the USF cohort. The differences between the two groups on level of perceived satisfaction are generally small. USF students are generally as satisfied as all students sampled nationally in the SSI database.
Appendix A

Brief Data Profile:

• 2006 data includes only freshmen and sophomores
• Data was not collected in 2009 or 2011.
• In 2010 and 2012 we also collected data on graduate students that is not reflected here
• Spring 2006 N = 161
• Spring 2007 N = 1110
• Spring 2008 N = 969
• Spring 2010 N = 788
• Spring 2012 N = 753

Appendix B

Results for the 12 specific areas

• **Student Centeredness** - Institutional performance gap is 0.75 (6.18-5.45). This scale measures the institution's attitude toward students and the extent to which they feel welcome and valued.

• **Campus Life** - Institutional performance gap is 0.60 (5.71-5.11). This scale assesses the effectiveness of student life programs offered by the institution, ranging from athletics to residence life. This scale also assesses campus policies and procedures to determine students' perceptions of their rights and responsibilities.

• **Instructional Effectiveness** - Institutional performance gap is 0.85 (6.48-5.63). This scale measures students' academic experiences, the curriculum, and the campus's commitment to academic excellence.

• **Recruitment and Financial Aid Effectiveness** - Institutional performance gap is 1.04 (6.19-5.15). This scale measures the competence of admissions counselors, along with students' perceptions of the financial aid programs.

• **Campus Support Services** - Institutional performance gap is 0.39 (6.03-5.64). This scale assesses the quality of support programs and services.

• **Academic Advising Effectiveness** - Institutional performance gap is 0.85 (6.39-5.54). This scale assesses the academic advising program, evaluating advisors and counselors on their knowledge, competence, approachability, and personal concern for students.
• **Registration Effectiveness** - Institutional performance gap is 0.89 (6.19-5.30). This scale assesses registration and billing, including how smooth the registration process is.

• **Safety and Security** - Institutional performance gap is 1.12 (6.12-5.00). This scale measures the campus' responsiveness to students' personal safety and security.

• **Concern for the Individual** - Institutional performance gap is 0.81 (6.30-5.49). This scale assesses your commitment to treating each student as an individual. This assessment includes groups who deal personally with students (e.g., faculty, advisors, counselors, and staff).

• **Service Excellence** - Institutional performance gap is 0.71 (6.05-5.34). This scale measures quality of service and personal concern for students in various areas of campus.

• **Campus Climate** - Institutional performance gap is 0.82 (6.24-5.42). This scale evaluates how the institution promotes a sense of campus pride and belonging.

• **Responsiveness to Diverse Populations** - Institutional performance gap is 0.13 (5.39-5.26). This scale assesses the institution's commitment to specific groups of students enrolled at the institution (e.g., under-represented populations, students with disabilities, commuters, part-time students, and adult learners).

**Appendix C**

Five Top most Important and Five Top Most Dissatisfied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 Important Characteristics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The content of the courses within my major is valuable</td>
<td>6.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their field</td>
<td>6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) The instruction in my major field is excellent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent</td>
<td>6.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 5 Most Dissatisfied Characteristics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The intercollegiate athletic programs contribute to a strong sense of school spirit</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) There is an adequate selection of food available in the cafeteria</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Billing policies are reasonable</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Adequate financial aid is available for most students</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D

Rankings by gap and by improvement

### Table 1D: Student Satisfactory Indices: Ranking by Gaps between Importance & Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2012 Gap</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Responsiveness to Diverse Populations Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Campus Support Services Scale</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Campus Life Scale</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Service Excellence Scale</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student Centeredness Scale</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Concern for the Individual Scale</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Campus Climate Scale</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Academic Advising Scale</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Instructional Effectiveness Scale</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Registration Effectiveness Scale</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Recruitment and Financial Aid Scale</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Safety and Security Scale</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2D: Student Satisfactory Indices: Ranking by 6 Year Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2006 Gap</th>
<th>2012 Gap</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Safety and Security Scale</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Service Excellence Scale</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concern for the Individual Scale</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Campus Life Scale</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student Centeredness Scale</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Campus Climate Scale</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Academic Advising Scale</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Registration Effectiveness Scale</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Instructional Effectiveness Scale</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Campus Support Services Scale</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Recruitment and Financial Aid Scale</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Responsiveness to Diverse Populations Satisfaction Scale</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Instructional Effectiveness Scale**

- **IMP** = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
- **SAT** = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
- 4.0 is neutral.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.

