Tracking student satisfaction and priorities is an important task for many college campuses, especially in challenging economic times when resources can’t afford to be wasted. When campuses understand the priorities of their students, resources can be used efficiently and effectively. Student satisfaction is a key component of student life and learning, a gauge of whether an institution is providing an experience that students deem worthwhile. By simultaneously assessing satisfaction and priorities, campuses can determine which areas demand their attention and make decisions that will have the greatest impact on the student experience.

With the current economic situation in the United States, community colleges are reporting high enrollments as more students choose these institutions to start their education locally, or as nontraditional students return to school to further their training and career opportunities. What do these students expect from their enrollment and how are community colleges serving these students? As community colleges work with increasing enrollments, what are the priorities for improvement and what initiatives need to be targeted to particular subpopulations of community college students?
The 2010 Study

The 2010 National Student Satisfaction and Priorities Report presents the responses to the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory™ (SSI) from more than 745,000 students at 1,095 four-year and two-year public and private institutions across North America. The results include student responses over a three-year academic time period from fall 2007 through spring of 2010. These results include the combination of data from institutions using both the original Form A version of the SSI as well as the shorter Form B version.

This year's study presents the overall satisfaction levels across institutional types, with a special emphasis on the experience of the more than 229,000 students at 248 two-year community, junior, and technical colleges. These community college findings stand out:

- Students across all subpopulations cited cost as the number one factor for enrolling at a community college.
- Sixty-nine percent of students at community colleges are likely to say the institution they are attending is their first choice, a key indicator of student satisfaction.
- Students 25 years of age and older are more satisfied than traditional-age students with their experience at community colleges nationally.
- Students cite the quality of instruction and campus climate as strengths for community colleges. They listed academic advising and the availability of classes as challenges.
- Student satisfaction at community colleges has been rising for four out of the past five years.

This Noel-Levitz Satisfaction and Priorities Report focuses on the community college data set from 2010. Future reports will focus on four-year private institutions in 2011, career and private schools in 2012, and four-year public institutions in 2013.

The survey instrument

The Student Satisfaction Inventory measures the satisfaction and priorities of students on a wide range of issues related to college life and learning. The results allow campuses to identify areas of strength, where students report high satisfaction in areas of high priority, and campus challenges, where students indicate low satisfaction in areas of high priority. The instrument has high reliability and validity, and more than 2,400 campuses have administered it since its release in 1994. It has versions specific to four-year colleges and universities, community colleges, and two-year career and private schools to better capture the experiences of students at these types of institutions. The SSI is part of the Satisfaction-Priorities Survey Suite, which includes surveys for campus personnel, adult students, online learners, and parents of currently enrolled students.
While the Student Satisfaction Inventory surveys a whole range of campus items, the general satisfaction results in this report are based on three summary items at the end of the survey . . .

**Satisfaction and likelihood to re-enroll: The overall results**

Slightly more than half of students at each of the four institution types indicate that they are satisfied or very satisfied with their overall experience at their college or university. At four-year private and public schools and community colleges, a slightly higher percentage of students indicate that they would probably or definitely re-enroll at the school if they had it to do over again. (At career schools, the percentage of satisfied and likelihood to re-enroll are the same).

**Percentage of students who were satisfied with overall college experience and who would re-enroll at current institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Re-Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Private Institutions</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-Year Public Institutions</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Colleges</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career and Private Schools</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A closer look at satisfaction levels for community colleges**

Community colleges reflect higher levels of satisfaction and likelihood to re-enroll. Students at these institutions appear to be more satisfied with their experiences than their counterparts at other types of institutions. What is it about community colleges and the students they serve that are reflecting higher satisfaction? It is possible that price may play a key role in these overall results. Given that community college students usually have made a much smaller financial investment than students at four-year institutions, they may be more inclined to feel that their education was “worth it.”

The perceptions of students at community colleges are important for leaders at four-year private and public institutions to monitor since these students may often be transferring into the four-year programs. Leaders at career schools may also find these data of interest since local community colleges may be competing for the same students as the proprietary schools.

Let’s take a closer look at the students at community colleges to determine what factors may be at play.
Institutional choice and student satisfaction

Institutional choice is a key indicator in student satisfaction. Students who attend an institution that was their first choice tend to have higher student satisfaction levels.

