

Student Satisfaction Feedback Survey

Pre-registration & Registration Fall 2002-2003

As part of the process improvement initiative, the Office of Institutional Research & Assessment (OIRA) administered in October 2002 a survey that evaluates student satisfaction with the Fall 2002 registration procedure.

Objectives

- ✓ To measure students' level of satisfaction with the registration process as a whole, and with its different processes.
- ✓ To evaluate the effect of changes initiated this year on student satisfaction with the process.
- ✓ To identify existing problems, if any, and recommend changes.

Method

Instrument

The Student Satisfaction Feedback Survey was prepared using, in general, the same guidelines adopted for previous similar surveys (1999- 2001, Appendix A). However, modifications were introduced to reflect changes in the process. Moreover, the Survey was made slightly shorter, to make it easier for students to answer. A five-point rating scale was used to assess students satisfaction / dissatisfaction with various phases of the registration process. The Survey included the following components:

- ✎ Biographical data. A number of questions requesting information on student background, gender, status, major, etc.
- ✎ The nine registration steps: Placement Tests, Pre-registration, New Student Orientation, Academic Advising, On-line Registration, Statement of Fees, ID Card & Renewal of Stickers, and AUB net Account and Drop & Add. Items measuring level of student satisfaction with specific aspects of each phase of the process were included. Particular attention was given to on-line registration.
- ✎ Global items measuring students' overall satisfaction with the process, in general, and with specific elements like ambiance, courtesy, instructions given, etc.
- ✎ Other related issues like Drop & Add, Financial Aid, etc.
- ✎ Comments section at the end of every step and at the end of the Survey to solicit feedback and suggestions.

Sample

The sample consisted of 641 undergraduate students from all faculties representing 12% of the population. Cluster sampling was used. The sample came from 29 undergraduate classrooms representative of fall undergraduate population. Table 1 provides a list of course sections covered by the Survey. A breakdown of the sample by faculty, gender, nationality, class, status, and country where high school was attended is presented in Tables 2 – 7. In addition, these tables provide the population figures for the University on each of these dimensions.

Table 1
Schedule for Student Registration Satisfaction Survey, Fall 2002 – 2003

	Monday 21/10	OIRA Staff	Tuesday 22/10	OIRA Staff	Wednesday 23/10	OIRA Staff
8:00	EN 203(1) EN 203(3)	Salim Barudi Monia Hamzeh	EN 204(3) CS 205(1)	Salim Barudi Mona Haddad	CS 205(6)	Hala Alamuddin
9:00	EN 204(5) EN 208(1)	Mona Haddad Hala Alamuddin				
10:00	EN 208(2)	Monia Hamzeh	EN 203(18) EN 208(5) CS 203(2) NFSC 287 (1)	Monia Hamzeh Mona Haddad Salim Barudi Hala Alamuddin		
11:00	EN 203(21) EN 208(6)	Hala Alamuddin Mona Haddad	EN 204(15) CS 203(5) CS 204 (6)	Monia Hamzeh Hala Alamuddin Mona Haddad	CS 204(8) CS 204(10)	Mona Haddad Monia Hamzeh
12:00	EN 206(1) EN 206(2) CS 204(3)	Salim Barudi Monia Hamzeh Hala Alamuddin	CS 205(5)	Salim Barudi		
1:00	EN 206(5) EN 206(6) HMPD204(1)	Mona Haddad Salim Barudi Hala Alamuddin			CS 205(7)	Hala Alamuddin
2:00					CS 204(12)	Salim Barudi
4:30	CS 203(15)	Monia Hamzeh				

Table 2
Sample and Population Distribution by Faculty

	Sample		Population	
	N	%	N	%
FAFS	61	10	405	8
FAS	220	34	2413	44
FEA	122	19	1189	22
SBUS	179	28	978	18
FHS	19	3	247	5
S NU	2	0.3	141	2.5
Others*	38	6	17	.5
Total	641	100	5392	100

*Did not provide faculty

Table 3
Sample and Population Distribution by Gender

	Sample		Population	
	N	%	N	%
Female	297	46	2513	47
Male	315	49	2878	53
Did not specify	29	5		

