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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Background and Findings

* The Ruffalo Noel Levitz [Student Satisfaction InventoryTM (SSI)](https://www.ruffalonl.com/upload/Student_Retention/SSI/Samples/SSIFormA4yrPaperandPencilSample.pdf) is a valid and reliable instrument.
* SU administered the SSI to identify strengths and challenges based on student responses.
* 9% (n = 649) of the SU undergraduate spring 2016 population participated (n = 7542) in the SSI.
* In general, the spring 2016 SSI participant sample is similar to the three comparison groups in terms of student demographic characteristics. The three groups were:
	+ the entire SU undergraduate population in spring 2016;
	+ the sample of SU students that participated in spring 2008 SSI administration; and
	+ National 4-year Public Schools.
* In general, SU students report greater satisfaction than the National group.
* In general, SU students have remained relatively consistent in their reported satisfaction rankings from the 2008 to the 2016 SSI administrations.
* The results of the SSI can inform institutional priorities to target aspects that students deem of high importance and high or low satisfaction, strengths and challenges, respectively.

## Next Steps

* Continue outreach to segments of the campus community regarding SSI results
* Discuss plans for follow-up assessment of student satisfaction
* Include these SSI data in the next SU Middle States Accreditation

# DETAILED SSI REPORT

## Why assess student satisfaction?

The Office of Student Affairs requested that the Office of University Analysis, Reporting and Assessment (UARA) administer the Ruffalo Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) to comprehensively assess student satisfaction with the undergraduate experience at Salisbury University (SU). The assessment analysis described in this report identifies strengths and challenges and also compares our data to other benchmarks (e.g., National 4 year Public Schools; earlier iterations of the instrument at SU).

These data can be used for evidence-based decision-making for relevant SU units and in relation to the [SU Strategic Plan (2014 - 2018)](http://www.salisbury.edu/uara/Planning/Strategic_Plan_2014_2018_webfile.pdf) so that they may strive to continuously improve the quality and excellence of an undergraduate education at SU.

## Methods

Data were collected from volunteer students at SU that self-selected and signed up to participate in various Gaining Understanding as a Lifelong Learner (GULL) Week testing sessions during a week in February, 2016. [GULL Week](http://www.salisbury.edu/uara/gullweek/index.html) sessions were open to the entire SU undergraduate student population. The assessments were administered in a proctored computer lab setting and lasted approximately one hour, of which roughly 25 minutes were dedicated to the online version of Form A of the Student Satisfaction Inventory ([SSI](https://www.ruffalonl.com/college-student-retention/satisfaction-priorities-assessments/student-satisfaction-inventory)). While a total of 1,179 students participated in GULL Week, not all students were administered the SSI. This report provides the results of 679 undergraduate students that completed the SSI, representing approximately 9.0% of the spring 2016 undergraduate enrollment (n = 7542).

## Instrument

The SSI is a valid and reliable instrument developed and published by Ruffalo Noel Levitz to assess traditional undergraduate students at four-year and two-year institutions. During spring 2016, SU administered the Four-year College and University version, Form A (original; [Schreiner & Juillerat 1994](https://www.ruffalonl.com/upload/Student_Retention/SSI/Samples/SSIFormA4yrPaperandPencilSample.pdf)). [The instrument includes 73 standard items](https://www.ruffalonl.com/upload/Student_Retention/SSI/Samples/SSIFormA4yrPaperandPencilSample.pdf) and 10 SU-specified campus (see [Appendix Table 2](#_Appendix_Table_2.)) items that measure student satisfaction within the context of what students feel is most important. The items of the instrument both statistically and conceptually span twelve scales (see [SSI Scales section](#_SSI_Scales) for more descriptions of the scales and [Appendix Table 1](#_Appendix_Table_1.) for item alignment with the scales).

**Performance Gap:** the *Importance* (expectation) score minus the *Satisfaction* (perception) score; where the larger the Performance Gap value, the greater the discrepancy between what students expect and their level of satisfaction with the current situation

**Standard Deviation** (SD)**:** represents the variability in the scores, in this instance of the *Satisfaction* scores; where the larger the SD value, the greater the variability in student responses

See [Appendix 1](#_Appendix_1._SSI) for more information about the SSI.