Among students at community colleges, 69 percent reported that they were attending their first-choice institutions. This was the highest rate among the institution types, compared to 64 percent at four-year privates, 63 percent at four-year publics, and 62 percent at career institutions.

Because college choice is such a strong indicator of student satisfaction, campuses may want to survey their own students for college choice. If students indicate that their current campus was their second or third choice, campuses should make an effort to reach out to those students and make them feel like they still made the right college choice.

Which community college subpopulations reflect higher satisfaction and re-enrollment likelihood?

A review of the satisfaction and likelihood to re-enroll percentages reflect the mindset of the subpopulations on today’s community college campuses. The leadership at these institutions can use this analysis to better understand the perceptions of their student populations and see the potential impact on the overall campus satisfaction levels if one subpopulation is overrepresented in the surveying or on the campus.

### Satisfaction/re-enrollment likelihood by student subpopulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Subpopulation</th>
<th>Higher satisfaction/higher likelihood to re-enroll percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>24 and younger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 and older</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity/Race</td>
<td>Caucasian/white</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students of color</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Status</td>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>3.0 and above</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.99 and below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Goal</td>
<td>Associate degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer to another institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These observations hold true with satisfaction trends over the past several years. Adult learners reflect higher satisfaction than traditional-age students. Females are consistently more satisfied than male students. While community colleges do better with satisfaction levels among students of color than four-year private and public institutions, white students still reflect higher overall satisfaction. Part-time students (who are more likely to be those 25 years of age and older) are more satisfied than students enrolled full-time. Not surprisingly, students with higher grade point averages are more satisfied with their educational experience. Students with an associate degree goal are more satisfied than students who have their eye on another institution and are planning to ultimately transfer their credits to continue their education elsewhere.
Two subpopulations reported similar satisfaction and re-enrollment percentages:

- First-year and second-year students
- Students employed off campus and students who are not employed

However, we will observe some different priority areas for these subpopulations as we continue to review the data.

**Strengths and challenges at community colleges**

The individual items on the Student Satisfaction Inventory reveal areas of relative strength and challenge. Strengths are identified as high importance and high satisfaction areas, while challenges are defined as items with high importance and low satisfaction.

The items on the Student Satisfaction Inventory were analyzed statistically and conceptually to determine scales, or cluster areas. These scales provide a broader view of the perceptions of students. The strengths and challenges are reflected within these cluster areas, allowing for analysis on general areas of interest. This report reflects the areas of strength and challenge which are consistent across the majority of the subpopulations, along with items of unique strength or challenge. Some items are indicated as both a strength and a challenge for the subpopulations, indicating that not all students are having the same experience.

Campuses use the strength and challenge indicators to help guide their decision making. Strengths provide an opportunity for celebration and positive reinforcement on campus. Challenges provide opportunities to focus resources and dialogue around students’ top concerns. Campuses that are using their satisfaction survey results actively to guide decision making tend to see improved satisfaction scores for their students, as well as improved retention on their campus.*

**Instructional Effectiveness**

This category measures students’ academic experiences, the curriculum, and the campus’s overriding commitment to academic excellence.

**Student satisfaction with Instructional Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The quality of instruction in most of my classes is excellent.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nearly all faculty are knowledgeable in their fields.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to experience intellectual growth here.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are notified early if they are doing poorly in a class.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2010 Satisfaction-Priorities Client Survey

---

**Defining Strengths and Challenges**

Strengths are items in the top half of importance and the upper quartile of satisfaction. Challenges are items in the top half of importance and the bottom quartile of satisfaction, or in the top half of importance and the top quartile of performance gap. The performance gap is calculated by subtracting the satisfaction score from the importance score. The larger the gap, the greater the discrepancy between what matters to students and how the institution is performing. The smaller the gap, the better the institution is doing at meeting the students’ expectations.
The variations in responses by subpopulations illustrate the importance of surveying different student segments. What may be perceived as a strength by one group may be seen as a challenge by another. Campuses need to understand those variations so that they can serve their entire student population better.

Students at community colleges are giving positive reviews of the overall quality of instruction, but want feedback more quickly about how they are doing in the class. Faculty may need to set realistic expectations for students on how quickly they can expect to receive feedback, but at the same time faculty need to be conscious of returning tests and papers in a timely fashion so students can make appropriate corrections to their work. Early-alert systems are often key components of retention efforts on campus and can benefit colleges by identifying those students who are most in need of additional assistance from institutions. Students want to know how are they doing and many will be receptive to additional assistance from the college when they know that it is available.