Table 4
Sample and Population Distribution by Nationality

	Sample		Population	
	N	%	N	%
Lebanon	496	77	2893	82
Arab Countries	71	11	596	9
Other	36	6	265	9
Did not answer	38	6		
Total	641	100		

Table 5
Sample Distribution by Class

Class	Sample		Population	
	N	%	N	%
Freshman	45	7	395	7
Sophomore	174	27	1826	34
Junior	165	26	1369	25
Senior	199	31	1164	22
Special/Prospective	4	.5	161	3
Others	54	8	477	9
Total	641	100	5391	100

Table 6
Sample Distribution by Status

	N	%
New	125	20
Currently registered	438	68
Old returning	21	3
Special	9	1.5
Others	7	1

Table7
Country Where High School Was Attended

	N	% with survey sample
Lebanon	478	75
Arab countries	102	16
Other	24	4

Administration

OIRA staff members administered the Survey just after the Drop & Add. Faculty members concerned were contacted by e-mail a week before the Survey, and arrangements were made so that OIRA staff can administer the Survey. Coding, data entry and analysis followed.

Data Analysis

Frequencies and descriptives were used to report the results for the whole sample and by faculty and class. The Kruskal Wallis Test was used to test for significant differences in responses to different items between faculties and between classes.

Results

Student Satisfaction

Tables 8 and 9 report student mean rating for each registration process, and the percentage of satisfied (those circling satisfied / highly satisfied, i.e. 4 & 5) and dissatisfied (those somewhat dissatisfied / dissatisfied, i.e. 1 & 2) for the whole sample.

Table 8
Registration Process Steps / Descriptives for 2001 and 2002

	2001				2002			
Process	N	Mean	%Dis	%Sat	N	Mean	%Dis.	%Sat.
1. Placement Test – English	104	3.1	31	36	168	2.9	30	28
2. Placement Test –Arabic	84	3.2	24	38	174	3.0	30	30
3. Organization of the Pre-Registration	147	3.2	28	36	236	2.9	33	31
4. Staff Professionalism					237	3.2	27	41
5. Adequacy of information in Admission package					227	3.2	24	45
8. Orientation activities	154	2.9	31	35	135	3.0	28	34
11. Availability of Advisor					583	2.9	38	31
12- Helpfulness of advisor	446	3.0	36	38	566	2.7	44	32
14- Clarity of deadlines					570	3.5	21	53
15- SIS access on-campus					255	3.8	17	67
16- SIS access Off -campus					297	3.1	32	35
17- SIS access both on and off campus					304	3.5	15	53
18- Fairness of registration slot allocation by ID					587	2.5	53	26
19- Capacity of scheduled courses	577	3.0	34	32	590	2.2	64	16
24- Staff professionalism					432	3.1	27	37
25- Staff helpfulness					440	3.2	25	42
26- Efficiency of on-line registration	550	2.9	39	33	517	3.4	20	50
27- Receiving Statement	613	3.9	13	71	620	3.8	13	65
28- Payment process	600	3.6	16	61	611	3.6	15	58
29- Validation process	383	3.7	12	59	593	3.0	34	38
30- Activating AUBnet Account process	595	3.6	15	56	583	3.6	17	56
31- Adequacy of instruction	578	3.6	14	56	574	3.4	20	51
33- Drop and Add process	337	3.2	30	44	505	2.8	36	28

Table 9
Overall Evaluation of Registration Process / Descriptives for 2001 and 2002

	2001				2002			
Process	N	Mean	% Dis.	%Sat.	N	Mean	% Dis.	% Sat.
Overall Process	616	3.1	24	47	607	3.1	23	37
Ambiance	589	3.0	28	39	588	3.0	29	30
Time Taken	617	2.6	47	26	611	3.0	31	36
Efficiency	611	3.0	32	34	616	3.2	24	42
Bureaucracy	576	2.9	30	28	597	2.9	29	28
Courtesy	563	3.1	23	29	589	3.1	24	32
Instructions	583	3.4	20	50	599	3.4	18	45
AUB Guide Service	552	3.5	20	51	583	3.3	18	42
Maps & Handouts	555	3.4	20	46	583	3.3	18	42
Campus Security Staff	555	3.5	15	54	578	3.5	15	52
New Student Orientation	295	3.0	30	35	349	3.2	24	38
Financial Aid	298	2.2	64	21	371	2.6	49	27
Dormitories	113	2.9	37	31	245	2.9	28	29
Deferred Payments	173	3.0	33	37	269	3.0	33	34