## Results & Interpretation

### How does our sample compare, in terms of demographics?

For the results from spring 2016 SSI administration (hereafter referred to as **SU SP16: SSI**; n = 679) to be meaningful (i.e., allow for valid and reliable interpretations to be made), the sample must be comparable. That is influenced by how well that sample aligns with the demographic categories of the three groups to which we compare:

1. the entire SU undergraduate population in spring 2016 (hereafter referred to as **SU SP16: All**; n = 7542);
2. the sample of SU students that participated in spring 2008 SSI administration (hereafter referred to as **SU SP08: SSI**; n = 776); and
3. National 4-year Public Schools (hereafter referred to as **National**; 93 institutions and n = 91,255). These National data are from Ruffalo Noel Levitz (2016d).

When there are demographic similarities between the various groups, results can be reasonably compared across the samples. More importantly, if the SU SP16: SSI sample is demographically similar to the SU SP16: All population, we may infer that the SSI results are representative of the general satisfaction of all undergraduate SU students enrolled in spring 2016.

In general, the spring 2016 SSI participant sample is similar to the three comparison groups. For example, each demographic category has a response option which was selected by the largest percentage of participants, these response selections were the same for each comparison group for all demographic categories except Class Level (e.g., freshman, sophomore, junior and senior). This and other demographic comparisons are noted below (an asterisk denotes when SU SP16: All group is not a comparison group because comparable institutional data is currently unavailable to align with the demographic category):

* **Gender:** Although the SU SP16: SSI percentage of females is similar (68%) to the National group (63%), the SU SP16: All group has fewer females (57%). Therefore, the male voice is slightly underrepresented in the SU SP16: SSI data.
* **Age\*/Enrollment Status\*/Class Load\*/Employment\*:** The most common response was 19 – 24 (Age)/Day (Enrollment Status)/Full-time (Class Load)/Not employed (Employment) for all groups, but the National group has more non-traditional students than any of the SU-related groups.
* **Class Level:** For the National group, the majority of survey participants were freshmen (26%), whereas juniors were the largest class responding to the SU SP08: SSI (32%). When SU’s spring 2016 groups were examined, seniors represented the largest group (30% and 33%, for the SU SP16: SSI and SU SP16: All groups, respectively). Therefore, the SU SP16: SSI data will be an accurate reflection of the SU SP16: All group, but it should be noted that it represents a more mature and experienced college student voice than either the National or SU SP08: SSI groups.
* **Ethnicity/Race:** The most common response was “Caucasian/White” for all groups, but SU is closing the gap between the National group (56%) and the SU SP08: SSI participants (82%) with the SU spring 2016 groups (68% and 69%, for the SU SP16: SSI and SU SP16: All groups, respectively). The largest increases between the 2008 and 2016 SU samples were in the “African-American” and “Hispanic” response options.
* **Current GPA/Disabilities\*:** The groups are similar in their participant percentages across all response options for these demographic categories.
* **Educational Goal\*:** The groups are similar in their participant percentages across all response options, except it is interesting to note that, the SU SP16: SSI group reported a 4% increase for "Doctorate or professional degree” as compared to the SU SP08: SSI group.
* **Current Residence\*:** Far fewer SU students live in their “parent’s home” or their “own house” as compared to the National group, although the most common response for all of the groups was to “rent a room or apartment off campus” (43% SU SP16: SSI; 47% SU SP08: SSI; 28% National). SU students have also increasingly resided in residence halls, as evidenced by the selection of that response option by the SU SP08: SSI (28%) and SU SP16: SSI (38%) groups. Therefore, SU students are more likely to engage in an increased number of University-related experiences, which would affect their responses compared to the National group.
* **Residence Classification\*:** SU consistently has more “out-of-state” students than the National group. Also, there has been a slight increase in “international” (not U.S. citizen) students at SU from the SU SP08: SSI collection to the current SU SP16: SSI sample.
* **Institution was my \_\_\_\_ choice\*:** In general, the groups are similar in their participant percentages across the response options, with “1st choice” selected by the largest percentage of participants in each group.

### Strengths and Challenges

The Satisfaction-Priorities Surveys Interpretive Guide (Ruffalo Noel Levitz 2016b) articulates how institutional strengths and challenges can be identified based on participants’ responses (excerpts in italics). For both strengths and challenges it should be noted that only items that collect responses for both the *Importance* and *Satisfaction* aspects of the survey are included – those that only include one or the other are not.