Many community colleges are getting positive marks on the item, “Classes dealing with practical experiences and applications.” Subpopulations of students such as those who are 25 years of age and older rate this item with high importance and high satisfaction, as do students who are employed off campus. These students may have more life experience which leads to greater expectations for their classes to have a direct tie to the work world and to be applicable immediately. Community colleges are meeting these expectations for these students.

“Faculty are understanding of students’ unique life circumstances” is identified as an area of high importance but low satisfaction for students 24 and younger, female students, students employed off campus, and second-year students. These students may feel faculty are not taking into consideration the students’ life beyond the classroom and there may be more opportunities for community colleges to assist faculty and students with building relationships outside of class. Increased dialogue between the different groups on campus may help to improve this perception.

The item, “Faculty are fair and unbiased in the treatment of individual students” is identified as a challenge by students with GPAs of 2.99 and below. This illustrates how some challenges may be perception issues, as students who are doing poorly may perceive an issue of fairness when it comes to grading. However, real or not, perceived challenges can still pose problems for campuses and need to be addressed. In this case, campus activities to improve timely feedback and to build relationships between students and faculty, as well as improved academic support services, may assist with improving satisfaction on this item with this population.

**Registration Effectiveness**

This scale assesses issues associated with registration and billing and the extent to which the registration process is smooth and effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are convenient ways of paying my school bill.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program requirements are clear and reasonable.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to register for classes with few conflicts.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ability to register for classes with few conflicts is a priority area for community colleges. As enrollments expand, these issues take on higher precedence and can also be retention issues: students may not stay enrolled if they do not have access to the classes they need to complete their degrees. This challenge may reflect students’ desires to get the classes they need when then need them in order to complete their educational goal in a timely and affordable manner—a key part of every community college’s mission.
Community colleges should continue to explore their course offerings and determine if they are student-centered (as compared with being offered when faculty want to teach them). Some campuses are having success with new late night course offerings to fit within the schedules of their students. Colleges also need to monitor the courses that fill quickly and identify resources to add additional sections of these courses as needed.

A similar item, “Classes are scheduled at times that are convenient” is also identified as a challenge for many subpopulations, including students 25 years of age and older, students employed off campus, students with a GPA of 3.0 and above, and second-year students. Community colleges will need to determine what “convenient” means to their students and the answer may vary by different subpopulations. Colleges may need to implement creative solutions to offer courses to meet a variety of expectations.

### Academic Advising and Counseling

This category assesses the comprehensiveness of the academic advising program, evaluating advisors’ knowledge, competence, approachability, and personal concern for students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My academic advisor is concerned about my success as an individual.</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My academic advisor is knowledgeable about my program requirements.</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My academic advisor is knowledgeable about transfer requirements.</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school does what it can to help me reach my educational goals.</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student perceptions of academic advising are more critical at community colleges than they are typically at four-year private and public institutions. This may be reflective of the traditional models at two-year schools being professional advising staff who serve students on a first-come, first-serve basis rather than the faculty/mentor model where relationships are built over time. At institutions with large enrollment growth, there are often struggles for the advising staff to keep up with the demand for their services. Based on the data in this report, community colleges have more opportunity to improve advising services to students to be able to best guide students toward the successful completion of their academic goals. These perceptions are consistent across the majority of demographic subpopulations.

There is often a strong connection between positive academic advising relationships and retention of students. Advisors can be the conduit for students for course access and with providing guidance on majors and transfer requirements. They can be cheerleaders that can help keep students motivated and gatekeepers that guide students forward. Sometimes advisors are simply the messengers of when courses are available and institutions need to assist advisors with communicating this fact to students to assist with the perceptions of advising at community colleges.
Campus Climate

This scale measures the extent to which the institution provides experiences that promote a sense of campus pride and belonging.