The means for the steps ranged between 2.2-3.8 (vs. 2.9- 3.9 for 2001), while for the overall ratings between 2.6-3.5 (vs 2.2 – 3.5 for 2001). The steps that were most satisfying to students (> 50%) were SIS Access on-campus, Net Account Activation/Instructions, Receiving/Payment of Fees, and On-line registration efficiency . The least satisfying ones were Capacity of Scheduled Courses, Id Slot Registration Procedure, Academic Advising and Drop & Add . With respect to the overall ratings, the highest satisfactory evaluation went to Campus Security Staff (x = 3.5, 52%), followed by Instructions (x=3.4, 45%), then AUB Guide Service and Maps & Handouts (x = 3.3, 42%). The least satisfying was Financial Aid (X = 2.6, 27%), followed by Bureaucracy (x = 2.9, 28%) and Dormitory Registration (x = 2.9, 29%).

Comparing Fall 2002 registration with that of 2001, we find significant improvement in Efficiency of On-line Registration. Slight improvement was noted in Orientation, while a number of steps maintained same level of satisfaction. However, satisfaction decreased in a number of steps: Course Capacity (from 3 to 2.2), ID Validation (from 3.7 to 3), Drop & Add (from 3.2 to 2.8), Pre-registration (from 3.2 to 2.9), Advising (from 3 to 2.7-2.9), and Placement Testing (from 3.1-3.2 to 2.9-3.0). The later drop in satisfaction in placement test evaluation was due to wrong scheduling of placement tests with orientation sessions and other activities. On a number of items, no comparative data is available as they represent newly added items to the survey. With respect to the overall ratings, mean 2002 ratings were considerably higher than 2001 on Financial Aid (2.6 vs 2.2), Time Taken (3 vs 2.6), Efficiency (3.2 vs 3) and New Student Orientation (3.2 vs

3). They dropped on AUB Guide Service and Maps & Handouts (3.5 to 3.3) and maintained same level of satisfaction for all other steps.

Other Findings

New Student Orientation

-Attended 45% yes 54% no
 Percentage is lower than that of 2001 (58%).
 - Orientation attended 36% FROP 64% TOP

Advising

Advisor assigned in time for registration 74%yes 25% no
 Met with advisor 50% yes

On-line Registration

-Source of information on on-line registration
 77% web 18% campus circulars 4% mail-in circulars
 -SIS access 60% on-campus 46% off-campus 47% both
 -Internet Provider: Terranet 22% Cyberia 27% Cable 16%
 Inconet 14% Others 37%
 -Difficulty in on-line registration 63% yes 36% no
 In 2001, 69% had difficulty.
 -Needed staff support 47%yes 51% no
 -Reason for difficulty:
 63% No. of courses offered. 36% Course sections
 1% Capacity/course/ section 0 % Other
 -Type of course difficulty found in:
 32% University required courses 34 % upper level courses in major
 14% lower level courses in major 16% Electives
 4 % other (outlined in comment section)

Drop & Add

Found needed courses in Drop & Add 47% yes 49% no

Student Satisfaction by Faculty

Tables 10-11 report mean satisfaction ratings by faculty on the registration steps and on the overall ratings. The Kruskal Wallis Test was used to identify areas where significant differences existed between faculties. The following is a summary of major findings:

Pre-registration

-Organization of the process means ranged between 2.9-3.1 for all faculties, while staff professionalism means between 3-3.3.

-Information in admission package was given higher values in all faculties (2.9-3.4)

New Student Orientation

-Attendance percentages: 25%(FHS), 32%Business, 52%A&S, 25%FAFS, 58%FEA.

-Range of means evaluating NSO, 2.8 (SB) - 3.3 (FAFS).

Advising

-Availability of advisor means ranged between 2.5 (SB) – 3.2 (FAFS, FHS).

-Helpfulness of advisor means ranged between 2.4 (FHS, SB) – 3.0(FAFS).