#### Strengths

***Strengths are items with high importance and high satisfaction.*** *These are specifically identified as items above the mid‐point in importance (top half) and in the upper quartile (25 percent) of your satisfaction scores. The strengths are listed in descending order of importance.*

##### **Table 1.** Strengths

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **SU SP16: SSI** | **SU SP16: SSI vs. SU SP08: SSI** | **SU SP16: SSI vs. National** |
| **Importance** | **Satisfaction/SD** | **Performance Gap** |
| 8. The content of the courses within my major is valuable. | 6.65 | 5.85/1.19 | 0.80 |  | **+** |
| 16. The instruction in my major field is excellent. | 6.62 | 5.75/1.21 | 0.87 |  | **+** |
| 33. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about requirements in my major. | 6.60 | 5.64/1.63 | 0.96 |  |  |
| 39. I am able to experience intellectual growth here. | 6.58 | 5.90/1.09 | 0.68 |  | **+** |
| 7. The campus is safe and secure for all students. | 6.58 | 5.76/1.23 | 0.82 | **+** | **+** |
| 55. Major requirements are clear and reasonable. | 6.57 | 5.81/1.35 | 0.76 |  | **+** |
| 68. Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their field. | 6.57 | 5.92/1.19 | 0.65 |  | **+** |
| 29. It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus. | 6.55 | 5.77/1.25 | 0.78 |  | **+** |
| 69. There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus. | 6.47 | 5.80/1.27 | 0.67 |  | **+** |
| 45. Students are made to feel welcome on this campus. | 6.43 | 5.66/1.30 | 0.77 |  | **+** |
| 72. On the whole, the campus is well-maintained. | 6.43 | 5.97/1.13 | 0.46 | **-** | **+** |
| 65. Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours. | 6.41 | 5.92/1.25 | 0.49 |  | **+** |
| 41. There is a commitment to academic excellence on this campus. | 6.40 | 5.75/1.17 | 0.65 | **+** | **+** |
| 26. Computer labs are adequate and accessible. | 6.38 | 5.79/1.28 | 0.59 | **+** | **+** |
| 67. Freedom of expression is protected on campus.  | 6.25 | 5.57/1.42 | 0.68 |  |  |
| 46. I can easily get involved in campus organizations. | 6.24 | 5.71/1.37 | 0.53 |  | **+** |
| 32. Tutoring services are readily available. | 6.23 | 5.84/1.23 | 0.39 | **+** | **+** |

Note: The SU spring 2016 SSI sample (**SU SP16: SSI**; n = 679) items (with respective item numbers) that were indicated by student responses as *Strengths* (high importance and high satisfaction) in order from highest to lowest importance. Comparison of those items to the SU spring 2008 SSI sample (**SU SP08: SSI**; n = 776) and the National 4-year Public Schools sample (**National**; 93 institutions and n = 91,255) is also noted; where +, -, or no sign indicates SU SP16: SSI satisfaction is statistically significantly higher, lower, or there is no difference when compared with the SU SP08: SSI or National samples, respectively.

#### Challenges

***Challenges are items with high importance and low satisfaction or large*** [***performance gap***](#_Instrument)***.*** *These are specifically identified as items above the mid‐point in importance (top half) and in the lower quartile (25 percent) of your satisfaction scores or items above the mid‐point in importance (top half) and in the top quartile (25 percent) of your performance gap scores. The challenges are listed in descending order of importance.*

##### **Table 2.** Challenges

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **SU SP16: SSI** | **SU SP16: SSI vs. SU SP08: SSI** | **SU SP16: SSI vs. National** |
| **Importance** | **Satisfaction/SD** | **Performance Gap** |
| 34. I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts. | 6.63 | 4.97/1.78 | 1.66 |  |  |
| 36. Security staff respond quickly in emergencies. | 6.55 | 5.54/1.35 | 1.01 |  | **+** |
| 66. Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment. | 6.48 | 5.27/1.55 | 1.21 | **-** |  |
| 47. Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course.  | 6.43 | 5.28/1.34 | 1.15 |  | **+** |
| 78. Campus item: Campus food services adequately meet the needs of students. | 6.38 | 5.02/1.63 | 1.36 | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| 14. My academic advisor is concerned about my success as an individual. | 6.37 | 5.23/1.72 | 1.14 |  |  |
| 23. Living conditions in the residence halls are comfortable (adequate space, lighting, heat, air, etc.) | 6.36 | 5.11/1.49 | 1.25 |  | **+** |
| 83. Campus item: The town is safe and welcoming to students. | 6.33 | 4.29/1.75 | 2.04 | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| 17. Adequate financial aid is available for most students. | 6.32 | 4.74/1.65 | 1.58 |  | **-** |
| 76. Campus item: Students find Gullnet helpful in keeping them organized.  | 6.29 | 5.19/1.70 | 1.10 | **n/a** | **n/a** |
| 38. There is an adequate selection of food available in the cafeteria. | 6.27 | 5.09/1.57 | 1.18 | **-** | **+** |
| 11. Billing policies are reasonable.  | 6.26 | 5.00/1.51 | 1.26 |  |  |
| 12. Financial aid awards are announced to students in time to be helpful in college planning. | 6.25 | 5.19/1.51 | 1.06 |  | **+** |
| 21. The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate. | 6.23 | 2.87/1.89 | 3.36 | **+** | **-** |