6.63 6.62 6.62 6.57 6.52 5.58 5.69 5.67 5.66 5.67

5.46 5.48 5.67 5.66 5.67

5.46 5.48 5.67 5.66 5.67

5.46 5.48 5.67 5.66 5.67

6.55 6.55 6.51 6.46 6.41 5.44 5.40 5.38 5.49 5.54

5.37 5.38 5.38 5.40 5.50

5.43 5.49 5.54

6.39 6.29 6.28 6.15 6.16 5.28 5.16 5.14 5.17 5.20

5.05 5.08 5.14 5.15 5.20

4.96 4.99 5.07 5.12 5.16

4.0 is neutral.

IMP = Not Important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
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IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student's expectations.

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.
Student Satisfaction Inventory
Importance and Satisfaction Means Comparisons
Undergraduate Students Only
2006 - 2012

Admissions counselors respond to prospective students' unique needs and requests.

Admissions counselors accurately portray the campus in their recruiting practices.

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.
Student Satisfaction Inventory
Importance and Satisfaction Means Comparisons
Undergraduate Students Only
2006 - 2012

The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student's expectations.

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.
Student Satisfaction Inventory
Importance and Satisfaction Means Comparisons
Undergraduate Students Only
2006 - 2012

The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student's expectations.

Library staff are helpful and approachable.

Library resources and services are adequate.

Computer labs are adequate and accessible.

Tutoring services are readily available.

IMP = Not Important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student's expectations.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.

IMP = Not Important at all (1) - Very Important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)

4.0 is neutral.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student's expectations.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student's expectations.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student's expectations.

**Concern for the Individual Scale**

**Importance**

- 6.41 (2006)
- 6.34 (2007)
- 6.32 (2008)
- 6.26 (2010)
- 6.30 (2012)

**Satisfaction**

- 5.11 (2006)
- 5.14 (2007)
- 5.20 (2008)
- 5.26 (2010)
- 5.34 (2012)

**National Norms**

- IMP (Not important at all (1) - Very important (7))
- SAT (Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7))

4.0 is neutral.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student's expectations.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet students’ expectations.
Student Satisfaction Inventory
Importance and Satisfaction Means Comparisons
Undergraduate Students Only
2006 - 2012

The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student’s expectations.

**The campus staff are caring and helpful.**

**Library staff are helpful and approachable.**

**The staff in the health services area are competent.**

**Counseling staff care about students as individuals.**

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)

4.0 is neutral.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.
Student Satisfaction Inventory
Importance and Satisfaction Means Comparisons
Undergraduate Students Only
2006 - 2012

The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student's expectations.

**Administrators are approachable to students.**

**It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.**

**I feel a sense of pride about my campus.**

**There is a commitment to academic excellence on this campus.**

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)

4.0 is neutral.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student's expectations.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University's ability to meet student's expectations.
The closer the gap between the two means (IMP v. SAT), the greater the University’s ability to meet student’s expectations.
Student Satisfaction Inventory
Importance and Satisfaction Means Comparisons
Undergraduate Students Only
2006 - 2012

Responsiveness to Diverse Populations Satisfaction Scale

IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.
Student Satisfaction Inventory
Importance and Satisfaction Means Comparisons
Undergraduate Students Only
2006 - 2012

Satisfaction that campus demonstrates commitment to
Part-time students

Satisfaction that campus demonstrates commitment to
Evening students

Satisfaction that campus demonstrates commitment to
Older, returning learners

Satisfaction that campus demonstrates commitment to
Under-represented populations

SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
IMP = Not important at all (1) - Very important (7)
4.0 is neutral.
Student Satisfaction Inventory
Importance and Satisfaction Means Comparisons
Undergraduate Students Only
2006 - 2012

So far, how has your college experience met your expectations?

Much worse than expected (1) - Much better than expected (7)
4.0 is Neutral
Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience here thus far.

SAT = Not satisfied at all (1) - Very satisfied (7)
4.0 is neutral.