On-line Registration

-SIS on-campus access was satisfactory in all faculties (3.8-3.9), with exception of FHS (2.9).

- Fairness of ID slot allocation was not favorably rated in all faculties (2.3-2.6), with exception of FAFS (3.0).

-Course listings capacity. Satisfaction was lowest with FHS (2.1), highest with FAFS (2.4) while all other faculties had a mean rating of 2.2.

-Staff professionalism widely ranged among faculties between FHS (2.6) and FAFS (3.9).

Similarly, staff helpfulness between FHS (2.9) to FAFS (3.9).

-Overall efficiency of on-line registration was similarly rated among faculties (3.3-3.5%).

-Difficulty in on-line registration percentages: 56%FAS 67%FEA 63%FAFS
56% FHS 68% Business

-Reasons for difficulty:

Capacity/course/section	70% A&S	73% Business	67% FHS
	83% FEA	76% FAFS	

Other reasons:	4% A&S	7% Business	0 % FHS
	8% FEA	14% FAFS	

-Type of course, in which difficulty was found:

University required courses	38%FAS	28%FEA	55 %FHS
	38%FAFS	28%Business	
Univ. upper level courses in major	32% A&S	50% Business	27% FHS
	25% FEA	21% FAFS	
Univ. lower level courses in major	12% A&S	13%Business	9 % FHS
	19% FEA	14% FAFS	
Electives	14% A&S	9% Business	9% FHS
	25% FEA	24% FAFS	

Table 10
Registration Process Steps by Faculty

	FAFS		FAS		SB		FEA		FHS		SN	
Process	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
1. Placement Test – English	14	2.6	68	2.9	42	2.9	24	3.1	8	2.3	1	5
2. Placement Test –Arabic	11	3.0	70	3.0	42	3.0	24	3.1	12	2.5	1	2
3. Organization of the Pre -Registration	14	3.1	99	2.9	54	3.0	39	2.9	12	2.9	1	4
4. Staff Professionalism	14	3.2	101	3.3	53	3.0	39	3.0	13	3.2	1	3
5. Adequacy of information in Admission package	14	3.1	97	3.4	52	3.1	39	3.2	11	2.9	-	-
8. Orientation activities	3	3.3	60	3.2	33	2.8	27	3.0	4	2.3	-	-
11. Availability of Advisor	59	3.2	202	3.1	156	2.5	113	3.0	17	3.2	2	2
12- Helpfulness of advisor	59	3.0	198	2.9	148	2.6	108	2.8	17	2.4	2	2.5
14- Clarity of deadlines	54	3.7	187	3.5	161	3.6	115	3.5	16	3.1	2	2.5
15- SIS access on-campus	32	3.9	128	3.8	104	3.9	74	3.8	14	2.9	1	2
16- SIS access Off -campus	18	3.0	102	3.2	94	3.2	50	2.8	11	3.0	1	3
17- SIS access both on and off campus	26	3.7	101	3.6	85	3.5	59	3.4	10	3.6	2	3
18- Fairness of registration slot allocation by ID	56	3.0	196	2.6	168	2.3	115	2.3	18	2.3	2	1
19- Capacity of scheduled courses	57	2.4	200	2.2	169	2.2	115	2.2	16	2.1	2	1
24- Staff professionalism	44	3.9	14	2.9	119	3.2	81	3.1	14	2.6	2	3.5
25- Staff helpfulness	45	3.9	149	3.1	120	3.1	82	3.1	15	2.9	2	3
26-Efficiency of on-line registration	47	3.5	170	3.3	148	3.4	104	3.5	16	3.5	2	3.5
27- Receiving Statement	61	3.9	214	3.8	177	3.9	122	3.7	18	3.7	2	2.5
28- Payment process	59	3.6	213	3.6	173	3.8	121	3.6	18	3.5	2	4
29- Validation process	60	2.8	203	3.0	172	3.2	117	3.0	17	2.9	2	4.5
30- Activating AUBnet Account process	59	3.6	202	3.5	169	3.6	112	3.6	17	3.1	2	4.5
31- Adequacy of instruction	57	3.6	197	3.5	170	3.5	112	3.4	16	2.8	2	4.5
33- Drop and Add process	51	3.0	175	2.9	154	2.8	89	2.8	15	2.7	2	2

