

Student Satisfaction Feedback Survey

Registration Fall 2004

Registration Fall 2004

As part of the process improvement initiative, the Office of Institutional Research & Assessment (OIRA) administered in October 2004 a survey that evaluates student satisfaction with the Fall 2004 registration procedure. This report presents a summary of results, in addition to a comparison with the 2002 registration survey results.

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.
- ✓ To identify changes in student satisfaction with various registration processes, as compared with 2002 survey.

Method

Instrument

The Student Satisfaction Feedback Survey was prepared using, in general, the same guidelines adopted for previous similar surveys (1999- 2002, Appendix A). In consultation with the Registrar's and Admissions Offices and Student Affairs, modifications were introduced to previous survey to reflect changes in the processes. 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.
- ✎ 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.
- ✎ Items soliciting student opinion and perception of the quality of AUB programs, classrooms and laboratories were introduced to provide information required by the Balanced Score Card, especially as Entering Student Survey was not conducted this year.

Sample

The sample consisted of 982 undergraduate students from all faculties representing 17% of the population. Cluster sampling was used. The sample came from 47 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, and status is presented in Tables 2 – 6. In addition, these tables provide the population figures for the University on each of these dimensions.

Table 1.
Survey Registration Satisfaction Survey Course Sample, Fall 2004 - 2005

	SUBJ	COURSE	SECTION			SUBJ	COURSE	SECTION
1	ENGL	102A	1		25	CVSP	205	6
2	ENGL	203	9		26	ENGL	204	7
3	ENGL	204	3		27	CVSP	204	12
4	ENGL	208	1		28	CVSP	204	10
5	NURS	301	2		29	ENGL	102B	1
6	ENGL	208	2		30	ENGL	203	1
7	ENGL	208	3		31	CVSP	204	3
8	ENGL	208	6		32	CVSP	205	7
9	ENGL	204	11		33	ENGL	102B	3
10	ENGL	203	21		34	CVSP	203	11
11	ENGL	206	1		35	CVSP	204	5
12	ENGL	206	2		36	CVSP	205	3
13	ENGL	204	15		37	CVSP	204	6
14	ENGL	204	16		38	CVSP	205	1
15	ENGL	206	3		39	ENGL	206	5
16	ENGL	100B	4		40	ENGL	206	6
17	ENGL	204	5		41	CVSP	203	13
18	ENGL	204	13		42	CVSP	204	9
19	ENGL	208	5		43	ENGL	208	7
20	ENGL	204	10		44	AGRL	235	1
21	ENGL	203	18		45	ENGL	203	3
22	ENGL	203	31		46	AGRL	301	1
23	CVSP	205	5		47	HMPH	204	2
24	HMPD	204	01					

Table 2
Sample and Population Distribution by Faculty

	Sample		Population	
	N	%	N	%
FAFS	70	7	504	9
FAS	293	30	2278	40
FEA	203	21	1369	24
OSB	273	28	1212	21
FHS	51	5	208	4
SNU	54	5	145	2
Others	38	4	19	0.3
Total	982	100	5735	100

Table 3
Sample and Population Distribution by Gender

	<u>Sample</u>		<u>Population</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Female	464	47	2723	47.5
Male	483	49	3012	52.5
Did not specify	35	4		
Total	982	100	5735	100

Table 4
Sample and Population Distribution by Nationality

	<u>Sample</u>		<u>Population</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Lebanon	799	81	4561	79
Arab Countries	99	10	570	10
Other	20	2	596	10
Did not specify	64	7	12	0.2
Total	982	100	5739	100

Table 5
Sample Distribution by Class

Class	N	%
Freshman	39	4
Sophomore	375	39
Junior	344	36
Senior	167	17
Special	2	0.2
Graduate	-	-
Did not specify	38	3.8
Total	965	100

Table 6
Sample Distribution by Status

	N	%
New	313	32
Currently registered	598	61
Old returning	21	2
Special	6	0.6
Cross registering	3	0.3
Prospective	3	0.3
Other	2	0.2
Did not specify	36	3.6
Total	982	100

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.