Student satisfaction with Campus Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus staff are caring and helpful.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students are made to feel welcome on this campus.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the whole, the campus is well-maintained.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I seldom get the “run-around” when seeking information on this campus.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The college shows concern for students as individuals.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community college students have generally positive perceptions of the campus climate which often has a strong correlation with overall satisfaction and likelihood to re-enroll at the college. However, there continues to be room for improvement in the area of campus run-around which can be frustrating to students, especially those who are balancing work and family demands in addition to going to school. Colleges have opportunities to examine how their processes and procedures are working from the student perspective and to continue to reduce run-around physically on campus, as well as through phone systems and Websites. Quality service training is one way many community colleges are working to address the issue of campus run-around. The perceptions of campus climate are consistent across the majority of demographic subpopulations.

Admissions and Financial Aid

This category measures the extent to which admissions counselors are competent and knowledgeable, along with students’ perceptions of the effectiveness and availability of financial aid programs.

Student satisfaction for Admissions and Financial Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate financial aid is available for most students.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a dual challenge for the institution and students. Many campuses face the challenge of adequate funding for financial aid. Students meanwhile are facing greater financial pressures, and a lack of financial aid can impact student access and retention. At the same time, this challenge may also partly be an issue of perception. There may be opportunities for better communication around financial aid options and deadlines and it may be appropriate to inform students of additional resources for financial support. Colleges are encouraged to discuss the issue with students to explore how improvements could be made. There may also be opportunities to reinforce the perception of the value of the education so students are more willing to take out loans or to identify dollars for the tuition themselves rather than relying on gift aid.
The item, “Financial aid awards are announced to students in time to be helpful in college planning” is a particular challenge area for several demographic subgroups at community colleges, including first-year students, students who are not employed, and students enrolled full-time. Students of color note that this item is a challenge along with the perception of “Financial aid counselors are helpful.” Colleges may not always be able to control the amount of financial aid that they have available to distribute and some timelines are federally driven, but with a commitment to customer service, community colleges can work to streamline the policies and procedures around financial aid awards and the helpfulness of the financial aid counselors throughout the process.

**Academic Services**

This scale assesses services students utilize to achieve their academic goals. These services include the library, computer labs, tutoring, and study areas.

**Student satisfaction in Academic Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library resources and services are adequate.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer labs are adequate and accessible.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Libraries and computer labs are receiving positive marks overall from community college students. Some populations are more critical of the equipment in the lab facilities, including students 24 and younger, female, students who plan to transfer, and students with GPAs of 2.99 and below. These perceptions may also be driven by programs that are more dependent on lab facilities. Colleges need to examine the resources that they have available and continue to invest in those areas that may be in high demand.

Of particular interest among the community college demographic subpopulations: students with GPAs of 2.99 and below gave positive indicators on the availability of tutoring services, while students of color indicated that services to help students decide upon a career had room for improvement.

**Safety and Security**

This category measures the institution’s responsiveness to students’ personal safety and security on the campus.

**Student satisfaction with Safety and Security**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The campus is safe and secure for all students.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While students feel generally safe and secure on community colleges nationally, there is room for improvement on the availability of parking spaces and the lighting of the parking lots. Students on commuter campuses in general have higher expectations for parking availability and many campuses struggle with this issue, either in reality or in perception. Campuses are encouraged to discuss parking issues with students to determine whether there truly is not enough parking during peak class times, or if students are just disgruntled because not everyone can park next to the classroom. Colleges can emphasize that parking is free, accessible, and available to help reduce unrealistic expectations. The perceptions of items in the area of safety and security are consistent across demographic subgroups.

**Trends over the past five years at community colleges**

The scale scores also provide an opportunity to monitor trends over time. In a snapshot over the past five academic years, the following trends are observed, as reflected in the complete table found in the appendix on page 14:

- **Importance scores**—generally trending up over four of the five years, with a leveling off in 2009-10.
- **Satisfaction scores**—a similar pattern of improving satisfaction scores for four of the five years, with a slight dip in 2009-10.
- **Performance gaps**—remaining fairly consistent across the five years.

It is possible that the increase in enrollments at community colleges during the 2009-10 academic year has played a role in the leveling off of the scores as two-year institutions struggle to keep up with the demand of larger populations and the difficulties that go with this situation.

