meeting between the CCT representative, the program associate dean, and the company affected.

Whatever the source, all student complaints are reviewed and results determined. Feedback is provided to the student making the complaint and, if appropriate, improvements are made and fed back again.

3P7 Satisfaction measures
Determining student and stakeholder satisfaction is accomplished via formal and informal processes. End-of-course feedback forms measure topics related to, for example, effectiveness of instructor communication, respect and enthusiasm, effective use of class time, quality of teaching materials, productive use of technology, and variety of classroom activities. Students are asked to rate whether the course they took was a wise use of time and money, how the physical environment contributed to their learning, etc. If concerns arise, the associate dean or appointed faculty mentor works individually with the course instructor to develop and execute professional improvement plans. Other concerns in the end-of-course feedback are addressed by department associate deans and deans as needed.

Student satisfaction is measured 6 months after program completion by an initial Graduate Follow-up Survey. An additional survey is done with graduates 5 years post-graduation as well. Non-completers have also been surveyed (3P2). Some departments conduct their own satisfaction surveys, especially during the program review cycle (every 5 years). At that time, students may be asked specific questions about their program scheduling, course sequencing, ability to apply what they are learning on the job, and goals for future transfer in some cases. Students in the Nursing program, in particular, participate in a pre-graduation focus group regarding their satisfaction with the program.

Employer satisfaction is measured in different ways. First, an Employer Satisfaction Survey is conducted every four years. Second, employers working with Corporate and Community Training are surveyed regularly to determine if customized training is meeting their needs and expectations. Employers of WCTC cooperative education student interns are interviewed and surveyed throughout the co-op experience to facilitate effective student learning and to make certain that employer needs are adequately met. On an informal basis, staff engages students and other stakeholders in casual conversation outside of the classroom or during student activities. Though not scientific data collection, this method often leads to “quick fixes” of issues concerning our customers.

In 1999 and 2002, WCTC students participated in the ACT Student Satisfaction Survey and in November 2006, students completed the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI). Results are discussed in 3R1 and 3R4.

Results
3R1 Results for student satisfaction
The items on the Noel-Levitz SSI are clustered together conceptually to form scales. In Figure 3-6 the scale means show the big picture of what matters most (Importance scores) to WCTC students and how the college is performing (Performance scores). WCTC students are similar to those nationally in that they rank instructional and registration effectiveness the most important. Compared to the national comparison group of other community, junior and technical colleges, WCTC students are significantly more satisfied with: Academic Resources/Services, Safety and Security, Campus Climate, Student Centeredness, Campus Support Service, and Instructional Effectiveness. They are significantly less satisfied with issues concerning Academic Advising/Counseling; and Admissions and Financial Aid.

3R2 Student relationship results
WCTC evaluates the results of relationships in a variety of ways:
- Number of new applications & students admitted
- Enrollments in courses and programs (O3, 2P5)
- Number of FTE students per year
- Number of students taking transcripted credit courses in high school who become regular WCTC program students (1P5, 2P5)
- IPEDS, QRP Retention and attrition rates (c.f. Section 1)
- Satisfaction rates from annual Graduate and Apprenticeship Follow-up surveys (Figure 1-14)
- Student return visits – to say “thank you”
- Transfer rates to and from WCTC
- First time pass rates for nursing students (Figure 1-13)
- Perkins Report Card data for retention (Figure 2-7)
Figure 3-6 Noel-Levitz Scores: What Matters Most/Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items listed in rank order of importance.</th>
<th>Waukesha County Technical College</th>
<th>Nation-wide Community, Junior and Technical Colleges</th>
<th>WCTC vs. Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Importance reflects “what matters most” to students</td>
<td>Performance Satisfaction Mean</td>
<td>Performance Satisfaction Mean</td>
<td>Satisfaction Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Effectiveness</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Effectiveness</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for the Individual</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising/Counseling</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Services</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Climate</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Centeredness</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Excellence</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions and Financial Aid</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Support Services</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness to Diverse Populations</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Statistics</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items rated on a 7-point Scale (7 being high).*

3R3 Stakeholder satisfaction results

Stakeholder satisfaction results are measured in various ways and are often translated to dollars received by the College to support its mission and programming. In 1999, taxpayers gave their vote of confidence to the college by approving at $26 million dollar building referendum for Health Careers, Printing & Graphic Arts, College Center, and additional space for Protective Services.