The means for the steps ranged between 2.3-4.0 (vs. 2.2-3.8 for 2002), while for the overall ratings between 2.6-3.8 (vs. 2.6-3.5 for 2002). The steps that were most satisfying to students (>60%) were Validation Process, SIS Access on-campus, Net Account Activation, Receiving/Payment of Fees, and Clarity of Deadlines. The most dissatisfying ones were Capacity of Scheduled Courses (60%), SIS access off-campus (54%), Id Slot Registration Procedure (43%), and Helpfulness of Advisor (39%). With respect to the overall ratings, the highest satisfactory evaluation went to Campus Security Staff ($x = 3.8$, 68%), followed by Maps & Handouts ($x=3.7$, 59%), then AUB Guide Service and New Student Orientation ($x = 3.5$, 50 and 55%, respectively). The least satisfying were Financial Aid related ($X = 2.6-2.8$, 27-28%), followed by Bureaucracy ($x = 3.0$, 27%) and Advising ($x = 3.0$, 34%).

The tables also provide comparison with 2002 results in terms of difference (Δ) in mean satisfaction on each process. Only four of the 33 items in Table 8 showed a negative change between 2004 and 2002 in favor of 2002, and two items did not show any change. All other items showed improvement in 2004 ranging between 0.1-1.0. Highest improvement (+1.0) concerned validation process followed by orientation activities and information package (+0.5), then by English Placement Test administration, organization of the pre-registration, and availability of advisor (+0.4). Drop & Add process and Helpfulness of Advisors improved by +0.3. The most serious decrease in satisfaction occurred in SIS access off-campus as it went down 0.7 points to 2.4 from 3.1.

Table 8
Registration Process Steps / Descriptives for 2002 and 2004

Process	2004				2002				Δ
	N	Mean	%Dis	%Sat	N	Mean	%Di	%Sa	
1. Placement Test – English	358	3.3	21	43	168	2.9	30	28	+0.4
2. Placement Test –Arabic	388	3.2	25	44	174	3.0	30	30	+0.2
3. Organization of the Pre-Registration	541	3.3	28	44	236	2.9	33	31	+0.4
4. Staff Professionalism	542	3.4	21	48	237	3.2	27	41	+0.2
5. Adequacy of information in Admission package	546	3.7	13	51	227	3.2	24	45	+0.5
8. Orientation activities	392	3.5	14	54	135	3.0	28	34	+0.5
11. Availability of Advisor	907	3.3	26	47	583	2.9	38	31	+0.4
12- Helpfulness of advisor	901	3.0	39	35	566	2.7	44	32	+0.3
14- Clarity of deadlines	874	3.7	14	64	570	3.5	21	53	+0.2
15- SIS access on-campus	674	3.8	16	66	255	3.8	17	67	0.0
16- SIS access Off -campus	457	2.4	54	21	297	3.1	32	35	-0.7
17- SIS access both on and off campus	394	3.5	12	51	304	3.5	15	53	0.0
18- Fairness of registration slot allocation by ID	885	2.7	43	24	587	2.5	53	26	+0.2
19- Capacity of scheduled courses	904	2.3	60	15	590	2.2	64	16	+0.1
24- Staff professionalism	664	3.3	22	43	432	3.1	27	37	+0.2
25- Staff helpfulness	680	3.1	26	37	440	3.2	25	42	-0.1
26- Efficiency of on-line registration	787	3.2	24	41	517	3.4	20	50	-0.2
27- Receiving Statement	945	3.6	19	60	620	3.8	13	65	-0.2
28- Payment process	913	3.7	13	64	611	3.6	15	58	+0.1
29- Validation process	919	4.0	9	74	593	3.0	34	38	+1.0
30- Activating AUBnet Account process	910	3.8	10	65	583	3.6	17	56	+0.2
31- Adequacy of instruction	896	3.7	13	58	574	3.4	20	51	+0.3
33- Drop and Add process	845	3.1	29	39	505	2.8	36	28	+0.3

