



Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory

Summary of Results

Spring 2014

Siena College

Office of Institutional Research

Contents

Executive Summary3

Introduction.....3

Siena College vs. Comparison Institutions.....4

Breakdown of Results by Demographic, Background, and Academic Variables.....6

Comparison with Previous Results7

Profile of Survey Respondents8

Discussion9

Conclusions..... 10

Appendix: NLSSI Scales, Items, and Rating Scores..... 11

List of Tables

Table 1: Mean ratings for composite scales.....4

Table 2: Ratings on overall satisfaction questions4

Table 3: Survey items on which Siena scored highest relative to other institutions4

Table 4: Items on which Siena scored lowest relative to other institutions4

Table 5: Correlations between items with low ratings and overall satisfaction questions5

Table 6: Items with highest ratings5

Table 7: Items with lowest ratings5

Table 8: Ratings on measures of overall satisfaction by demographic and background variables.....6

Table 9: Ratings on measures of overall satisfaction by academic variables.....7

Table 10: Change in ratings from 2011 to 2014.....7

Table 11: Change in ratings - overall satisfaction.....7

Table 12: Items showing the largest decline in rating scores from 2011 to 20148

Table 13: Items showing an increase in rating scores from 2011 to 2014.....8

Table 14: Response rates - demographics.....8

Table 15: Response rates - academics8

Executive Summary

The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (NLSSI) was administered at Siena College in spring 2014. Results indicate that Siena students generally had lower ratings than comparison institutions, particularly in some areas of campus life and in overall satisfaction. Certain subgroups of students (e.g. males, Hispanics, students from Long Island, students in the School of Business) had especially low satisfaction ratings. Comparison of results with the 2011 NLSSI showed that satisfaction ratings declined across this time period for Siena College, but not for comparison institutions. The response rate for the 2014 survey was low, but respondents were more likely than non-respondents to be academically successful and involved in student activities.

Introduction

Background: The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (NLSSI) is a nationally normed survey which elicits satisfaction ratings in the areas of instructional effectiveness, student activities, performance of college offices, and other areas of institutional performance. The NLSSI is administered online to all full-time undergraduate students. This report provides a summary of results from the spring 2014 administration of the NLSSI.

Methodology: In early March 2014, all full-time Siena undergraduates received an email invitation to participate in the NLSSI survey. Subsequently, two reminders were sent to students who had not yet responded. Out of 2881 students who were invited to participate in the NLSSI 2014 survey, 327 students responded for an 11.3% response rate. The low response rate suggests that caution should be exercised in interpreting survey results, which may not be representative of the Siena community at large.

The NLSSI survey asks respondents to rate items on a seven-point scale with reference both to importance (1="not at all important" and 7="very important") and to satisfaction (1="not at all satisfied" and 7="very satisfied"). For purposes of the present analysis, only the satisfaction ratings are analyzed. There is a tendency for students to rate all items as being very important, leading to a lack of discriminatory power among the importance ratings.

In the survey output, results are provided for each individual item on the survey, and also for several "scales" or composite scores for a related group of questions. (See results section for a list of these scales.)

Survey output also provides a comparison of results for Siena College to two groups of institutions who participated in the NLSSI survey over the course of the previous year: four-year private colleges and universities (N=344), and the following group of peer institutions selected by Siena:

- Champlain College, VT
- Cornell College, IA
- Gordon College, MA
- Messiah College, PA
- Transylvania University, KY
- Wentworth Institute of Technology, MA
- Linfield College, OR

All of these peer institutions except Linfield College are included in our primary list of "near peers"; Linfield College is classified as an "almost peer".

Siena College vs. Comparison Institutions

The table to the right shows the mean scores for each of the survey scales, which as noted above are composite scores for a group of related questions. (Some questions appear on more than one scale.) Shaded boxes indicate statistically significant differences. These results indicate that Siena scored significantly lower than both comparison groups (i.e. all 4-year private institutions, and the select group of peer institutions) on the “Student Centeredness” and “Campus Life” scales. Additionally, Siena scored significantly lower than the select peer group on the following scales: “Academic Advising,” “Concern for the Individual,” “Service Excellence,” and “Campus Climate.”

