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This study presents the results of a three-step project designed to: (1) identify what students perceive to be quality service as offered by instructors, (2) relate the dimensions identified to an appropriate survey instrument (the QISS) and pilot-test the instrument, and (3) survey a stratified representative sample of the undergraduate population with the instrument. A stratified sample of students (N=457) were surveyed using the QISS questionnaire in the spring semester of 2004. The QISS is a modified SERVQUAL questionnaire. Results indicate that students consistently identify Reliability and Responsiveness as the most important dimensions of instructor service to students. Female students consistently report that their experiences with instructors do not meet their expectations. The same holds true for males but to a lesser degree. Information provided from this kind of assessment provides a means of identifying areas where student satisfaction is already strong and areas where it can be improved.

Introduction

At the 2002 fall semester faculty conference, the president of our historically black college/university (HBCU) stated that a main goal for the university’s future was to provide quality service in order to improve student retention. Subsequently, all departments and colleges were charged with developing plans to improve customer service and thereby increase student retention. The suggested proposals were combined and distributed for all faculty to consider. These have been discussed at a number of conferences and symposia over the past two years. Yet few of the proposals addressed improving the quality of customer service.

*Corresponding author. Department of Communications, PO Box 271, Alabama State University, Montgomery, AL 36101, USA. Email: EmanuelASU@yahoo.com

ISSN 0260-2938 (print)/ISSN 1469-297X (online)/06/050535–15
© 2006 Taylor & Francis
DOI: 10.1080/02602930600679548
Reaction to the customer service perspective

It is not surprising that many of the faculty at this university were reluctant to view themselves as being engaged in a service industry or to consider their students as customers. There has been much objection to the notion of applying for-profit business concepts to not-for-profit educational endeavors (Laskey, 1998; Walsch, 1998; Shapiro, 2002). It appears that much of the opposition to the ‘students as customers’ outlook stems from a flawed understanding of the word ‘customer’ or what Engel (1990) defines as a verbal or linguistic dispute rather than a real dispute. Whereas real disputes argue facts, verbal disputes argue semantics. Swenson (1998) argues that many academicians with little or no business experience tend to assume that business people accept literally the philosophy that ‘the customer is always right’. When applied in academia, this misguided notion presumably creates a slippery slope to things like student-dictated curricula and grade inflation. Furthermore, a study by Strebel (1996) found that faculty and staff alike tend to resist an institutional shift to a service-oriented paradigm because most have the conviction that providing service to students is simply not their job! Shelley (2005) suggests that a more appropriate analogy for the instructor–student relationship comes from medicine, not business. He states that ‘students are like patients, and professors are like doctors’ (p. B16). Following this analogy, ‘customer service’ would be akin to a doctor’s bedside manner. Whether one uses the term ‘customer service’ or ‘bedside manner’ or simply ‘instructor rapport with students’, the fact is that instructors the world over provide service to students.

There is ample evidence that universities internationally are embracing a ‘customer service’ model. The Universities and Colleges Information Systems Association’s (UCISA) 2004 ‘Customer First!’ Management Conference in Manchester, England, stated that ‘universities are entering a more competitive marketplace in which students see themselves as consumers’. Shank et al. (1996) state that in the future students will behave more like consumers and expect ‘value’ for money and the time spent in the classroom. Narasimhan (1996a, 1996b, 1997) links ‘customer service’ concepts and measures to teaching and learning in an international context. Julianne East’s 2001 article, ‘International students identified as customers: their expectations and perceptions’, states that higher education in Australia is urged to operate more commercially and that more often students are identified as customers.

Customer service defined

It is important to note that economists routinely classify educational institutions as belonging in the service industry (Encyclopedia of Careers and Vocational Guidance, 2002). Educational institutions are, by the very nature of what they do, service organizations. This idea is apparent in the definition of quality customer service by Martin (1986), which states that it is: ‘A willingness by one to assist another to obtain individual needs and wants in a responsive and cooperative manner’. Feigenbaum (1991) and Smith and Whitehall (1987) suggest that the definition of service quality is what
the customer says it is. Primarily, service organizations are a group of people working
with and serving other people (Adams, 1992). Successful service organizations are
customer driven to provide quality service and they rely upon the contributions of all
organizational members to achieve stated objectives. According to Gold (2001), fail-
ure by faculty to realize that their students are their customers can lead to attitudes
and behaviors that are inappropriate and potentially disruptive to the university’s
customer service goals. Thus, a service orientation by the faculty should be consid-
ered just as important as effective teaching methods and technologies. Wallace (2000)
observed that failure to provide satisfactory service to students may ultimately have a
negative effect on enrollment, retention, funding, job security, and the viability of the
university.

