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Background

• Administered every Fall and Spring semester
• Survey contains questions on the following:
  – Experiences with department, courses, faculty, out-of-class activities, etc.
  – Participation in curricular and co-curricular activities
  – Satisfaction with major and Boise State
Quality of Results

• Response Rate
  – Overall: 37% (1,338/3,594)
  – UGRD: 36% (1,027/2,867)
  – GRAD: 43% (311/727)
  – Depts: average of 39%

• Margin of Error
  – UGRD: 2.5%
  – GRAD: 4.2%
Quality of Results (cont.)

• Representativeness
  – Women responded slightly more (average of 2%)
  – Whites responded slightly more (average of 3%)
  – Almost all colleges within 1% of expectation at UGRD and GRAD
    • COBE about 4% lower at GRAD
    • COHS about 3% lower at UGRD
While a student. . .

- 47% worked full-time while attending school
- 31% worked on campus
- 28% lived on campus for at least a year
- 28% had responsibilities for children

And 70% reported transferring credit to Boise State as part of earning their degree
Results over Time

• More graduates agreed:
  + Interactions with peers in the dept were a major source of motivation and support (76% now vs. 71% in 2010-11)
  + There was good communication btwn faculty and students re: student needs/concerns (82% vs. 78%)
  + I received sound academic advice (79% vs. 75%)
  – A number of courses covered the same material and were redundant (49% vs. 44%)
Results over Time (cont.)

- Fewer students reported courses not being offered at the right time
- More students reported meeting with an advisor at least every year (64% vs. 60% in 2012-13)
We examined two questions related to satisfaction:

• Are transfer students more or less satisfied than non-transfer students?

• Which item responses predict satisfaction for non-transfer and transfer students?
Comparing Satisfaction

• Two items
  1. Enroll in same major/program averaged with advise a friend to enroll in same major/program (Major Satisfaction)
  2. Encourage others to attend Boise State (University Satisfaction)
Comparing Satisfaction (cont.)

• Major Satisfaction
  – Non-transfer: Mean of 3.18, SD of .78
  – Transfer: Mean of 3.17, SD of .80

• University Satisfaction
  – Non-transfer: Mean of 3.31, SD of .72
  – Transfer: Mean of 3.31, SD of .77
Predicting Major Satisfaction (Non-Transfer)

• 31.2% of variance explained by
  – Faculty were outstanding teachers (20.8%)
  – Received sound academic advice (27.3%)
  – Faculty genuinely interested in welfare of students (29.4%)
  – Interactions with peers a major source of motivation and support (30.8%)
  – Live on-campus for at least a year (31.2%)
Predicting Major Satisfaction (Transfer)

• 36.2% of variance explained by
  – Good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs/concerns (24.2%)
  – Received sound academic advice (32.7%)*
  – Faculty were outstanding teachers (34.8%)*
  – Interactions with peers a major source of motivation and support (36.2%)*
Predicting University Satisfaction (Non-Transfer)

• 23.2% of variance explained by
  – Faculty were outstanding teachers (14.4%)
  – Many department/program courses were not offered at the right time for me (19.6%)
  – Good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs/concerns (21.8%)
  – Faculty genuinely interested in welfare of students (22.5%)
  – Live on-campus for at least a year (23.2%)
Predicting University Satisfaction (Transfer)

- 20.6% of variance explained by
  - Received sound academic advice (14.8%)
  - Good communication between faculty and students regarding student needs/concerns (19.5%)*
  - Many department/program courses were not offered at the right time for me (20.6%)*
Analysis of Open-Ended Responses

• Students recognize that Boise State keeps improving (facilities, programs, support)
• Students feel like they often get the support they need
• Applied experiences, volunteering, and student club activities were praised
• Seen as welcoming and friendly
Boise State has a student culture that cultivates change and engagement. Although there is still lots of room for improvement for engaging students, BSU is a place where if you want to make a change and help make the university better it is very possible. In my three years here I have seen improvements over the university overall and it is apparent to me that it will continue to get better! Classes are interesting and engaging, professors for the most part are passionate and intelligent, the school spirit is fun and Boise is a great place to live.
Major Satisfaction Comments (Non-Transfer)

• Comments from those who would **not** enroll in the same major or recommend it

• Majority of comments on faculty quality, advising, and admin policies; quite a few mixed reports

• “While some professors were genuinely interested in the students and I feel taught excellently and encouraged learning, others did not.”
Major Satisfaction Comments (Transfer)

- Comments from those who would not enroll in the same major or recommend it
- Greater focus on admin policies and logistics compared to non-transfers
- “This program was very unorganized. Every semester there were changes in curriculum and teachers. It made it very difficult on us as students. I felt like a test subject. The program has been around long enough that all the kinks should have been worked out long ago.”
University Satisfaction

• Nearly half of comments were fully positive; quite a few “mixed bag” comments as well
• Similar responses across non-transfers and transfers
• Concerns focused on learning environment (expectations, practicality), cost, admin policies
Summary

• Several positive changes over the last 5 years, and students recognize it too
• No differences in satisfaction between non-transfers and transfers
• What predicts satisfaction?
  – **Major satisfaction**: transfers more focused on communication with faculty; non-transfers seem somewhat more focused on high quality teachers
  – **University satisfaction**: Good communication important to both
Goals of the Survey

1. Integrate overlapping surveys
2. Reduce redundancy and increase efficiency
3. Deliver a coordinated institutional-level survey that aligns to the NACE standards and accounts for the needs of individual colleges and departments

Foci

1. Perceptions of experiences
2. Overall satisfaction in programs and at the university
3. First-destination information (i.e., next steps in their career or academic plans)

Approach

- University-wide questions
  --- PLUS ---
- Customization option for colleges & departments
  - optional question sets
  - submit their own custom questions
Issues and concerns identified

Review and evaluate current surveys, spring 2015

Input from department chairs and other key partners on needs, challenges, desired process, etc., spring 2015

Develop a v.15 survey based on all of the feedback, summer/fall 2015

Pilot test the customization process with several departments in Dec 2015

Refine the process (including an evaluation of incentives), Jan-March 2016

Launch the revised survey, April/May 2016

Results available for departments, August 2016

Results available for departments, August 2016
Questions & Comments
University Satisfaction (cont.)

• The [ ] program has too many changes and instructors are being thrust into classes they have never taught and instead of truly teaching they are often more concerned that hours are filled with busy work. More focus needs to be on skills.

• The faculty at BSU was the only redeeming aspect of my education. The administrative issues and seemingly random holds and policies were maddening and extremely discouraging.
Going Forward – Process for Revising the Graduating Student Survey

1. Issues and concerns identified
2. Review and evaluate current surveys, spring 2015
3. Solicit input from department chairs and other key partners on needs, challenges, desired process, etc., spring 2015
4. Develop a v.15 survey based on all of the feedback, summer/fall 2015
5. Pilot test the customization process with several departments in Dec 2015
6. Refine the process (including an evaluation of incentives), Jan-March 2016
7. Launch the revised survey, April/May 2016
8. Results available for departments, August 2016