Table 1: Mean ratings for composite scales

Composite Scale:	Siena	All 4-year	Peers
Student Centeredness	5.21	5.43	5.52
Campus Life	4.75	5.01	5.12
Instructional Effectiveness	5.53	5.51	5.62
Recruitment and Financial Aid	5.22	5.13	5.23
Campus Support Services	5.55	5.48	5.57
Academic Advising	5.48	5.52	5.63
Registration Effectiveness	5.09	5.19	5.14
Safety and Security	5.12	5.04	5.10
Concern for the Individual	5.25	5.34	5.52
Service Excellence	5.17	5.24	5.34
Responsiveness to Diverse Populations	5.24	5.29	5.22
Campus Climate	5.24	5.35	5.48

However, Siena did score slightly (but non-significantly) higher than the 4-year private comparison group on several scales, including: “Instructional Effectiveness,” “Recruitment and Financial Aid,” “Campus Support Services,” and “Safety and Security.” Similarly, Siena scored slightly higher than select peer institutions on two scales: “Safety and Security” and “Responsiveness to Diverse Populations.”

Table 2: Ratings on overall satisfaction questions

Overall Satisfaction:	Siena	All 4-year	Peers
So far, how has your college experience met your expectations?	4.31	4.62	4.73
Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience here thus far.	4.96	5.27	5.51
All in all, if you had to do it over, would you enroll here again?	4.73	5.21	5.51

Table 2 shows mean scores for three individual questions relating to overall satisfaction. Siena scored significantly lower on all three questions than either comparison group. Siena scores were especially low compared to the group of peer institutions, and most particularly for the question “Would you enroll here again?”

Table 3: Survey items on which Siena scored highest relative to other institutions

Item:	Siena	All 4-year	Peers
This institution has a good reputation within the community.	6.16	5.60	6.02
Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.	5.67	5.24	5.47
Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.	5.54	5.13	5.13
Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.	6.10	5.70	5.90
Financial aid awards are announced to students in time to be helpful in college planning.	5.40	5.01	5.29
A variety of intramural activities are offered.	5.32	4.98	5.27
Institution's commitment to students with disabilities?	5.77	5.44	5.45
Adjunct faculty are competent as classroom instructors.	5.71	5.41	5.38

Table 3 lists the individual items on which Siena performed most strongly in relation to the two comparison groups. These items cover a number of areas, including college reputation, safety and security, faculty availability, financial aid processing, co-curricular activities, and services to students with disabilities.

Table 4: Items on which Siena scored lowest relative to other institutions

Item:	Siena	All 4-yr	Peers
Student disciplinary procedures are fair.	4.18	5.28	5.17
Living conditions in the residence halls are comfortable.	4.01	4.74	4.95
The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	3.27	3.99	3.84
Residence hall regulations are reasonable.	4.23	4.91	5.06
There is an adequate selection of food available in the cafeteria.	3.74	4.26	4.10
The staff in the health services area are competent.	4.57	5.06	5.22
Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.	4.75	5.19	5.22
It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.	5.05	5.44	5.60
The student center is a comfortable place for students to spend their leisure time.	4.76	5.13	5.28
Student activities fees are put to good use.	4.42	4.76	4.93

Table 4 lists the individual items on which Siena performed most poorly in relation to the two comparison groups. These items also cover a number of areas, although items relating to campus life are most prominent. Siena scored particularly poorly on the items relating to living conditions in the residence halls and student disciplinary procedures, as well as parking and food selection.

It is important to consider the extent to which dissatisfaction on particular items is contributing to students' overall dissatisfaction, as measured by the three summary questions on overall satisfaction listed in Table 2. For example, a student may be very dissatisfied with the cafeteria food, and yet may be highly satisfied with their overall Siena experience – the food quality is simply a minor annoyance. To determine the extent to which the individual items listed in Table 4 were contributing to students' overall dissatisfaction, a simple correlational analysis was run in which these ten individual items were correlated with the three measures of overall satisfaction. Results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Correlations between items with low ratings and overall satisfaction questions

Item:	Met expectations	Overall satisfaction	Enroll again
It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.	0.73	0.78	0.78
Student activities fees are put to good use.	0.52	0.53	0.54
Living conditions in the residence halls are comfortable.	0.50	0.48	0.53
Student disciplinary procedures are fair.	0.47	0.49	0.52
Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.	0.48	0.49	0.46
Residence hall regulations are reasonable.	0.42	0.46	0.49
The student center is a comfortable place for students to spend their leisure time.	0.36	0.41	0.39
There is an adequate selection of food available in the cafeteria.	0.36	0.35	0.36
The staff in the health services area are competent.	0.41	0.34	0.34
The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	0.34	0.36	0.36