Note: The SU spring 2016 SSI sample (**SU SP16: SSI**; n = 679) items (with respective item numbers) that were indicated by student responses as *Challenges* (high importance and low satisfaction or large performance gap) in order from highest to lowest importance. Comparison of those items to the SU spring 2008 SSI sample (**SU SP08: SSI**; n = 776) and the National 4-year Public Schools sample (**National**; 93 institutions and n = 91,255) is also noted; where +, -, no sign indicates SU SP16: SSI satisfaction is statistically significantly higher, lower, or there is no difference when compared with the SU SP08: SSI or National samples, respectively. Please note that campus items specified by SU for the spring 2016 SSI administration are not available for comparison groups.

#### SU SP16: SSI vs. National

We were able to evaluate our [strengths](#_Strengths) and [challenges](#_Challenges) in the broader perspective of our students’ compared to the National sample:

* For all items identified as SU [strengths](#_Table_1._Strengths), all but two were statistically significantly higher at SU. SU students report greater satisfaction on 15 items as compared to the National group. Items 33 and 67 were comparable with the National group’s reported satisfaction.
* A total of 14 items were identified as [challenges](#_Table_2._Challenges) for SU. These items were selected because SU students rated them as important but satisfaction was low.
	+ Despite being identified as challenges, SU students actually reported statistically significantly higher satisfaction than the National group on five of the items (36, 47, 23, 38, and 12) identified as challenges.
	+ Three items (78, 83, and 76) identified as challenges were SU-specific campus items and therefore cannot be compared to the National group.
	+ Four items (34, 66, 14, and 11) identified as challenges were comparable with the National group.
	+ Two items identified as challenges (17 and 21) recognized areas where SU students reported statistically significantly less satisfaction when compared to the National group.

In general, SU students report greater satisfaction than the National group. These results help SU to support the quality and excellence expected of our undergraduate experience. It also assists the University in [identifying areas where improvements can be made](#_Prioritizing_Action:_Past,), especially as they align with the [SU Strategic Plan](http://www.salisbury.edu/uara/Planning/Strategic_Plan_2014_2018_webfile.pdf).

It should also be noted that some of the satisfaction trends seen at SU have similarly been identified at other National 4-year Public Schools in previous reports (Noel Levitz, Inc. 2011; Ruffalo Noel Levitz 2016a). For example, Ruffalo Noel Levitz (2016a) stated, “Many students at four-year institutions do not think tuition paid was a worthwhile investment.” Also, Noel Levitz, Inc. (2011) reported that “The importance ranking and satisfaction levels shifts [sic] in financial items.” Specifically, importance and satisfaction rankings of financial items have increased over time based on the analysis of 15-year trends in the SSI data (1994 – 1995 sample vs. 2009 – 2010 sample).

### SSI Scales

The SSI Interpretative Guide (Ruffalo Noel Levitz 2016c) provides descriptions, below, of 12 clusters of items that shared common meaning, otherwise known as scales. These scales were analyzed by Ruffalo Noel Levitz and can help institutions identify strengths and challenges (described below, alphabetically) for these broader themes. However, caution should be used when interpreting the meaning of scales as [particular items](https://www.ruffalonl.com/upload/Student_Retention/SSI/Samples/SSIFormA4yrPaperandPencilSample.pdf) can skew the overall outcomes of a scale. Some items may appear on more than one scale ([Appendix Table 1](#_Appendix_Table_1.)). The ten SU-specified campus items ([Appendix Table 2](#_Appendix_Table_2.)) are not included in any of the scales.