Table 9
Overall Evaluation of Registration Process for 2004-5 and 2002

Process	2004					2002			
	N	Δ	Mean	% Dis.	%Sat	N	Mean	% Dis.	% Sat.
Overall Process	927	+0.1	3.2	20	37	607	3.1	23	37
Ambiance	889	+0.1	3.1	27	33	588	3.0	29	30
Time Taken	923		2.9	35	32	611	3.0	31	36
Efficiency	921	0.0	3.2	24	38	616	3.2	24	42
Bureaucracy	884	+0.1	3.0	28	27	597	2.9	29	28
Courtesy	871	0.0	3.1	25	32	589	3.1	24	32
Instructions	898	0.0	3.4	16	49	599	3.4	18	45
AUB Guide Service	887	+0.2	3.5	15	50	583	3.3	18	42
Maps & Handouts	891	+0.4	3.7	13	59	583	3.3	18	42
Campus Security Staff	882	+0.3	3.8	9	68	578	3.5	15	52
New Student Orientation	646	+0.3	3.5	14	55	349	3.2	24	38
Advising	894		3.0	34	34				
Financial Aid Decision	371		2.6	50	27				
Time of FA Decision	376		2.8	39	28				
Financial Aid Process	368	+0.1	2.7	43	28	371	2.6	49	27
Dormitories	215	+0.4	3.3	21	46	245	2.9	28	29
Deferred Payments	745	+0.5	3.5	16	52	269	3.0	33	34
AUB has high quality academic programs	877		4.0	5	76				
AUB has high quality classroom & lab facilities	872		3.6	14	58				

With respect to overall ratings (Table 9), mean satisfaction remained same on 3 items and improved on all other items. Improvement ranging between 0.1-0.5 with Deferred payment improving most (0.5) followed by Dormitory registration and maps and handouts (0.4) New Student Orientation process improved by 0.3, while the overall process improved by 0.1 reaching 3.2.

Other Findings

AUB and Student Choice

AUB 1st choice 81% AUB 2nd choice 15%
AUB 3rd choice 2% AUB 4th or lower 2%

New Student Orientation

Attended: Yes 71% (vs.45% in 02) No 29% (54% in 02)
% is of those who answered item, n=527
Orientation attended: FROP 20% (36%) TOP 73% (64%) ISOP 7%

Advising

Advisor assigned in time for registration Yes 86% (74%), No 14% (25%)
Met with advisor Yes 74% (50%)

On-line Registration

-Source of information on on-line registration

Web 82% (77%) Campus Circulars 13.4% (18%) Mail-in Circulars 4.2% (4%)

-SIS access 69% On-campus 47% Off-campus 40% Both

-Internet Provider: Terranet 19% Cyberia 14% Cable 5%
Inconet 13% IDM 20% AUB 13%

Only 207 (21%) provided response to this question, many of them provided more than one choice.

-Difficulty in on-line registration: Yes 73% (63%) No 27% (36%)

-Needed staff support Yes 56% (47%) No 44% (51%)

-Reason for difficulty:

6% No. of courses offered. 8% Course sections
81% Capacity/course/ section 6% Other

-Type of course difficulty found in:

36% University required courses 25% Upper level courses in major
18% Lower level courses in major 18% Electives
3 % Other (outlined in comment section)

Drop & Add

Found needed courses in Drop & Add: Yes 52% (47%) No 48% (49%)

Financial Aid

42% of respondents applied for financial aid

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 differences were on 15 of the 34 rating items, i.e. 35%. Tables 12 and 13 provide list of items where significant differences existed and the faculties concerned with these differences.

Placement Tests

No significant differences among faculties, though FAS and FEA had higher satisfaction with them.

Pre-registration

No significant differences were noted on organization of the process and staff professionalism, though FAS and FEA had higher satisfaction. Information in admission package and time taken differed significantly among faculties, with FAS and FEA obtaining higher satisfaction.

