Currently Enrolled Student Survey
The Last Ten Years (2005 to 2014)
Graphical Information

The Currently Enrolled Student Survey is a tool for evaluating service quality. Each year every student is given an opportunity to rate their experiences with various offices and online resources. Departments such as Student Financial Aid and Parking Services are measured by six questions regarding helpfulness, ease of contact, responsiveness, the quality of information received, online information resources, and “going the extra mile” to provide service. Ratings are on a scale from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent), and a 4.0 mean rating or higher meets Texas Tech’s standard for providing quality service. (Students may also add lengthy comments about each service.)

Emphasized in this report are the services that have been evaluated in the same manner for an extended period of time (usually ten years). For each area there are two charts. First, a summary trend chart shows the average result of those who answered all six standard questions in a given year. A second chart shows the yearly ratings by individual question. (Question order is determined by the ratings in 2014, and the color coding is consistent for all similar charts.)
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Ten-Year Summary of Ratings in General

Overall, ratings over the last 10 years have been consistently high – averaging just below the 4.0 standard of performance.

The ratings by freshmen are highest. The scores by those in the Graduate School are almost as high.

Undergraduate ratings decline by classification. (Sophomore are less pleased than freshmen; juniors are less satisfied than sophomores; etc., etc.) Each service encounter is an opportunity for the student to be pleased or disappointed, and the declining scores over time is likely a reflection of accumulated service failures. (We know from the comments that especially bad service is long-remembered.) That the amount of decline is so slight is almost another indicator of success – if poor service were more common, a steeper decline would be expected.

Students in Agriculture, Business, Education, and Human Sciences tend to be more pleased than those in Architecture, Engineering, and the Arts.
Common Question Sets Over Ten Years

Overall, ratings of seven major service departments using the same six service questions over the ten year period are good. A closer look will show improvement for the first four years, a decline in 2009 (when dissatisfaction over the aid disbursement debit card significantly lowered the ratings for financial aid, business services and the registrar), a rebound in 2011, and a period of declining scores.

Helpfulness is frequently the highest-rated characteristic. Ease of contact, Information quality, and Responsiveness are also often well-regarded. Going-the extra-mile always trails all the other characteristics, but the difference is narrowing.
The following seven departments utilized a common suite of 6 questions.

THE UNITS:  
Academic Advising (p. 4)  
Student Financial Aid (p. 5)  
Student Business Services (p. 6)  
The Registrar (p. 7)  
Parking Services (p. 8)  
The Library (p. 9)  
The Learning Center (p. 10)  

THE COMMON QUESTIONS:  
Making contact with this office was easy.  
Online resources were useful to me.  
Response time was reasonable.  
The quality of the information I received was good.  
The staff were helpful in addressing my requests.  
The staff were willing to ‘go the extra mile’ to address my needs.
Academic Advising

Ratings for advising have been consistently above the 4.0 standard. After a long period of slowly rising scores, the ratings have steadily declined in recent years.

Helpfulness is the best quality each year and it is rated well above the 4.0 standard. Going-the-extra-mile is not as well regarded, but it meets the standard or is close to it every year. (Online resources have not always been applicable in some program areas, so the lower but improving ratings for that is to be expected.)
Student Financial Aid

Student Financial Aid is consistently below the standard, being often rated around 3.5.

Helpfulness is consistently the best quality. Low ratings for Ease-of-contact relate to students complaining of difficulties getting answers over the phone and wait times for in-person service.

For 2014 the lesser-regarded qualities scored much better than in the past.
Student Business Services

Student Business Services ratings tend to track closely with the Financial Aid ratings but at a somewhat higher level.

As is often the case, helpfulness is the best quality and *Going-the-extra-mile* needs improvement. *Information quality* is higher than is typical for most units. The items that were lower-rated in the past are showing improvement.
The Registrar

The ratings for the registrar are often at or slightly below the 4.0 standard.

In comparison with the other units evaluated above, the Registrar is notable in that the Responsiveness ratings are better than usual. Helpfulness is frequently at or above the 4.0 standard. Going-the-extra-mile is usually lowest, but it is not as far off the other ratings in recent years.
Parking Services

Parking Services had enjoyed a long series of rising scores early in the period, but that trend has reversed and those gains appear to have been lost.

In comparison with the units evaluated above, *Helpfulness* is notable for being one of the lower-rated service characteristics. Operational characteristics are best. *Going-the-extra-mile* trails all other characteristics to a notable extent.
The Library

The Library is one of the highest rated units – being above the 4.0 standard every year.

In recent years there is little difference between the best-quality characteristic and the lowest-rated one. All of the qualities have been above the 4.0 standard in recent years. Recent scores are not as high as they once were.
The Learning Center

The academic support center has gone by different names over the years. Fewer students use and rate this service, hence the larger margin of error. The 4.0 standard for quality falls within that margin of error.

Increasingly, the difference between the highest-rated and lowest-rated characteristic is narrowing.
PART TWO: Other Areas of Service

The following pair of “How would you rate ...” questions have appeared for only 9 years. The ratings are at or above the 4.0 standard, but the scores seem to be slipping downward.

![Graph of Regarding Your Education](image1)

![Graph of General TTU Experience](image2)
The Raiderlink section has been a part of the survey for only six years. Search is often the subject of complaints.

One can now say The MyTech Tab is reasonably useful in all regards.
Online Registration has been improving since the low in 2008.

The Texas Tech website is most appreciated for its appearance, although that characteristic is not as well regarded as it once was. Usability is getting better. Search has improved.
Individual questions about Information Technology have come and gone over time. The top chart shows all of the ratings. The lower chart is limited to those items appearing on the survey most consistently.

With the exception of “wireless,” all of the services are now meeting the 4.0 standard.
At the computer lab the student used most often (usually academic department labs, the library, and various ATLC’s), availability has increased to meet or exceed the 4.0 standard. Hardware and software has been at or above the standard for the entire period.

The distance learning section was expanded with new questions in 2009. The ratings are rather close together over the last five years, but they are in a slight decline.
The following two sections have been added to the survey for only the last two years. Both are doing consistently well, being at or near the 4.0 standard.
PART THREE: Histograms for the Departments and Areas

The first two charts in red are single-question items. All other charts represent total counts for multiple questions.

[Charts and graphs depicting data for various departments and areas, such as Regarding Your Education, General TTU Experience, Advising, Financial Aid, Student Business Services, Parking Services, Registrar, Library, and Learning Center.]
**Note: Normalized Test Samples for Validating Apparent Trends**

Given that there are known differences in the characteristic responses of different populations by classification and by college, and knowing that the response rates by college and classification vary in each survey year, we checked to see if trend data was accurately reflecting changes of opinion or simply reflecting random changes in survey population.

For each summary chart below there are also four additional columns at the right where a year’s data was normalized ("YearN") as a test for possible distortions. The test years were evenly spaced over the ten-year period.

A standard population distribution was defined for 45 combinations of classification and college so that each normalized year has, for example, the same proportion of agriculture freshmen, business juniors, and graduate students in the arts, etc. The appropriate number of survey responses were randomly selected each year to make a comparable survey database for each of the four test years. (Some oversampling was occasionally required.)

There is little, if any, difference between the normalized year results and the original survey year results. Thus, the trends in the original data likely reflect real changes of opinion and are not some artifact arising from differences in survey participation patterns from one year to another.