Employer satisfaction is measured with an employer follow-up every four years; see Figure 1-17.

In the last ten years, the college has received $11.7 million in donations; these donations are critical for scholarships and specific academic programming needs. In 2002-03, the WCTC Foundation, Inc. was given a $1 million gift from Quad/Graphics Inc. for the college’s printing and graphics programs. This gift was the largest single monetary donation ever made to a Wisconsin Technical College and is used to fund scholarships, equipment, and train educators in the program.

3R4 Results for building stakeholder relationships

Key Stakeholder relationship results are demonstrated by their continuing support of WCTC. A variety of indicators may include scholarship contributions (Figure 3-7), repeat customers (employers) and revenue, number of new customized training contracts, in-kind WCTC Foundation donations, positive feedback from legislature and private citizens, various awards, membership on advisory committees and boards, volunteer guest speakers for classes, and increasing transferability.

Figure 3-7 WCTC Foundation and External Scholarships

![WCTC Foundation and External Scholarships Chart]

3R5 Comparisons with other institutions

Figure 3-8 and Figure 3-9 summarize how WCTC’s 2006 Noel-Levitz SSI results compared with the national comparison group.
Figure 3-8 Noel Levitz Summary Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WCTC</th>
<th>Nation-wide Community, Junior and Technical Colleges</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So far, how has your college experience met your expectations?</td>
<td>4.80 / 1.32</td>
<td>4.73 / 1.30</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate your overall satisfaction with your experience here thus far.</td>
<td>5.48 / 1.31</td>
<td>5.41 / 1.33</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All in all, if you had to do it over, would you enroll here again?</td>
<td>5.77 / 1.44</td>
<td>5.65 / 1.54</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rated using a 7 Point Likert Scale (with 7 being high). The asterisk in the mean difference column indicates statistical significance in mean satisfaction ratings: * Difference statistically significant at the .05 level

Figure 3-9 presents a summary of WCTC students’ perceptions and, while they do not provide specific direction on what needs to be changed, Noel-Levitz indicates that colleges with higher scores on these three items enjoy higher retention and graduation rates and lower loan default rates.

WCTC’s students’ overall satisfaction is similar to students nationally. (In 2004, WCTC’s average two-year default rate was 3.2% among those who entered repayment whereas the national comparison rate for other two-year colleges was 8.1% and the WTCS average was 4.4%. Graduation rates vary considerably, depending on the cohort chosen.)

Figure 3-9 lists individual survey items that received statistically higher and lower satisfaction ratings and higher importance ratings by WCTC students. Nationally, students rate their instructional experiences positively, but WCTC students are significantly more satisfied than students nationwide. Conversely, class scheduling is a challenge for most colleges, but even more of one for WCTC. Advising is also more of a challenge for WCTC.

Improvement

3I1 Improving current processes
WCTC recognizes the limitations of the findings obtained through general student satisfaction studies and needs assessments. Therefore, for areas of significant concern, more in-depth feedback is sought from students using standardized surveys and focus groups conducted at the program level. Input is also sought from WCTC’s student government representatives. Knowing that course scheduling has been a concern of students through prior administrations of ACT student satisfaction surveys, the QRP has purposefully sought feedback from students about their course scheduling preferences and changes have followed. In the future, QRPs will gather systematic feedback from students about their advising needs and experiences, another area of significant concern.

3I2 Setting targets for improvement
As WCTC sets targets we strive to be statistically above the national average – to be “Best in State” among WTCS colleges – and to show ongoing improvement in ratings or other performance measures. Some examples of information sources for setting improvement targets include:

- CCT Business Plan – service balance to small, medium, and large businesses
- Adult Basic Education state targets - see Figure 2-6
- Academic Master Plan – number of new programs developed to meet needs of changing industry demands
- QRP benchmarked indicators (State, College and Program) – See Figure 7-5
- Perkins indicators – see Figure 2-7
- Grant funding outcome measures – related job placement of students