The highest correlation was found for the item “It is an enjoyable experience...” This is not surprising, however, as this item is actually very similar to the global measures of satisfaction and is therefore of limited interest. The next five items in the table (mostly dealing with campus life issues, as well as one faculty issue) have moderate correlations (roughly 0.5) with the three global measures. This suggests that students' satisfaction on these individual items is contributing to their overall satisfaction, but not in a determinative manner; there are clearly other factors contributing to overall satisfaction. The last four items in the table (parking, food services, health services, student center) have relatively low correlations (0.3-0.4), indicating that these items are not contributing heavily to students' overall satisfaction. This is reassuring, as these items should be of relatively peripheral importance. Basically, results of the correlational analysis suggest that many factors are contributing to students' overall level of satisfaction; furthermore, the particular combination of important factors probably varies considerably from one student to another.

Table 6: Items with highest ratings

Item	Score
This institution has a good reputation within the community.	6.16
Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.	6.10
Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their field.	6.06
The campus is safe and secure for all students.	5.95
Library resources and services are adequate.	5.85
Institution's commitment to students with disabilities?	5.77
I am able to experience intellectual growth here.	5.75
My academic advisor is knowledgeable about requirements in my major.	5.73
Adjunct faculty are competent as classroom instructors.	5.71
Library staff are helpful and approachable.	5.70

pertain to the library.

Table 7 shows the ten items with the lowest average scores for Siena respondents. The top seven items concern various issues relating to campus life. The remaining three items cover miscellaneous aspects of the Siena experience.

In addition to comparing results for Siena to other colleges and universities, it is also helpful to examine the items on which Siena scored the highest and lowest, without reference to other institutions. Table 6 shows the ten items with the highest average scores for Siena respondents. The highest rated item concerns institutional reputation, while the next two highest items concern faculty availability and competence; two additional items also relate to instructional effectiveness. Two items in the “top-ten” list

Table 7: Items with lowest ratings

Item	Score
The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	3.27
There is an adequate selection of food available in the cafeteria.	3.74
Living conditions in the residence halls are comfortable.	4.01
Student disciplinary procedures are fair.	4.18
Residence hall regulations are reasonable.	4.23
Student activities fees are put to good use.	4.42
Channels for expressing student complaints are readily available.	4.45
Billing policies are reasonable.	4.49
The staff in the health services area are competent.	4.57
The intercollegiate athletic programs contribute to a strong sense of school spirit.	4.59

Breakdown of Results by Demographic, Background, and Academic Variables

This section provides a breakdown of results for Siena respondents by several demographic, background, and academic variables. The tables in this section show average scores on each of the three summary questions for each selected subgroup. As noted above, the summary questions are as follows:

- So far, how has your college experience met your expectations?
- Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience here thus far.
- All in all, if you had to do it over, would you enroll here again?

Table 8 shows satisfaction ratings by demographic and background variables. Key findings from these data include the following:

- Female students at Siena have markedly higher satisfaction ratings than male students.
- Of the major ethnic groups, Hispanic students have the lowest satisfaction ratings, while multiracial students have the highest ratings.
- International students have very high satisfaction ratings.
- There is little difference in satisfaction ratings between in-state and out-of-state students. However, within the state of New York, students from Long Island have notably lower satisfaction ratings.
- Students who matriculated as transfers have higher satisfaction ratings than students who matriculated as new students.
- Commuter students have higher satisfaction ratings than students living in the residence halls. This finding may reflect in part the fact that many of the items with the lowest satisfaction rating are in areas of student life that would not be relevant to commuter students.
- Students who affirmed Siena as their first college choice had higher satisfaction ratings than students who stated that Siena was their second or lower choice.
- Students who are involved in one or more activities have higher satisfaction ratings than students who are not involved in any activities.

Table 8: Ratings on measures of overall satisfaction by demographic and background variables