There is wide agreement among service organization theorists that customer satis-
faction is the basis for customer retention and brand loyalty (Zemke & Anderson,
1996; Johnson & Gustafsson, 2003; Schmitt, 2003). The best way to determine
customer satisfaction with service is to assess it. Service, however, is difficult to
measure and to evaluate because of its intangibility (Barrington & Olsen, 1987).
Because it is both produced and received simultaneously, service requires the active
participation of the customer who may or may not facilitate the service provider in
order to realize a full and rewarding experience. In higher education, students receive
the services of instructors as service providers. Students must be present and must
participate in the service interaction in order to realize the full effect of the service
being provided. This suggests that educational institutions are more client-based than
product-based. The recipients of the services—clients—eventually become the prod-
ucts of the educational institution which are then ‘consumed’ by the economy and the
businesses that compose it (Swenson, 1998).

An instructor in the university setting is a service provider who can be seen as a
‘boundary spanner’ who attempts to span the needs of both employer (university) and
the student through activities designed to satisfy both (Thompson, 1967). In compar-
ison to other university employees, instructors tend to be the most ‘high contact’
service providers in the organization due to the number and duration of their interac-
tions with the students and the opportunity to build a history with students over the
course of an academic term. Thus, the boundary-spanning instructor is both the
primary provider of service and the point of contact between the university and its
customers. Martin (1986) suggests that whatever the boundary spanner does and
says, s/he is the organization when serving as the point of contact with customers.
Instructors, then, are the ones that manage service as an information exchange
medium (Naisbitt, 1984) which is essential to the successful delivery of the services
being provided. While teaching is only one role most modern universities fulfill, it is
foundational to a university’s existence.

The current three-step project resulted in the development and use of an instru-
ment to assess student perceptions of the quality of service provided by instructors in
a university setting. It was determined early in this process that student evaluations
of teacher effectiveness (SETEs), which are administered every semester, were mainly
evaluations of faculty adherence to university policies rather than assessments of
customer satisfaction (Havelka et al., 2003). Even though SETEs do offer questions dealing with an instructor's rapport with students, it is clear that this sort of survey is more oriented towards evaluations of faculty for promotion, tenure, and salary considerations than toward measuring student perceptions of instructor service.

Method

The first step

Initially, student input was sought to determine the dimensions of service that students associate with excellent instructors and instruction. The first step (Adams & Emanuel, 2004) involved providing students in basic speech communication courses with an overview of our university president's goals for improving customer service. Students were then provided with a definition of quality customer service. Student focus groups were charged with identifying the specific interactive behaviors they felt were exemplary of quality service. Then they were asked to rank-order these behaviors in terms of importance. The focus groups identified key preferences for what they felt their instructors should do. These preferences were developed into a ten-item, Likert-type instructional service questionnaire that was distributed to 83 students. Sixty-five students completed and returned these surveys.

The preferences students identified coincide with the dimensions of service quality as advanced by Garvin (1984) and with previous customer service assessments compiled by Zeithaml et al. (1990). According to their investigations, the attributes of quality service are: Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance and Empathy. Tangibles include appearance of the classroom, student seating and the like. Reliability is the instructor's ability to instruct the course dependably and accurately. Responsiveness addresses the instructor's willingness to respond to students' questions and concerns. The instructor's knowledge and ability to convey trust and confidence to students define the Assurance dimension. Empathy is the caring and individual attention the instructor provides his/her students. These five dimensions are tracked on the SERVQUAL instrument developed by Parasuraman et al. (1988).

The popular SERVQUAL questionnaire is ‘one of the preeminent instruments for measuring the quality of services as perceived by the customer’ (Stafford et al., 1999, p. 1). This instrument is often recommended by the Marketing Science Institute as the primary step in building a model of balancing customers’ perceptions of the value of a particular service with the customers’ need for that service (Zeithaml, 1990). The instrument has been used widely in service quality surveys by client-based organizations to include: hospitals, light and power companies, financial institutions, hospitality industries, information systems, and most applicably, academic libraries (Cook, 1999).