Table 11
Overall Evaluation of Registration Process by Faculty

	FAFS		FAS		SB		FEA		FHS		SN	
Process	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
34. Overall Process	61	3.4	213	3.1	179	2.9	119	3.2	16	3.0	2	1.5
35. Ambiance	60	3.1	205	3.0	176	2.9	114	3.0	15	2.9	2	1.5
36. Time Taken	61	3.3	216	3.0	178	3.0	120	3.1	17	3.0	2	1
37. Efficiency	61	3.4	217	3.2	179	3.1	121	3.2	19	3.5	2	2.5
38. Bureaucracy	60	3.0	209	3.0	174	2.9	117	2.8	19	3.5	2	2
39. Courtesy	58	3.1	207	3.1	174	3.0	115	3.0	19	3.3	1	1
40. Instructions	60	3.4	209	3.3	175	3.4	118	3.3	18	3.9	2	3
41. AUB Guide Service	59	3.3	208	3.3	170	3.4	111	3.2	19	3.4	1	1
42. Maps & Handouts	59	3.4	208	3.4	171	3.4	112	3.2	17	3.5	1	1
43. Campus Security Staff	59	3.5	207	3.6	168	3.5	111	3.3	18	3.5	2	3
44. New Student Orientation	36	3.3	135	3.3	89	3.2	61	2.8	17	3.6	1	1
45. Financial Aid	41	2.6	130	2.7	96	2.5	77	2.4	16	3.2	1	5
46. Dormitory registration process	25	2.8	99	3.0	66	3.0	35	2.9	14	3.4	-	-
47. Deferred Payments	31	2.7	97	3.0	76	3.1	45	2.9	14	3.0	-	-

Statement of Fees

- Receiving Statement Range of means 3.7 (FEA, FHS) –3.9 (SB, FAFS)
- Payment of Fees Range of means 3.5 (FHS) –3.8 (SB)

ID Card

- Validation Range of means 2.8 (FAFS) –3.2 (SB).

Net Account

- Activation Range of means 3.1 (FHS) - 3.6 (all other faculties).
- Instructions Range of means 2.8 (FHS) - 3.6 (FAFS)

Drop & Add

- Process Range of means 2.7 (FHS) - 3.0 (FAFS)

Overall ratings

Overall process means ranged between 2.9 (SB) – 3.4 (FAFS).

Ratings on overall items were quite close between faculties with Business obtaining lower ratings on a number of items (overall process, ambiance, efficiency), FEA on bureaucracy, financial aid and new student orientation, and FAFS on dormitory registration and drop & add items.

Student Satisfaction by Class

Tables 12-13 report student satisfaction by Class. Kruskal Wallis Test of significance helped to identify areas of significant differences. The results revealed higher mean ratings and satisfaction for freshmen on most of the steps and processes, with exception of placement testing. With respect to differences between the other groups, seniors, in general, were more satisfied with the steps. The same trend prevailed with respect to differences in the overall processes.

Summary of Students' Comments on Registration Steps

Following is a summary of main comments made by students on various steps of the registration process. A more detailed listing of the comments is provided in the appendix. The comments are very much in agreement with ratings and percentage satisfaction levels previously discussed. They highlight main areas for improvement, mainly, placement testing, academic advising, ID slot allocation, and financial aid. They also identify the reasons for the dissatisfaction with each of these processes.

Most of the students' responses to the *placement test* reflect the unfairness of the tests in placing them in different levels. They think that one essay is not enough to judge them. Moreover, there was a time conflict between on-line registration and placement test. Most of the students complained about the *pre-registration* dates that were not compared with the actual ones. That is, all the dates given in the package were wrong. Regarding *on-line registration*, some of the students considered it as an excellent system but more capacity is needed. However, most of the students found the slot allocation by ID is unfair along with finding the staff at AUB unhelpful. In addition, what the students considered also as unfair is the slot allocation by ID when it comes to *Drop and Add* and they claimed that it should occur

at a later time with an increase in the capacity of the courses offered. Concerning the *new student orientation*, various opinions were realized. Few students considered it as helpful and others considered it as useless.

Concerning *academic advising*, most of the students stated that the advisors should be more knowledgeable about the courses, all the major requirements and should be available when needed.