**Enrollment factors at community colleges**

The Student Satisfaction Inventory also captures importance scores on nine items which factor into the students’ decisions to enroll. These items include, in rank order of importance for students at community colleges:

**Enrollment factors: community colleges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Enrollment Factor</th>
<th>Importance Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Financial aid</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Academic reputation</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Geographic setting</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Personalized attention prior to enrollment</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Campus appearance</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Size of institution</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Recommendations from family/friends</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Opportunity to play sports</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Importance scores are the average score on a 1 to 7 rating, with 7 being high.
When the data for the demographic subpopulations are reviewed, cost is consistently the number-one factor in the decision to enroll for all subpopulations at community colleges. There are opportunities for community colleges to emphasize the academic quality that they offer in addition to their perceived affordability. Often community colleges are perceived as offering instruction that is of a lower quality than instruction at a four-year private or public institution, when on many community college campuses this is not the case. When community colleges focus the discussion on the quality of the instruction, the experience and qualifications of its faculty, and the satisfaction of students in these areas, they may be able to boost importance scores for academic reputation. If students don’t perceive a quality academic experience, they may not be committed to the institution no matter how affordable the classes are.

Closing ideas: Assessment and benchmarking often show the way to greater institutional success

National satisfaction-priorities benchmarks offer a broad picture of what is happening at campuses. However, they have the greatest value when combined with regular, systematic campus assessment. Individual campus results capture the truly unique experience of each campus, while also pointing out strengths and challenges of a specific campus. These internal benchmarks offer the greatest assessment of the student experience at your campus. Data from these assessments can provide bottom-line perceptions and specific details on what should be the most pressing campus priorities. Each campus can dig into their own results further, analyzing demographic subgroups and devising initiatives that will improve the student experience for every student subpopulation.

By using a combination of national benchmarks and individual assessment data, campuses can focus their resources and initiatives more precisely, improving student life and learning and fulfilling their institutional missions.

As noted earlier, based on feedback from colleges regularly assessing student satisfaction, they are seeing improvement in retention. In addition, a study published by Noel-Levitz in 2009 reflects a link between student satisfaction and retention specifically at four-year institutions.* A similar study at community colleges is planned for the future.

Community colleges should assess their students’ satisfaction regularly and develop a plan to actively respond to the identified priorities as part of a continuous quality improvement commitment. The process includes surveying students, reviewing and sharing the results, responding to the data with new initiatives, and closing the feedback loop by communicating what has been accomplished. This process should continue on an annual or every-other-year cycle.