	Count	Met expectations	Overall satisfaction	Enroll again
Gender				
Female	200	4.43	5.22	5.03
Male	127	4.12	4.57	4.25
Ethnicity				
American Indian	2	4.00	4.00	4.00
Asian	10	4.30	4.70	4.40
Black	12	4.33	4.75	4.83
Hispanic	17	3.88	4.59	4.59
International	10	5.20	5.70	6.10
Multiracial	8	4.63	5.63	5.38
Unknown	1	4.00	5.00	6.00
White	267	4.30	4.97	4.67
Residency				
Foreign	10	5.20	5.70	6.10
In-state	245	4.30	4.97	4.68
Out-of-state	72	4.22	4.87	4.67
Region				
Capital district	79	4.23	4.97	4.84
Long Island	43	3.98	4.53	4.09
Other NY	128	4.44	5.10	4.80
Out-of-state	77	4.36	4.99	4.83
Matriculation				
New	294	4.29	4.97	4.68
Transfer	33	4.48	5.00	5.12
Housing				
Commuter	60	4.40	5.08	5.05
ResHall	267	4.29	4.94	4.65
Siena choice				
First	154	4.45	5.28	5.10
Second	107	4.29	4.83	4.64
Third or lower	60	4.00	4.45	3.98
Activities				
None	152	4.14	4.67	4.51
One or more	175	4.46	5.23	4.91
Total	327	4.31	4.97	4.72

Table 9: Ratings on measures of overall satisfaction by academic variables

Table 9 shows satisfaction ratings broken down by several academic variables. Some key findings from these data include the following:

- Generally speaking, freshmen and sophomores had higher satisfaction ratings than junior and seniors.
- Students in the School of Business had the lowest satisfaction ratings, while students in the School of Science had the highest ratings.
- Students with a cumulative GPA of less than 2.5 had lower satisfaction ratings, while students with a GPA of 3.5 or higher had higher than average ratings.
- Students with an aid grade of 60 or higher had relatively high satisfaction ratings, but there was no clear pattern of satisfaction ratings for students with an aid grade lower than 60.

	Count	Met expectations	Overall satisfaction	Enroll again
Class				
Freshman	59	4.50	4.86	4.78
Sophomore	89	4.30	5.09	4.91
Junior	69	4.17	4.99	4.61
Senior	110	4.31	4.92	4.62
School				
Arts	136	4.27	5.01	4.70
Business	104	4.15	4.70	4.47
Science	87	4.57	5.22	5.06
CGPA				
2.00 or less	5	3.40	4.00	3.80
2.00-2.49	26	3.65	3.96	3.81
2.50-2.99	63	4.25	4.95	4.52
3.00-3.49	105	4.17	4.79	4.57
3.50+	121	4.64	5.40	5.21
n/a	7	4.29	4.86	4.57
Aid grade				
10-25	22	4.18	4.50	4.18
30-40	75	4.17	4.91	4.84
45-55	57	4.09	4.69	4.30
60+	173	4.46	5.15	4.88
Total	327	4.31	4.97	4.72

Comparison with Previous Results

Table 10 provides a comparison of scale scores on the NLSSI for the 2014 survey and the 2011 survey (the last time we administered the NLSSI at Siena). It should be noted that in 2011 we administered the NLSSI in the fall term, whereas in 2014 the survey was administered in the spring term. Also, the 2011 survey was incentivized and had higher response rates. Because of these differences, caution should be exercised in comparing results across the two administrations.

These data show a decline in scores for Siena College on all scales. The decline was greatest for the scales “Campus Life”, “Student Centeredness,” and “Campus Climate.”

Table 10: Change in ratings from 2011 to 2014

	Siena		All 4-year	
	2011	2014	2011	2014
Campus Life	5.11	4.75	4.92	5.01
Student Centeredness	5.51	5.21	5.37	5.43
Campus Climate	5.53	5.24	5.29	5.35
Concern for the Individual	5.45	5.25	5.26	5.34
Service Excellence	5.36	5.17	5.16	5.24
Safety and Security	5.31	5.12	4.93	5.04
Recruitment and Financial Aid	5.36	5.22	5.06	5.13
Campus Support Services	5.63	5.55	5.40	5.48
Registration Effectiveness	5.17	5.09	5.13	5.19
Instructional Effectiveness	5.59	5.53	5.44	5.51
Responsiveness to Diverse Populations	5.28	5.24	5.21	5.29
Academic Advising	5.50	5.48	5.45	5.52

For all four-year private institutions, however, the opposite trend is seen: scores increased from 2011 to 2014 for all scales, although the magnitude of the change was slight. (It should be noted that the institutions included in the comparison groups are different for 2011 and 2014.)

Table 11: Change in ratings - overall satisfaction

	Siena		All 4-year	
	2011	2014	2011	2014
So far, how has your college experience met your expectations?	4.51	4.31	4.60	4.62
Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience here thus far.	5.26	4.96	5.26	5.27
All in all, if you had to do it over, would you enroll here again?	5.15	4.73	5.22	5.21

Table 11 provides a similar comparison for the three questions pertaining to overall satisfaction. For Siena College, there was a significant decline from 2011 to 2014 on all three questions; the decline was most marked for the question “Would you enroll here again?” For all four-year private institutions, in contrast, there was virtually no change.