***Academic Advising******(and Counseling) Effectiveness:*** *Assesses the comprehensiveness of your academic advising program. Academic advisors (and counselors) are evaluated on the basis of their knowledge, competence, and personal concern for student success, as well as on their approachability.*

***Campus Climate:*** *Assesses the extent to which your institution provides experiences that promote a sense of campus pride and feelings of belonging. This scale also assess*[es] *the effectiveness of your institution’s channels of communication for students.*

***Campus Life:*** *Assesses the effectiveness of student life programs offered by your institution, covering issues ranging from athletics to residence life. This scale also assesses campus policies and procedures to determine students’ perception of their rights and responsibilities.*

***Campus Support Services:*** *Assess*[es] *the quality of your support programs and services which students utilize to make their educational experiences more meaningful and productive. This scale covers a variety of areas.*

***Concern for the Individual:*** *Assesses your institution’s commitment to treating each student as an individual. Those groups who frequently deal with students on a personal level (e.g., faculty, advisors, etc.) are included in this assessment.*

***Instructional Effectiveness:*** *Assesses your students’ academic experience, the curriculum, and the campus’s overriding commitment to academic excellence. This comprehensive scale covers areas such as the effectiveness of your faculty in and out of the classroom, content of the courses, and sufficient course offerings.*

***Recruitment******(or Admissions)******and Financial Aid******Effectiveness:*** *Assesses your institution’s ability to enroll students in an effective manner. This scale covers issues such as competence and knowledge of admissions counselors, as well as the effectiveness and availability of financial aid programs.*

***Registration Effectiveness:*** *Assesses issues associated with registration and billing. This scale also measures your institution’s commitment to making this process as smooth and effective as possible.*

***Responsiveness to Diverse Populations:*** *Assesses your institution’s commitment to specific groups of students enrolled at your institution, e.g., under‐represented populations; students with disabilities; commuters; part‐time students; and older, returning learners.*

***Safety and Security:*** *Assesses your institution’s responsiveness to students’ personal safety and security on your campus. This scale measures the effectiveness of both security personnel and campus facilities.*

***Service Excellence:*** *Assesses the perceived attitude of your staff, especially front‐line staff, toward students. This scale pinpoints the areas of your campus where quality service and personal concern for students are rated most and least favorably.*

***Student Centeredness:*** *Assesses your campus’s efforts to convey to students that they are important to your institution. This scale measures the extent to which students feel welcome and valued.*

##### **Table 3.** SSI Scales

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Scale** | **SU SP16: SSI** | **SU SP16: SSI vs. SU SP08: SSI** | **SU SP16: SSI vs. National** |
| **Importance** | **Satisfaction/SD** | **Performance Gap** |
| Academic Advising | 6.43 | 5.38/1.34 | 1.05 | **-** |  |
| Instructional Effectiveness | 6.42 | 5.61/0.88 | 0.81 |  | **+** |
| Safety and Security | 6.40 | 4.82/1.10 | 1.58 | **+** |  |
| Student Centeredness | 6.29 | 5.51/0.97 | 0.78 |  | **+** |
| Registration Effectiveness | 6.26 | 5.18/1.10 | 1.08 |  |  |
| Concern for the Individual | 6.25 | 5.33/1.05 | 0.92 |  | **+** |
| Campus Climate | 6.25 | 5.45/0.93 | 0.80 |  | **+** |
| Recruitment and Financial Aid | 6.17 | 5.16/1.09 | 1.01 |  | **+** |
| Campus Support Services | 6.14 | 5.59/0.91 | 0.55 | **+** | **+** |
| Service Excellence | 6.11 | 5.38/0.94 | 0.73 |  | **+** |
| Campus Life | 6.00 | 5.30/0.92 | 0.70 |  | **+** |
| \*Responsiveness to Diverse Populations |  | 5.45/1.29 |  | **+** | **+** |

Note: The SU spring 2016 SSI sample (**SU SP16: SSI**; n = 679) scales in order from highest to lowest importance. Comparison of those items to the SU spring 2008 SSI sample (**SU SP08: SSI**; n = 776) and the National 4-year Public Schools sample (**National**; 93 institutions and n = 91,255) is also noted; where +, -, or no sign indicates SU SP16: SSI

satisfaction is statistically significantly higher, lower, or there is no difference when compared with the SU SP08: SSI or National samples, respectively. An asterisk (\*) denotes a scale where students were not asked to respond to how important the items in the scale were and therefore no *Importance* or Performance Gap values are reported.

## Prioritizing Action: Past, Present, and Future Initiatives and Efforts

Ruffalo Noel Levitz suggests institutions use the matrix for prioritizing action ([Fig. 1](#_Figure_1._Matrix)) to aid in decision-making. Items that fall in quadrants 1 and 2, Institutional [Challenges](#_Challenges) and [Strengths](#_Strengths), respectively, should be priorities for improvement. Whereas items that fall in quadrants 3 and 4 are deemed less important by SU students and therefore should not be top action items.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Very Dissatisfied** |  | **Very Important** |  | **Very Satisfied** |
| 1Institutional Challenges | 2Institutional Strengths |
| 3 | 4 |
| **Very Unimportant** |

##### **Figure 1.** Matrix for prioritizing action (Copyright 1994 – 2016 Ruffalo Noel Levitz)

Accordingly, the following list includes many of the initiatives and efforts aligned with those priorities ([SSI item numbers](#_Appendix_1._SSI) in parentheses) that have been made since 2008, are currently in progress, or are planned (in table format with respective list, 1-30 below, and item numbers in [Appendix Table 3](#_Appendix_Table_3.)).