Concerning *statement of fees*, most of the students found the tuition fees very expensive and they were against its continuous increase. Moreover, they wanted more accurate and more informative announcements regarding deadlines.

Most of the students find the *renewing process of the ID* as useless, unorganized and crowded. They suggested the increase of the number of persons in charge of this process.

Concerning the AUB net account, students stated that more information should be provided on this service.

Concerning the *students' suggestions & comments*, the financial aid process was not fair. Needy students don't take financial aid while those who don't deserve were given. Documents needed for financial aid are too expensive (300,000 L.L). Also, registration by ID was not fair. Seniors should be given more priority. Moreover, some of the students commented that campus security staff is very rude and that the whole process with dorm registration was very difficult and the responsible people were not helpful.

Table 12**Registration Process Steps by Class**

	Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior	
Process	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
1. Placement Test – English	18	2.4	70	3.1	39	2.9	21	2.7
2. Placement Test –Arabic	12	2.8	88	3.0	37	3.1	17	2.9
3. Organization of the Pre-Registration	37	3.1	106	3.0	38	2.7	27	2.9
4. Staff Professionalism	38	3.3	110	3.3	37	3.0	26	2.9
5. Adequacy of information in Admission package	37	3.2	104	3.4	36	2.9	25	3.0
8. Orientation activities	33	3.4	60	3.1	19	3.0	10	2.5
11. Availability of Advisor	45	3.2	159	3.0	154	2.8	174	2.8
12- Helpfulness of advisor	42	3.3	149	3.0	150	2.6	175	2.6
14- Clarity of deadlines	42	3.3	151	3.3	151	3.7	171	3.7
15- SIS access on -campus	32	3.7	96	3.7	91	3.9	122	3.9
16- SIS access Off -campus	19	3.3	71	3.1	83	3.2	90	3.1
17- SIS access both on and off campus	28	3.5	77	3.7	78	3.6	88	3.5
18- Fairness of registration slot allocation by ID	41	2.9	154	2.5	155	2.3	190	2.6
19- Capacity of scheduled courses	42	2.3	159	2.3	155	2.2	186	2.2
24- Staff professionalism	30	3.1	123	3.2	109	3.0	131	3.2
25- Staff helpfulness	29	3.5	124	3.3	114	3.0	136	3.2
26-Efficiency of on-line registration	34	3.7	140	3.5	134	3.3	162	3.4
27- Receiving Statement	43	3.7	173	3.7	162	3.8	198	3.9
28- Payment process	42	3.7	168	3.6	161	3.5	196	3.7
29- Validation process	43	3.2	162	3.2	157	3.1	191	2.9
30- Activating AUBnet Account process	44	3.8	167	3.7	153	3.5	181	3.5
31- Adequacy of instruction	43	3.6	166	3.3	150	3.5	179	3.6
33- Drop and Add process	34	3.0	131	2.9	140	2.9	164	2.9

Table 13
Overall Evaluation of Registration Process by Class

	Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior	
Process	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
34. Overall Process	43	3.2	169	3.1	162	3.0	197	3.2
35. Ambiance	36	3.5	166	3.0	158	2.8	195	2.9
36. Time Taken	44	3.2	171	3.0	161	2.9	199	3.1
37. Efficiency	44	3.4	173	3.3	163	3.0	199	3.2
38. Bureaucracy	42	3.2	167	3.1	159	2.8	194	2.8
39. Courtesy	44	3.4	161	3.2	156	3.0	192	2.9
40. Instructions	45	3.5	168	3.4	158	3.3	193	3.4
41. AUB Guide Service	45	3.6	164	3.3	155	3.3	184	3.2
42. Maps & Handouts	45	3.6	164	3.4	157	3.3	184	3.2
43. Campus Security Staff	44	3.8	166	3.6	152	3.4	184	3.4
44. New Student Orientation	44	3.8	119	3.1	82	3.0	80	3.1
45. Financial Aid	26	3.3	102	2.5	104	2.5	116	2.5
46. Dormitory registration process	29	3.2	61	3.2	68	2.8	67	2.8
47. Deferred Payments	20	3.1	70	3.1	78	2.8	78	3.0