Table 12 shows the individual NLSI items which had the greatest decline in mean score from 2011 to 2014 for Siena respondents. These items cover several areas of institutional performance, although items pertaining to campus life are somewhat more prominent. None of the items, however, are in the area of instructional effectiveness.

Table 12: Items showing the largest decline in rating scores from 2011 to 2014

Item	Change
Student disciplinary procedures are fair.	-0.69
The student center is a comfortable place for students to spend their leisure time.	-0.57
The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	-0.57
Residence hall regulations are reasonable.	-0.53
I feel a sense of pride about my campus.	-0.53
Campus item: My social experiences meet my expectations.	-0.53
The intercollegiate athletic programs contribute to a strong sense of school spirit.	-0.52
Living conditions in the residence halls are comfortable.	-0.46
Most students feel a sense of belonging here.	-0.42
Admissions counselors accurately portray the campus in their recruiting practices.	-0.42
I seldom get the "run-around" when seeking information on this campus.	-0.42
It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.	-0.41

Table 13 displays a few items which showed a modest increase in mean score from 2011 to 2014 for Siena respondents. Three of these five items relate to faculty competence and availability.

Table 13: Items showing an increase in rating scores from 2011 to 2014

Item	Change
Institution's commitment to students with disabilities.	0.21
Tutoring services are readily available.	0.19
Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.	0.16
Adjunct faculty are competent as classroom instructors.	0.11
Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their field.	0.10

Profile of Survey Respondents

This section examines the profile of students who took the NLSI survey. Table 14 shows the response rates by several demographic and background variables. The response rate was somewhat higher for females than for males. Out-of-state and especially international students had higher response rates than in-state students. Students who matriculated as new students had a somewhat higher

Table 14: Response rates - demographics

	Count	Response Rate
Gender		
Female	1545	12.9%
Male	1336	9.5%
Ethnicity		
Diverse	546	10.8%
White	2318	11.5%
Unknown	17	5.9%
Residency		
Foreign	49	20.4%
In-state	2272	10.8%
Out-of-state	558	12.9%
Matriculation		
New	2531	11.6%
Transfer	350	9.4%
Housing		
Commuter	565	10.6%
ResHall	2316	11.5%
Activities		
No	1684	9.0%
Yes	1197	14.6%
Total	2881	11.4%

Table 15: Response rates - academics

	Count	Response Rate
Class		
Freshman	544	10.8%
Sophomore	672	13.2%
Junior	770	9.0%
Senior	895	12.3%
School		
Arts	1096	12.4%
Business	1072	9.7%
Science	713	12.2%
CGPA		
2.00 or less	118	4.2%
2.00-2.49	299	8.7%
2.50-2.99	697	9.0%
3.00-3.49	963	10.9%
3.50+	737	16.4%
n/a	67	10.4%
Aid grade		
10-25	346	6.4%
30-40	815	9.2%
45-55	498	11.4%
60+	1219	14.2%
Total	2881	11.4%

response rate than transfer students. Students who participated in at least one student activity in the fall term (as coded in Banner) had a higher response rate than students who did not participate in any student activities. There was very little difference in response rate by ethnicity or housing status.

Table 15 shows response rates by several academic variables. Sophomores had the highest response rate by class, whereas juniors had the lowest response rate. Students in the School of Business had a lower response rate than students in the School of Arts or School of Science. Response rates increase with cumulative GPA: students with a GPA of 3.5 or higher had a much higher response rate than students with a low GPA. Similarly, response rates increase with aid grade: students with an aid grade of 60 or higher had a much higher response rate than students with low aid grade.

Discussion

The present report examines results from the 2014 administration of the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (NLSSI). The NLSSI is a nationally normed survey which asks respondents to rate their satisfaction with many aspects of campus life, instructional effectiveness, and college operations. The NLSSI survey was administered in spring 2014 to all full-time undergraduates; 327 students took the survey for an 11.3% response rate.

Overall, Siena College did not fare particularly well on this administration of the NLSSI. Compared to other institutions, Siena students tended to give somewhat lower ratings, especially on questions pertaining to overall level of satisfaction. Compared to the previous administration of the NLSSI (fall 2011), Siena students generally gave lower satisfaction ratings on the 2014 survey.