1. [General Education review](http://www.salisbury.edu/campusgov/facsenate/genedreview/) is currently in progress (Strengths: 8, 16, 33, 39, 55, 29, 69, 41; Challenge: 66)
2. Development of the [Office of Instructional Design & Delivery](http://www.salisbury.edu/instructionaldesign/) for faculty professional development and course improvement (Strengths: 16, 29, 65, 41; Challenges: 66, 47)
3. Development of the [Office of Innovation in Teaching and Learning](http://www.salisbury.edu/gsr/docs/publications/magazine/2015/SU_ResearchMag2015_pp17-19.pdf) for faculty professional development as well as course and curriculum development (Strengths: 8, 16, 39, 55, 29, 65, 41; Challenges: 66, 47)
4. Inauguration of SU Faculty Learning Communities (2016-17 academic year) for faculty professional development as well as course and curriculum development (Strengths: 8, 16, 39, 55, 29, 69, 65, 41; Challenges: 66, 47)
5. Creation of and filling four new professional [academic advisor positions](http://www.salisbury.edu/hr/careers/employment-opportunities.html?id=2148&e=staff&t=staff-listings) (2016-17 academic year) to support student advising and offset advising responsibility of teaching faculty (Strengths: 8, 16, 33, 39, 55, 29, 65, 41; Challenges: 66, 47, 14)
6. Focus on maintaining and expanding [undergraduate research opportunities](http://www.salisbury.edu/gsr/research/Student/index.html) (e.g., [SUSRC](http://www.salisbury.edu/susrc/), grants/competitions in the various Schools, travel grants, [USARA](http://www.salisbury.edu/gsr/research/Student/usara.html), [NSF REUs at SU](http://www.salisbury.edu/gsr/docs/publications/magazine/2015/SU_ResearchMag2015_pp21-22.pdf), [Research Day and Innovation Showcase](http://www.salisbury.edu/researchday/); Strengths: 8, 16, 39, 29, 69, 41; Challenges: 66, 14, 83)
7. Expansion of student [Living Learning Communities](http://www.salisbury.edu/housing/LLC/) (LLCs; Strengths: 39, 29, 45, 41, 46; Challenge: 23)
8. Growth in [graduate programs](http://www.salisbury.edu/gsr/gradstudies/programs/programs.html) (Strengths: 8, 16, 39, 68, 29, 69, 41, 32)
9. Approval of tailgating at sporting events effective Fall 2016 (Strengths: 29, 45; Challenge: 66)
10. Creation of and filling additional staff positions in Student Activities unit (Strengths: 29, 46; Challenge: 66)
11. Improvements of new student, faculty, and staff orientation programs (Strengths: 8, 16, 33, 39, 55, 29, 45, 65, 41, 46, 32; Challenges: 34, 66, 47, 14, 76, 11)
12. Increased computer labs in Conway Hall (formerly Teacher Education and Technology Center, TETC), Perdue Hall, and in the new Academic Commons (opens fall 2016; Strengths: 16, 39, 29, 69, 72, 41, 26)
13. New printing station in the Guerrieri University Center (GUC; Strength: 26)
14. Expansion of [student organization](http://www.salisbury.edu/saol/orgs/) promotional events (Strengths: 29, 45, 46)
15. U.S. Department of Education funding of the SU [TRiO ACHIEVE](http://www.salisbury.edu/trio/) Student Support Services project (Strengths: 39, 41, 32; Challenge: 66)