New Student Orientation

Attendance %s:	FAS 85, OSB 59, FHS 65, FEA 77, FAFS 41, SNU 71.
ISOP	5% 10%, 8%, 5%, 15%, 10%
FROP	25% 23%, 13%, 30%
TOP	70% 67%, 92%, 82%, 85%, 60%

No significant differences in satisfaction with orientation sessions among faculties.

Advising

	FAS	OSB	FHS	FEA	FAFS	SNU
Advisor assigned on time (% Yes)	89	83	88	88	82	83
Met with advisor (% Yes)	87	54	92	73	78	87

Significant differences in satisfaction with advising between faculties. FAS and FHS had highest satisfaction, while OSB had lowest means.

On-line Registration

There were insignificant differences on some items (4) with significant differences noted on: Off-campus registration, fairness of slot, and staff helpfulness and professionalism.

Difficulty in on-line registration (%Yes):	68%FAS	79%FEA	58%FAFS
	62% FHS	80% OSB	74% SNU

Needed staff support (%Yes) FAS 46, OSB 62, FHS 73, FEA 54, FAFS 62, SNU 62.

Reasons for difficulty:

	FAS	OSB	FHS	FEA	FAFS	SNU
No. of courses offered	6	4	3	8	5	3
Course sections	10	10	7	5	3	5
Capacity/course/section	78	81	86	80	85	92
Other	6	6	3	7	7	

Type of course, in which difficulty was found:

	FAS	OSB	FHS	FEA	FAFS	SNU
University required courses	38	38	19	36	25	33
Univ. upper level courses in major	23	33	16	23	14	7
Univ. lower level courses in major	18	16	16	12	33	30
Electives	17	7	48	28	25	27
Other	3	6		2	3	3

Statement of Fees

Non-significant differences between faculties on items relating to payment of fees.

ID Card & Renewal of stickers

Non-significant differences were found between faculties on items relating to ID Card & Renewal of stickers.

AUB Net Account

Significant differences were found between faculties on items relating to AUB Net Account, with FAS and FEA obtaining highest satisfaction and FHS lowest.

Drop & Add

Significant differences were noted on drop & add, with FHS, FEA and FAFS obtaining highest mean score and OSB lowest.

% Of students who found needed courses at D&A

FAS 56, OSB 41, FHS 54, FEA 58, FAFS 59, SNU 49.

Financial Aid

Non-significant differences were found between faculties on items relating to financial aid. All had low satisfaction.

Percentage who applied for financial aid

FAS 42, OSB 38, FHS 48, FEA 42, FAFS 36, SNU 59.

Overall Items

There were significant differences between faculties on five of the 13 overall items, with FAFS and FHS obtaining highest mean satisfaction and OSB lowest. FHS score on Advising was notably higher than others.