The low response rate for the 2014 survey indicates that results should be viewed with caution, as the respondents may not be representative of the Siena student body as a whole. On the other hand, it is important not to simply dismiss the results because of the low response rate; in fact several lines of evidence suggest that the results have at least a moderately high level of validity. First, there were well over 300 respondents, which is a large enough number to provide for statistical reliability in aggregate analyses. Second, there were no marked differences in demographic profile between respondents and non-respondents. Third, respondents were on average academically more successful and more involved in student activities than non-respondents; consequently, it is not likely that respondents represent a marginal or disengaged group of students. Fourth, the response patterns within the survey indicate that respondents are applying a certain level of discrimination in answering the survey questions, and not simply marking all items low because they are dissatisfied with a particular area. (84% of respondents used a response range of at least 5 points on a 7-point scale.) And finally, while survey respondents may or may not be representative of the entire student body, they do constitute a very important group of students who are willing to express their views about Siena, positive or negative.

Siena students tended to give the lowest satisfaction ratings to areas relating to campus life, in particular the condition of the residence halls, student disciplinary procedures, the student center, and student activity fees. Other items with low satisfaction ratings included parking availability, food services, and health services, but these are more peripheral items which are somewhat less essential to students' overall satisfaction and sense of well-being at the college.

On the positive side, Siena students tended to give somewhat higher satisfaction ratings in the areas of instructional effectiveness, campus support services, and safety and security. Faculty competence and availability received good ratings, as did library services. However, the item "Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course" received a relatively low satisfaction rating, and may suggest an area for possible evaluation.

The item on which Siena scored the highest was "This institution has a good reputation within the community." This is both interesting and significant on a number of points. First, the high rating for this item confirms the positive reputation of the college, which is reassuring. Second, the fact that students scored Siena high on this item indicates that students were not simply "slamming" Siena in a global sense in their survey responses; they were clearly making discriminations among items. Third, the high ratings on this item may in part help to explain student dissatisfaction in other areas. More specifically, it is possible that students are seeing a significant disconnect between the "image" of Siena (i.e. its reputation) and the "reality" (i.e. their own experiences), and that this disconnect is contributing to low scores on some of the items pertaining to global satisfaction (e.g. "All in all, if you had to do it over, would you enroll here again?").

There was considerable variability in satisfaction ratings across certain groups of students. International students gave very high satisfaction ratings, although they constitute only a very small percentage of respondents. Of some concern were the relatively low satisfaction ratings given by Hispanic students, particularly in light of their relatively poor retention and graduation rates. This is an emerging population which constitutes an increasingly important part of Siena's enrollment management stream, so it is critically important to ensure both their success and satisfaction. Of similar concern were the relatively low satisfaction ratings given by male students, who constitute over half our student body. The discrepancy between satisfaction ratings for male and female students was striking. This discrepancy may in part reflect different survey response attitudes, but it may also reflect a genuine dissatisfaction among male students. Another notable finding was the low satisfaction expressed by students from Long Island. These students also constitute an important part of our enrollment management stream, so again it is important to ensure that they have a positive experience when they come to Siena College.

Somewhat surprisingly, perhaps, transfer students had higher satisfaction ratings than new students, and commuters had higher ratings than students living on campus. This may reflect in part the fact that many of the lower-rated items were in the area of campus life, which might be more applicable to traditional on-campus students. Not surprisingly, students who indicated that Siena was their first choice among colleges had higher satisfaction ratings than students who indicated that Siena was a lower choice. The magnitude of the difference, however, was rather noteworthy: students who identified Siena as their third or lower choice had much lower ratings. Another predictable finding was higher satisfaction ratings among students who were involved in one or more campus activities.

In terms of academic profile, we again see some significant differences among various subgroups of students. Not surprisingly, students with higher levels of academic success are more satisfied than students who are struggling academically. There was a very marked difference in ratings scores between students with a cumulative GPA of 3.5 or higher, and students with a GPA of 2.5 or lower. Finally, it is worth noting that students in the School of Science had significantly higher ratings than students in the School of Business. It may be that science students were academically stronger to begin with, or possibly that the type of academic experiences in which science students participate lead to higher satisfaction ratings.