Appendix I. List of schools

AIB College of Business, IA
Adirondack Community College, NY
Alexandria Technical College, MN
Allen County Community College, KS
Anne Arundel Community College, MD
Appalachian Technical College, GA
Augusta Technical College, GA
Austin Community College, TX
Bay Noc Community College, MI
Bismarck State College, ND
Black Hawk College, IL
Blackhawk Technical College, WI
Braxosport College, TX
Brevard Community College, FL
Bristol Community College, MA
Brookdale Community College, NJ
Brookhaven College (DCCCD), TX
Bucks County Community College, PA
Burlington County College, NJ
Butler Community College, KS
Butler County Community College, PA
Cape Cod Community College, MA
Capital Community College, CT
Carl Sandburg College, IL
Carteret Community College, NC
Cascadia Community College, WA
 Catawba Valley Community College, NC
Cedar Valley College (DCCCD), TX
Central Georgia Technical College, GA
Central Maine Community College, ME
Central New Mexico Community College, NM
Central Ohio Technical College, OH
Centralia College, WA
Century College, MN
Chandler-Gilbert Community College, AZ
Chattahoochee Technical College, GA
Chippewa Valley Technical College, WI
Cincinnati State Technical and Community College, OH
Clark College, WA
Clark State Community College, OH
Cloud County Community College, KS
Clovis Community College, NM
Community College of Philadelphia, PA
Coconino Community College, AZ
Coffeyville Community College, KS
Colby Community College, KS
College of Southern Nevada, NV
College of the Mainland, TX
Collin County Community College District, TX
Community College of Denver, CO
Cowley County Community College, KS
Cuyahoga Community College, OH
Cypress College, CA
Dakota College at Bottineau, ND
Davidson County Community College, NC
Delaware County Community College, PA
Delgado Community College, LA
Delta College, MI
Dunwoody College of Technology, MN
East Central College, MO
Eastern Arizona College, AZ
Eastern Gateway Community College, OH
Eastern Iowa Community College District, IA
Eastern Maine Community College, ME
Eastern New Mexico University Roswell, NM
Edison Community College, OH
El Centro College (DCCCD), TX
El Paso Community College, TX
Elgin Community College, IL
Essex County College, NJ
Flathead Valley Community College, MT
Flint Hills Technical College, KS
Florenc-Darlington Technical College, SC
Florida State College at Jacksonville, FL
Fort Belknap College, MT
Fort Scott Community College, KS
Fox Valley Technical College, WI
Galveston College, TX
Garden City Community College, KS
Gateway Community College, AZ
Gateway Community and Technical College, KY
Gateway Technical College, WI
Georgia Military College, GA
Georgia Northwestern Technical College, GA
Glen Oaks Community College, MI
Glendale Community College, AZ
Granite Rapids Community College, MI
Griffin Technical College, GA
Gwinnett Technical College, GA
Highland Community College, KS
Hinds Community College, MS
Hutchinson Community College, KS
Illinois Central College, IL
Illinois Valley Community College, IL
Independence Community College, KS
Inver Hills Community College, MN
Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana East Central, IN
Jackson Community College, MI
Johnson County Community College, KS
Kansas City Kansas Community College, KS
Kaskasia College, IL
Kennebec Valley Technical College, ME
Kilian Community College, SD
Ladette Community College, KS
Lake Land College, IL
Lake Region State College, MN
Lake Superior College, MN
Lakeland College Canada, AB
Lakeshore Technical College, WI
Lamar State College Port Arthur, TX
Lanier Technical College, GA
Lansing Community College, MI
Laredo Community College, TX
Lincoln College Normal (Midwest College of Cosmetology), IL
Lincoln Land Community College, IL
Little Priest Tribal College, NE
Los Rios Community College, CA
Luna Community College, NM
Luzerne County Community College, PA
Madison Area Technical College, WI
Madisonville Community College, KY
Marion Technical College, OH
Merritt College, CA
Mesa Community College, AZ
Mid Michigan Community College, MI
Midland Community College, MI
Mid-State Technical College, WI
Milwaukee Area Technical College, WI
Mission College, CA
Mitchell Technical Institute, SD
Moberly Area Community College, MO
Montana State University Billings, College of Technology, MT
Montana Tech of The University of Montana South, MT
Montclair Technical College, MI
Monterey Peninsula College, CA
Montgomery County Community College, PA
Moraine Park Technical College, WI
Morton College, IL
Mountain View College (DCCCD), TX
New Mexico State University at Alamogordo, NM
Navarro College, TX
Neosho County Community College, KS
New Mexico Junior College, NM
North Dakota State College of Science, ND
North Hennepin Community College, MN
North Lake College (DCCCD), TX
North Metro Technical College, GA
Northeastern Technical College, WI
Northeast College, NE
Northwest Kansas Technical Center, KS
Northeast Wisconsin Technical College, WI
Northeastern Junior College, CO
Northern Maine Community College, ME
Northwest Technical College, MN
Northwest Vista College, TX
Northwestern Technical College, GA
The Ohio State University Agricultural Technical Institute, OH
Okefenokee Technical College, GA
Oklahoma State University – Okmulgee, OK
Ouachita Technical College, AR
Palo Alto College, TX
Paradise Valley Community College, AZ
Pensacola Junior College, FL
Phoenix College, AZ
Piedmont Community College, NC
Piedmont Technical College, SC
Pierpont Community and Technical College, WV
Pitt Community College, NC
Portland Community College, OR
Potomac State College of West Virginia University, WV
Pratt Community College, KS
Pulaski Technical College, AR
Reading Area Community College, PA
Red Rocks Community College, CO
Redwoods Community College District, CA
Richland College (DCCCD), TX
Richland Community College, IL
Rio Hondo College, CA
Robeson Community College, NC
Rochester Community and Technical College, MN
Rogue Area Community College, OR
Saint Paul College, A Community & Technical College, MN
San Antonio College, TX
San Jacinto College Central, TX
San Jacinto College North, TX
San Jacinto College South, TX
San Juan College, NM
Sanderson Technical College, GA
Santa Fe Community College, NM
Savannah Technical College, GA
Scottsdale Community College, AZ
Seminole State College of Florida, FL
Sitting Bull College, ND
South Arkansas Community College, AR
South Central College, MN
South Plains College, TX
Southeast Technical Institute, SD
Southeastern Community College, IA
Southern Maine Community College, ME
Southwestern Indian Polytechnical Institute, NM
Spartanburg Community College, SC
Spartanburg Falls Community College, WA
St. Clair County Community College, MI
St. Luke’s College, MO
St. Philip’s College, TX
State Fair Community College, MO
Surry Community College, NC
Tacoma Community College, WA
Texas State Technical College West Texas, TX
Texas Tech College of Nursing and Health Sciences, OH
The University of Montana Helena College of Technology, MT
Thomas Nelson Community College, VA
Tri-County Technical College, SC
Trident Technical College, SC
University of Alaska Bristol Bay, AK
University of Alaskaanchik, AK
University of Alaska Kachemak, AK
University of Alaska Kodiak, AK
University of Alaska Kuskokwim, AK
University of Alaska Interior/ Aleutians, AK
University of Alaska Mat-Su, AK
University of Alaska Northwest, AK
University of Alaska Rural College, AK
University of Alaska Sitka, AK
University of Alaska Tanana Valley, AK
University of Akron Wayne College, OH
University of Hawaii Kauai Community College, HI
Washington Community College, ME
Washington State Community College, WA
Waubonsie Community College, IL
Waukesha County Technical College, WI
West Central Technical College, GA
West Georgia Technical College, GA
West Virginia University at Parkersburg, WV
Western Dakota Technical Institute, SD
Western Iowa Tech Community College, IA
Western Nevada College, NV
Western Technical College, WI
Wharton County Junior College, TX
White Earth Tribal and Community College, MN
Wichita Area Technical College, KS
Willmar State College, MN
Wisconsin Indianhead Technical College, WI
Wright State University Lake Campus, OH
York County Community College, ME
Appendix II. Demographics for community colleges