Table 10: Registration Process Steps by Faculty

Process	FAFS		FAS		OSB		FEA		FHS		SN	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
EPT	22	3.1	122	3.4	97	3.2	85	3.4	13	3.1	7	2.9
APT	32	3.3	125	3.3	97	3.3	95	3.3	20	2.9	6	2.8
Organization of Pre-Regist	41	3.1	188	3.4	131	3.0	127	3.3	20	3.1	15	3.0
Staff Professionalism	40	3.3	194	3.5	131	3.2	126	3.5	21	3.2	12	3.3
Information in Adm. Pac.	41	3.6	192	3.9	132	3.5	127	3.9	21	3.3	14	3.1
Time Taken	38	2.9	190	3.4	127	2.9	124	3.4	21	2.7	15	3.2
New Student Orient Activi	21	3.3	154	3.6	82	3.4	98	3.5	14	3.5	10	3.7
Availability of Advisor	68	3.3	279	3.6	240	2.8	187	3.2	50	4.0	52	3.8
Helpfulness of advisor	67	2.9	277	3.1	235	2.5	188	2.9	50	3.7	53	3.5
On-line Registration clarity of deadlines	58	3.4	261	3.7	251	3.7	185	3.9	47	3.9	43	3.9
SIS access On Campus	46	3.7	166	3.7	193	3.8	142	3.7	45	3.9	43	4.3
SIS access Off Campus	29	2.4	113	2.6	144	2.5	95	2.4	25	2.3	35	1.8
SID access Both	25	3.5	107	3.5	123	3.5	89	3.6	18	3.6	15	3.1
Fairness of reg. slots	58	3.0	258	2.7	258	2.5	186	2.5	51	3.2	43	3.1
Capacity of courses	60	2.5	265	2.5	259	2.0	191	2.1	51	2.7	44	2.5
Staff: Professionalism	44	3.3	182	3.4	206	3.1	134	3.3	36	3.3	38	3.6
Staff Helpfulness	48	3.3	185	3.3	206	2.9	140	3.2	39	3.4	38	3.2
Efficiency of on-line reg.	48	3.3	239	3.3	227	3.1	162	3.1	40	3.4	43	3.4
Receiving Statement	69	3.6	286	3.7	268	3.6	201	3.7	51	3.8	50	3.3
Deferred Payment	53	3.6	226	3.5	229	3.4	151	3.6	39	3.5	34	3.4
Payment process	65	3.8	284	3.8	262	3.7	194	3.7	46	3.7	44	3.5
ID Validation	65	4.1	280	4.1	265	4.0	190	4.1	50	4.0	51	3.7
Net account activate	66	3.8	279	3.9	256	3.7	190	4.0	48	3.6	52	3.6
Net account instructions	64	3.6	274	3.7	253	3.6	190	4.0	47	3.4	50	3.3
Drop & Add process	57	3.3	255	3.1	246	2.9	177	3.3	46	3.3	48	3.1

Table 11
Overall Evaluation of Registration Process by Faculty

	FAFS		FAS		OSB		FEA		FHS		SNU	
Process	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Registration Overall Process	66	3.4	284	3.2	265	3.0	197	3.1	50	3.4	51	3.3
Ambiance	63	3.3	272	3.1	258	3.0	188	3.0	50	3.2	45	2.9
Time Taken	66	3.1	279	3.0	267	2.9	197	2.8	50	3.1	50	2.9
Efficiency	66	3.4	281	3.3	265	3.0	195	3.1	50	3.4	50	3.1
Bureaucracy	63	3.2	271	3.0	256	2.9	189	2.9	47	3.1	45	2.9
Courtesy	60	3.4	266	3.2	256	2.9	185	3.0	47	3.2	44	3.0
Instructions	63	3.5	277	3.5	257	3.4	195	3.4	48	3.6	47	3.3
AUB Guide Service	64	3.4	269	3.6	259	3.4	188	3.4	48	3.6	49	3.4
Maps and Handouts	62	3.6	270	3.8	261	3.6	190	3.7	49	3.5	49	3.4
Campus Security Staff	62	3.9	272	3.8	253	3.9	189	3.8	48	3.9	48	3.6
New Student Orientation	47	3.5	204	3.7	173	3.4	152	3.5	30	3.8	31	3.3
Advising	65	3.1	279	3.1	249	2.6	189	3.0	50	3.7	51	3.3
Financial Aid: did you apply	62	1.7	259	1.6	236	1.6	178	1.6	40	1.5	51	1.4
Time of decision	25	2.6	117	3.1	98	2.6	82	2.7	18	2.7	31	2.7
Decision	24	2.4	115	2.8	96	2.5	82	2.4	18	2.6	31	2.7
Overall process	24	2.3	116	2.9	95	2.7	80	2.6	19	2.8	29	2.9
Dorms registration	18	2.9	71	3.6	66	3.1	34	3.5	13	3.2	11	3.1
AUB has high quality academic programs	61	4	273	4.0	258	4.0	182	4.1	50	4.0	46	4.0
AUB has high quality classroom & Lab facilities	60	3.7	273	3.6	257	3.5	179	3.6	50	3.8	46	3.8