The NLSSI was administered at Siena College in Fall 2011. Comparison of the previous results with the 2014 results indicates that satisfaction scores for Siena declined on all scales across this time period. The decline was greatest for the scales "Campus Life", "Student Centeredness," and "Campus Climate." There was also a significant decline in ratings for the three summary questions pertaining to overall satisfaction. For the comparison group of 4-year private institutions, however, there was actually an increase in rating scores on all scales, so the decline at Siena is not, for example, simply mirroring national trends. As a caveat, it should be noted that the switch from a fall to spring administration of the survey at Siena College could affect the pattern of results; also, the group of comparison institutions changed from 2011 to 2014. Nevertheless, the decline in satisfaction ratings for Siena College is cause for concern.

Conclusions

Siena College did not perform particularly well on the 2014 NLSSI, especially in some areas relating to campus life. Certain subgroups of students (e.g. males, Hispanics, students from Long Island) showed notably lower satisfaction ratings. However, the results of any survey of this type should be interpreted with caution, especially when the response rate is quite low (as is the case here). Results point to some areas of campus performance that might be evaluated, especially if data from other sources points in the same direction, but significant policy decisions should not be made simply on the basis of survey results.

Appendix: NLSSI Scales, Items, and Rating Scores

Scale / Item	Siena College	4-year Private	Select Peers
Student Centeredness	5.21	5.43	5.52
01. Most students feel a sense of belonging here.	5.01	5.28	5.31
02. The campus staff are caring and helpful.	5.46	5.56	5.67
10. Administrators are approachable to students.	5.11	5.32	5.30
29. It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.	5.05	5.44	5.60
45. Students are made to feel welcome on this campus.	5.41	5.60	5.71
59. This institution shows concern for students as individuals.	5.20	5.36	5.54
Campus Life	4.75	5.01	5.12
09. A variety of intramural activities are offered.	5.32	4.98	5.27
23. Living conditions in the residence halls are comfortable.	4.01	4.74	4.95
24. The intercollegiate athletic programs contribute to a strong sense of school spirit.	4.59	4.47	4.55
30. Residence hall staff are concerned about me as an individual.	4.86	5.02	5.29
31. Males and females have equal opportunities to participate in intercollegiate athletics.	5.55	5.39	5.65
38. There is an adequate selection of food available in the cafeteria.	3.74	4.26	4.10
40. Residence hall regulations are reasonable.	4.23	4.91	5.06
42. There are a sufficient number of weekend activities for students.	4.75	4.61	4.89
46. I can easily get involved in campus organizations.	5.58	5.38	5.68
52. The student center is a comfortable place for students to spend their leisure time.	4.76	5.13	5.28
56. The student handbook provides helpful information about campus life.	5.27	5.24	5.22
63. Student disciplinary procedures are fair.	4.18	5.28	5.17
64. New student orientation services help students adjust to college.	5.11	5.30	5.37
67. Freedom of expression is protected on campus.	5.00	5.44	5.44
73. Student activities fees are put to good use.	4.42	4.76	4.93
Instructional Effectiveness	5.53	5.51	5.62
03. Faculty care about me as an individual.	5.50	5.49	5.70
08. The content of the courses within my major is valuable.	5.59	5.67	5.78
16. The instruction in my major field is excellent.	5.67	5.65	5.75
25. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.	5.08	5.34	5.47
39. I am able to experience intellectual growth here.	5.75	5.68	5.89
41. There is a commitment to academic excellence on this campus.	5.62	5.54	5.76
47. Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course.	5.30	5.21	5.18
53. Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.	4.75	5.19	5.22
58. The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent.	5.54	5.55	5.63
61. Adjunct faculty are competent as classroom instructors.	5.71	5.41	5.38
65. Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.	6.10	5.70	5.90
68. Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their field.	6.06	5.86	6.00
69. There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.	5.20	5.45	5.47
70. Graduate teaching assistants are competent as classroom instructors.	5.56	5.28	5.34
Recruitment and Financial Aid	5.22	5.13	5.23
04. Admissions staff are knowledgeable.	5.52	5.38	5.47
05. Financial aid counselors are helpful.	5.21	5.12	5.07
12. Financial aid awards are announced to students in time to be helpful in college planning.	5.40	5.01	5.29
17. Adequate financial aid is available for most students.	4.86	4.93	4.95
43. Admissions counselors respond to prospective students' unique needs and requests.	5.40	5.29	5.43
48. Admissions counselors accurately portray the campus in their recruiting practices.	4.91	5.10	5.15
Campus Support Services	5.55	5.48	5.57
13. Library staff are helpful and approachable.	5.70	5.69	5.79
18. Library resources and services are adequate.	5.85	5.57	5.66
26. Computer labs are adequate and accessible.	5.66	5.41	5.47
32. Tutoring services are readily available.	5.69	5.57	5.60
44. Academic support services adequately meet the needs of students.	5.49	5.35	5.51
49. There are adequate services to help me decide upon a career.	5.36	5.27	5.46
54. Bookstore staff are helpful.	5.13	5.51	5.52