16. American Association of State Colleges and Universities [(AASCU) selects SU for “Re-Imagining the First Year of College” Project](http://www.salisbury.edu/news/article.html?id=6661) (Strengths: 39, 41, 32; Challenge: 66)
17. Development, additional funding, and growth of the [Center for Student Achievement](http://www.salisbury.edu/achievement/) (CSA; Strengths: 39, 41, 32; Challenge: 66)
18. Adoption and integration of [College Scheduler](http://www.collegescheduler.com) (Civitas Learning) with GullNet to enhance course scheduling and registration (Challenges: 34, 76)
19. Planned improvements for usability, navigation, and mobile access of GullNet (Challenge: 76)
20. Created the “[2016 One Book](http://www.salisbury.edu/stepbystep/docs/OneBook_2016.pdf)” and associated [website](http://www.salisbury.edu/stepbystep/) to help new students navigate SU (Strengths: 39, 29, 45, 41, 46, 32; Challenges: 34, 36, 17, 76, 11, 12)
21. Creation of [campus security officer positions](http://www.salisbury.edu/hr/careers/employment-opportunities.html?id=2140&e=staff&t=staff-listings) (Strength: 7; Challenge: 36)
22. Expansion of campus emergency blue lights (Strength: 7; Challenge: 36)
23. Development of a new safety app expected for the 2016-17 academic year (Strength: 7; Challenge: 36)
24. Neighborhood Relations and External Affairs, which are subcommittees of the [Town-Gown Council](http://www.salisbury.edu/partnersforprogress/mission.html) initiative to build connections between SU, including its students, and the community (Strength: 45; Challenge: 83)
25. Increased funds for student financial aid – $300K one time and $400K ongoing (Challenges: 66, 17, 12)
26. Construction of [Sea Gull Square](https://www.salisbury.edu/housing/Building_Pages/Sea%20Gull%20Square%20App%20Rates.html) to increase and improve on-campus student housing options (Strength: 29; Challenge: 23)
27. Completion of the comprehensive Housing and Residence Life renovation plan to improve on-campus student housing (Strength: 29; Challenge: 23)
28. Increased parking (e.g., Wayne Street parking garage and newly expanded parking lot between Sea Gull Square and Maggs Hall off US Route 13); (Strengths: 29, 72; Challenge: 21)
29. [Many improvements to the dining options on campus](http://www.salisbury.edu/news/article.html?ID=6919), including: increased dining options; increased options/safeguards for those with [restricted diets](http://www.salisbury.edu/news/article.html?id=6912); and improving student satisfaction of campus dining (Strengths: 29, 45; Challenges: 78, 38)
30. The University’s commitment to protecting the freedom of expression is reaffirmed in several institutional documents (e.g., [Student Code of Conduct, p.2](http://www.salisbury.edu/studentconduct/docs/codeofconduct/15-16/Code_Conduct_Handbook_2015_16.pdf); [Chalking Policy](https://www.salisbury.edu/studentconduct/docs/Salisbury%20University%20Chalking%20Policy.pdf)) and policies; [OIE](http://www.salisbury.edu/equity/) will also offer [three webinars](https://webapps.salisbury.edu/calendars/Program/calendar.asp?month=&year=&ID=39) relevant to freedom of expression in a campus environment in fall 2016 (Strengths: 29, 45, 67)