Table 12.
Faculty Differences in Registration Satisfaction

Item	Significance	Faculty/High	Faculty/low
I. Placement Tests (EPT, APT)	NS		
II. Pre-registration (Office of Admissions)			
Organization of the pre-registration process	NS		
Staff Professionalism	NS		
Information in Admission package supplied	Sig.	FAS, FEA	FHS
Time Taken	Sig.	FAS, FEA	FHS
III. New Student Orientation (Office of Students Affairs)			
Orientation activities	NS		
IV. Academic Advising (Faculties)			
Availability of advisor	Sig.	FHS, FAS	OSB
Helpfulness of advisor	Sig.	FHS	OSB,
V. On-line Registration (Registrar's Office)			
Clarity of deadlines	NS		
SIS access -On-campus	NS		
Off-campus	Sig.	FAS	FHS
Both	NS		
Fairness of registration slot allocation by faculty/class	Sig.	FHS	OSB, FEA
Capacity of scheduled courses	Sig.	FHS	OSB, FEA
Staff: Professionalism	Sig.	FAS	OSB
Staff Helpfulness	Sig.	FHS	OSB
Efficiency of on-line registration	NS		
VI. Statement of Fees (Comptroller's Office)			
Receiving Statement	NS		
Deferred Payment Application process	NS		
Payment process	NS		
VII. ID Card & Renewal of Stickers (Registrar's Office)			
Validating the AUB ID process at the Office of Registrar	NS		
IX. AUBnet Account (Registrar's Office)			
Activating AUBnet Account process	Sig.	FEA, FAS	FHS
Adequacy of instructions	Sig.	FEA,	FHS
X. Drop & Add (Registrar's Office)			
Drop & Add process	Sig.	FHS, FEA, FAFS	OSB
XI. Financial Aid (Financial Aid Office)			
Time of Decision	NS		
Decision	NS		
Overall process	NS		

Table 13
Faculty Differences in Satisfaction – Overall Items

Item	Significance	Faculty/High	Faculty/low
Overall process	Sig.	FAFS, FHS	OSB
Ambiance	NS		
Time Taken	NS		
Efficiency	Sig.	FAFS, FHS	OSB
Bureaucracy	Sig.	FAFS	OSB, FEA
Courtesy	Sig.	FAFS	OSB
Instruction	NS		
AUB Student Guide Service	NS		
Maps & Handouts	NS		
Campus Security Staff	NS		
Orientation (for new students)	NS		
Advising	Sig.	FHS	OSB
Dormitory Registration	NS		
College Impressions			
AUB has high-quality academic programs	NS		
AUB has high-quality classroom & laboratory facilities	NS		

Student Satisfaction by Class

Tables 14-15 report student satisfaction by Class. Kruskal Wallis Test of significance helped to identify areas of significant differences. There were significant differences by class on nearly all of the items, except those related to EPT, Drop & Add, and Time of Financial Aid Decision. The results revealed higher mean ratings and satisfaction for freshmen on most of the steps and processes, with exception of placement testing and pre-registration. Sophomores came next in mean satisfaction with juniors happier in terms of financial aid decision. The same trend prevailed with respect to differences in the overall processes. Tables 14 and 15 highlight highest mean ratings (in green) and weak areas (in yellow) by class.

Summary of Students' Comments on Registration Steps

Concerning the placement tests, most of the students complained that the APT should be more difficult in order to reveal the real level of the students. According to the students, the pre-*registration* process was unorganized. Moreover, most of them claimed that the staff should be friendlier, while others considered them very cooperative. In addition, some of the new students considered the *student orientation* as slightly boring and unorganized while others believed it was great but it needs to be a bit earlier. Concerning the *academic advising*, most of the students considered the advisors to be not knowledgeable about their jobs and are inefficient. Moreover, they are always busy, not available, and sometimes abroad. Concerning the *on-line registration*, the students complained of the following: that it is too slow, errors in the system, time conflict, class restriction, capacities are very limited, lack of computers and unfriendly staff. Concerning the *statement of fees*, some students said that the date of payment is too early and the deadlines should be clearer. Moreover, most students regarded *ID Card* process

as a very speedy, easy, and efficient process. Also, they noted staff friendliness. Regarding the *AUBnet account*, some students considered it too complicated and complained of the conflict of passwords from the registrar's office. Concerning Drop & Add, most of the students considered the timing to be too early and recommended that it should be the second week after beginning of the semester. And at the same time they considered it as a useless and a hectic process.