Age
- 61% 25 and older
- 39% 24 and younger

Gender
- 61% Female
- 39% Male

Employment
- 64% Employed off campus
- 30% Not employed
- 6% Employed on campus

Current Class Load
- 70% Full-time
- 30% Part-time

Ethnicity/Race
- 63% Caucasian/White
- 37% Students of Color

Age
- 61% 25 and older
- 39% 24 and younger

Education Goal
- 28% Transfer to another institution
- 51% Associate degree
- 21% Other goal

Current GPA
- 56% 3.0 and above
- 44% 2.99 and below

Class Level
- 49% First-year
- 33% Second-year
- 18% More than two years

Institutional Choice
- 69% First choice
- 22% Second choice
- 9% Third choice
### Appendix III. Five-year trends at community colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Advising/Counseling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admissions and Financial Aid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Climate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Support Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern for the Individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Registration Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsiveness to Diverse Populations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety and Security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Service Excellence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Centeredness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Gap</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Records: n = 81,813 for 2005-06; n = 61,064 for 2006-07; n = 60,206 for 2007-08; n = 62,875 for 2008-09; n = 60,695 for 2009-10
Please visit [www.noellevitz.com/benchmark](http://www.noellevitz.com/benchmark) to download these Noel-Levitz National Satisfaction-Priorities Reports on additional populations that may be of interest.
Questions about this report?

We hope you have found this report to be helpful and informative. If you have questions or would like more information about the findings, please contact Julie Bryant, Noel-Levitz associate vice-president of retention solutions, at 1-800-876-1117 or julie-bryant@noellevitz.com.

A word about Noel-Levitz

A trusted partner to higher education, Noel-Levitz helps systems and campuses reach and exceed their goals for enrollment, marketing, and student success. Over the past three decades, the higher education professionals at Noel-Levitz have consulted directly with more than 2,600 colleges and universities nationwide in the areas of:

- Student retention
- Staff and advisor development
- Student success
- Marketing and recruitment
- Financial aid services
- Research and communications
- Institutional effectiveness

Noel-Levitz has developed an array of proven tools and software programs; diagnostic tools and instruments; video-based training programs; and customized consultations, workshops, and national conferences. With the Satisfaction-Priorities Surveys (including the Student Satisfaction Inventory), the firm brings together its many years of research and campus-based experience to enable you to get to the heart of your campus agenda.

For more information, contact:

Noel-Levitz, Inc.
2350 Oakdale Boulevard
Coralville, Iowa 52241-9702

Phone: 800-876-1117
Fax: 319-626-8388
E-mail: ContactUs@noellevitz.com