Scale / Item	Siena College	4-year Private	Select Peers
Academic Advising	5.48	5.52	5.63
06. My academic advisor is approachable.	5.63	5.72	5.81
14. My academic advisor is concerned about my success as an individual.	5.41	5.49	5.63
19. My academic advisor helps me set goals to work toward.	4.99	5.09	5.11
33. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about requirements in my major.	5.73	5.71	5.88
55. Major requirements are clear and reasonable.	5.63	5.60	5.72
Registration Effectiveness	5.09	5.19	5.14
11. Billing policies are reasonable.	4.49	4.71	4.71
20. The business office is open during hours which are convenient for most students.	5.36	5.28	5.17
27. The personnel involved in registration are helpful.	5.44	5.44	5.34
34. I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts.	4.68	5.15	4.98
50. Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.	5.58	5.40	5.53
Safety and Security	5.12	5.04	5.10
07. The campus is safe and secure for all students.	5.95	5.73	5.84
21. The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	3.27	3.99	3.84
28. Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.	5.54	5.13	5.13
36. Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.	5.67	5.24	5.47
Concern for the Individual	5.25	5.34	5.52
03. Faculty care about me as an individual.	5.50	5.49	5.70
14. My academic advisor is concerned about my success as an individual.	5.41	5.49	5.63
22. Counseling staff care about students as individuals.	5.44	5.24	5.43
25. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.	5.08	5.34	5.47
30. Residence hall staff are concerned about me as an individual.	4.86	5.02	5.29
59. This institution shows concern for students as individuals.	5.20	5.36	5.54
Service Excellence	5.17	5.24	5.34
02. The campus staff are caring and helpful.	5.46	5.56	5.67
13. Library staff are helpful and approachable.	5.70	5.69	5.79
15. The staff in the health services area are competent.	4.57	5.06	5.22
22. Counseling staff care about students as individuals.	5.44	5.24	5.43
27. The personnel involved in registration are helpful.	5.44	5.44	5.34
57. I seldom get the "run-around" when seeking information on this campus.	4.62	4.85	4.95
60. I generally know what's happening on campus.	5.46	5.18	5.49
71. Channels for expressing student complaints are readily available.	4.45	4.86	4.77
Responsiveness to Diverse Populations	5.24	5.29	5.22
84. Institution's commitment to part-time students?	5.15	5.24	5.12
85. Institution's commitment to evening students?	5.23	5.26	5.06
86. Institution's commitment to older, returning learners?	5.46	5.39	5.31
87. Institution's commitment to under-represented populations?	5.06	5.30	5.26
88. Institution's commitment to commuters?	4.87	5.11	5.07
89. Institution's commitment to students with disabilities?	5.77	5.44	5.45
Campus Climate	5.24	5.35	5.48
1. Most students feel a sense of belonging here.	5.01	5.28	5.31
02. The campus staff are caring and helpful.	5.46	5.56	5.67
03. Faculty care about me as an individual.	5.50	5.49	5.70
07. The campus is safe and secure for all students.	5.95	5.73	5.84
10. Administrators are approachable to students.	5.11	5.32	5.30
29. It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.	5.05	5.44	5.60
37. I feel a sense of pride about my campus.	5.05	5.22	5.34
41. There is a commitment to academic excellence on this campus.	5.62	5.54	5.76
45. Students are made to feel welcome on this campus.	5.41	5.60	5.71
51. This institution has a good reputation within the community.	6.16	5.60	6.02
57. I seldom get the "run-around" when seeking information on this campus.	4.62	4.85	4.95
59. This institution shows concern for students as individuals.	5.20	5.36	5.54
60. I generally know what's happening on campus.	5.46	5.18	5.49
62. There is a strong commitment to racial harmony on this campus.	5.26	5.57	5.48
66. Tuition paid is a worthwhile investment.	4.62	4.90	5.03
67. Freedom of expression is protected on campus.	5.00	5.44	5.44
71. Channels for expressing student complaints are readily available.	4.45	4.86	4.77