The *students' suggestions* emphasized the need for car parking and more computers on campus and that renovation is needed, especially in the lower campus. Moreover, they complained that the cooling system turned out to be a freezing system so improving the conditioning system is suggested.

Table 14
Registration Process Steps by Class

Process	Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
EPT	16	3.4	200	3.4	92	3.1	34	3.3
APT	5	3.2	241	3.5	92	2.9	36	3.0
Organization of Pre-Regist	34	3.2	308	3.5	121	2.9	50	2.9
Staff Professionalism	36	3.2	310	3.6	120	3.0	51	3.1
Information in Adm. Pac.	37	3.8	314	4.0	118	3.3	51	3.2
Time Taken	35	3.2	307	3.4	118	2.8	48	3.0
New Student Orient Activi	32	3.8	261	3.5	65	3.7	20	2.8
Availability of Advisor	39	4.3	348	3.4	322	3.2	149	3.1
Helpfulness of advisor	39	3.5	346	3.1	319	2.9	149	2.7
On-line Registration clarity of deadlines	33	3.5	350	3.9	306	3.7	144	3.6
SIS access On Campus	22	3.9	256	3.6	244	3.9	123	4.0
SIS access Off Campus	15	3.5	138	2.7	183	2.1	99	2.5
SID access Both	16	3.8	139	3.7	144	3.4	75	3.3
Fairness of reg. slots	34	3.1	330	2.6	316	2.6	161	2.7
Capacity of courses	37	2.7	343	2.3	315	2.2	160	2.3
Staff: Professionalism	26	3.4	263	3.5	234	3.2	107	3.0
Staff Helpfulness	24	3.6	268	3.3	243	3.0	111	3.0
Efficiency of on-line reg.	29	3.7	324	3.1	269	3.2	127	3.3
Receiving Statement	38	4.0	367	3.9	335	3.5	167	3.3
Deferred Payment	30	3.7	296	3.8	274	3.4	123	3.1
Payment process	39	4.0	364	4.0	317	3.6	158	3.3
ID Validation	36	4.1	350	4.3	335	4.0	163	3.5
Net account activate	37	4.1	368	4.0	317	3.7	154	3.6
Net account instructions	37	3.7	364	3.8	312	3.6	150	3.5
Drop & Add process	32	3.2	313	3.2	319	3.1	153	3.0

Table 15
Overall Evaluation of Registration Process by Class

Process	Freshman		Sophomore		Junior		Senior	
	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Registration Overall Process	37	3.6	363	3.2	334	3.1	162	3.2
Ambiance	35	3.4	353	3.1	315	3.0	157	3.0
Time Taken	37	3.2	362	2.9	331	2.8	162	3.1
Efficiency	37	3.4	365	3.3	329	3.0	159	3.1
Bureaucracy	34	3.5	349	3.1	315	2.8	159	2.8
Courtesy	36	3.4	339	3.2	313	2.9	156	2.9
Instructions	37	3.7	356	3.6	322	3.3	156	3.3
AUB Guide Service	36	3.9	348	3.7	321	3.4	157	3.1
Maps and Handouts	36	4.3	356	4.0	318	3.5	157	3.2
Campus Security Staff	36	3.9	355	4.1	313	3.7	155	3.6
New Student Orientation	34	4.0	304	3.8	197	3.4	94	3.1
Advising	38	3.4	350	3.1	321	2.9	158	2.7
Time of decision	5	2.4	149	2.9	139	2.9	74	2.5
Decision	5	2.0	144	2.6	141	2.8	73	2.3
Overall process	5	3.0	141	2.8	140	2.9	75	2.4
Dorms registration	20	4.0	77	3.5	72	3.3	40	2.9
AUB has high quality academic programs	39	4.2	353	4.2	308	4.0	155	3.7
AUB has high quality classroom & Lab facilities	39	3.9	349	3.8	308	3.5	154	3.3