## Next Steps

* Continue outreach to segments of the campus community regarding SSI results. Meetings with the following groups, where SSI discussion was included, have already occurred: President’s Executive Council, Student Affairs Director’s group, Student Government Association (SGA) Executive Staff, and the SGA Forum.
* Discuss plans for follow-up assessment of student satisfaction (timeline, assessment instrument, budget, logistics for administration, etc.).
* Include these SSI data in the next SU Middle States Accreditation ([Ruffalo Noel Levitz 2011](https://www.ruffalonl.com/upload/Student_Retention/SSI/Accreditation/MSCHE%20SSI%204-Year%20Form%20A.pdf)).
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# APPENDICES

## Appendix 1. SSI Instrument Information

**See a paper and pencil version of the SSI** [**here**](https://www.ruffalonl.com/upload/Student_Retention/SSI/Samples/SSIFormA4yrPaperandPencilSample.pdf) **and SU-specified campus items in** [**Appendix Table 2**](#_Appendix_Table_2.)**.**

### **Appendix Table 1.** Alignment of SSI items and Scales

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scales** | **Items (number of items in scale)** |
| Academic Advising Effectiveness | 6, 14\*, 19, 33, 55 (n = 5) |
| Campus Climate | 1\*, 2\*, 3\*, 7\*, 10\*, 29\*, 37, 41\*, 45\*, 51, 57\*, 59\*, 60\*, 62, 66, 67\*, 71\* (n = 17) |
| Campus Life | 9, 23, 24, 30\*, 31, 38, 40, 42, 46, 52, 56, 63, 64, 67\*, 73 (n = 15) |
| Campus Support Services | 13\*, 18, 26, 32, 44, 49, 54 (n = 7) |
| Concern for the Individual | 3\*, 14\*, 22\*, 25\*, 30\*, 59\* (n = 6) |
| Instructional Effectiveness | 3\*, 8, 16, 25\*, 39, 41\*, 47, 53, 58, 61, 65, 68, 69, 70 (n = 14) |
| Recruitment and Financial Aid Effectiveness | 4, 5, 12, 17, 43, 48 (n = 6) |
| Registration Effectiveness | 11, 20, 27\*, 34, 50 (n = 5) |
| Responsiveness to Diverse Populations | 84 – 89 (n = 6) |
| Safety and Security | 7\*, 21, 28, 36 (n = 4) |
| Service Excellence | 2\*, 13\*, 15, 22\*, 27\*, 57\*, 60\*, 71\* (n = 8) |
| Student Centeredness | 1\*, 2\*, 10\*, 29\*, 45\*, 59\* (n = 6) |

Note: Items 35 and 72 are not included on any scale. An asterisk (\*) denotes items that are in more than one scale.

### **Appendix Table 2.** Ten SU-specified campus items on the SSI in spring 2016

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Item Number** | **Item** |
| 74 | Intercollegiate athletic events add value to campus life. |
| 75 | I feel welcome in the local Salisbury community. |
| 76 | Students find Gullnet helpful in keeping them organized. |
| 77 | There are adequate recreational facilities available in GUC. |
| 78 | Campus food services adequately meet the needs of students. |
| 79 | Individual differences are valued on this campus. |
| 80 | College personnel and students show tolerance and respect for different viewpoints. |
| 81 | The diversity of students on this campus is satisfactory. |
| 82 | The diversity of faculty on this campus is satisfactory. |
| 83 | The town is safe and welcoming to students. |

Note: The 2016 SU-specified campus items did not align and therefore cannot be compared to the 2008 SU-specified campus items.

**Reliability & Validity (Ruffalo Noel Levitz 2016c):** *The Student Satisfaction Inventory is a very reliable instrument. Both the two‐year and four‐year versions of the SSI show exceptionally high internal reliability. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha is .97 for the set of importance scores and is .98 for the set of satisfaction scores. It also demonstrates good score reliability over time; the three‐week, test‐retest reliability coefficient is .85 for importance scores and .84 for satisfaction scores.*

*There is also evidence to support the validity of the Student Satisfaction Inventory. Convergent validity was assessed by correlating satisfaction scores from the SSI with satisfaction scores from the College Student Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSSQ), another statistically reliable satisfaction instrument. The Pearson correlation between these two instruments (r = .71; p<.00001) is high enough to indicate that the SSI’s satisfaction scores measure the same satisfaction construct as the CSSQ’s scores, and yet the correlation is low enough to indicate that there are distinct differences between the two instruments.*

## Appendix 2. Table format of [Prioritizing Action: Past, Present, and Future Initiatives and Efforts](#_Prioritizing_Action:_Past,)

### **Appendix Table 3.** SU initiatives and efforts aligned with SSI priorities

| **Initiative/ Effort** | **Strength Items** | **Challenge Items** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **8** | **16** | **33** | **39** | **7** | **55** | **68** | **29** | **69** | **45** | **72** | **65** | **41** | **26** | **67** | **46** | **32** | **34** | **36** | **66** | **47** | **78** | **14** | **23** | **83** | **17** | **76** | **38** | **11** | **12** | **21** |
| 1 | \* | \* | \* | \* |  | \* |  | \* | \* |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | \* | \* |  | \* |  | \* |  | \* |  |  |  | \* | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | \* | \* |  | \* |  | \* |  | \* | \* |  |  | \* | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | \* | \* | \* | \* |  | \* |  | \* |  |  |  | \* | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* | \* |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | \* | \* |  | \* |  |  |  | \* | \* |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  | \* |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |  | \* |  |  | \* |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | \* | \* |  | \* |  |  | \* | \* | \* |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | \* | \* | \* | \* |  | \* |  | \* |  | \* |  | \* | \* |  |  | \* | \* | \* |  | \* | \* |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |  | \* |  |  |
| 12 |  | \* |  | \* |  |  |  | \* | \* |  | \* |  | \* | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16 |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17 |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |
| 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |
| 20 |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |  | \* |  |  | \* |  |  | \* | \* | \* | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* | \* |  | \* | \* |  |
| 21 |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22 |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23 |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |  |
| 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |
| 29 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |
| 30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \* |  |  | \* |  |  |  | \* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: An asterisk (\*) denotes alignment with SSI item (see [Table 1](#_Table_1._Strengths) and [Table 2](#_Table_2._Challenges)).