The second step

The second step (Emanuel & Adams, 2004) involved modifying the SERVQUAL instrument’s questions to fit both the instructor–student interaction and the academic
context. This resulted in an instrument which will be referred to as the Quality of Instructor Service to Students (QISS) questionnaire.

Eighty-two students and fifty-one faculty members completed the survey. Students consistently expressed higher expectations than actual experiences. Students and faculty indicated that Reliability was clearly the most important dimension to them. Students and faculty also rated Tangibles and Empathy lower than the other attributes. While Tangibles are not generally controlled by the instructor, this element may certainly affect the provision of service. Student respondents do not seem to expect or experience Empathy as much as they do Assurance, Responsiveness, or Reliability. The five dimensions of instructor service to students demonstrated strong reliability with alpha coefficients ranging from 0.81 to 0.94. Based on comments from students and faculty, minor modifications were made to the instrument. For example, instead of asking for students’ expectations of ‘excellent’ instructors, students were asked about their expectations of instructors in general. And instead of asking students to assess their instructor, they were asked to assess their overall experience with all their instructors ‘at this school’.

The QISS questionnaire

The QISS questionnaire consists of two sets of 20 affirmatively worded statements which respondents rate on a 7-point Likert-type (1932) scale from (1) Strongly Disagree to (7) Strongly Agree. The first set of statements probes students’ expectations of their instructors in general. The second set of statements parallels the first except that students assess the extent to which they believe their instructors at this school exhibit those behaviors. So, the first set of statements assesses expectations and the second set assesses actual experiences. These two sets of statements are separated by a middle section which asks students to allocate a total of 100 points among five statements according to how important each statement is to them. These scores are called ‘importance weights’. Each statement is representative of one of five key dimensions of service—Tangibles, Reliability, Responsiveness, Assurance, and Empathy. The survey also asks students’ gender and year in school and provides space for students to write comments (See Appendix 1 for a copy of the QISS).

Scoring the QISS

Each of the five key service dimensions are measured using four ‘expectation’ questions and four ‘experience’ questions. A ‘gap’ score is derived by subtracting the four experience scores for a dimension from the four expectation scores for that same dimension. Gap scores could range from a minimum of -6 to a maximum of 6. A negative gap score would indicate that students’ expectations are being exceeded. A positive gap score indicates that students’ expectations are not being met. The larger the gap score the stronger the respondent feels about expectations being met or not. An ‘unweighted gap average’ is simply the average of all the gap scores for a given dimension. A ‘weighted gap average’ is computed by multiplying the unweighted gap
average for a dimension times its related importance weight. An importance weight is a number between 0 and 100 that a respondent assigns to each of the five dimensions measured by the QISS questionnaire. If, for example, a student perceives the five dimensions to be equally important, each dimension would receive an importance score of 20. This helps put things in perspective. Even if a dimension has a relatively small unweighted gap average, its importance weight relative to the other dimensions may result in a relatively large weighted gap average for that dimension. Finally, an ‘overall gap average’ is determined by computing the average score for all the experience questions and then subtracting it from the average score for all the expectation questions. This overall gap average is a simple measure of whether or not students’ expectations are generally being met. It would be reasonable to say that the smaller the gap, the more satisfied the customer.

The third step

A 10% stratified sample of undergraduate students (N=457) at an historically Black college/university (HBCU) in the deep south completed the modified version of the QISS questionnaire in the spring semester 2004. The sample was stratified by class (i.e. 1st-year, 2nd-year, 3rd-year, 4th-year) and by gender. The majority of the surveys were distributed at the university’s annual college of arts and sciences research and creative activity symposium which was well attended by undergraduate students. The remainder of surveys were completed by students enrolled in basic speech communication courses in the same semester.

Results

Each of the five dimensions demonstrates strong internal consistency. Cronbach (1970) alpha coefficients range from 0.83 to 0.88 across the five ‘expectation’ dimensions and from 0.77 to 0.90 across the five ‘experience’ dimensions. Students were more consistent in their responses to the ‘expectations’ portion of the survey (SD = 0.99 to 1.12) than the ‘experience’ portion (SD = 1.51 to 1.67).

Both the largest and the smallest gap score occurred on two of the statements which partially comprise the Tangibles dimension. The largest gap occurred with ‘Instructors at this school hold class in modern classrooms with comfortable seating, heating, air conditioning, and instructional equipment’. The smallest gap occurred on the statement: ‘Instructors at this school provide class materials (such as syllabi and class schedules) that clearly explain course policies’. This held true across gender and year in school.

It is remarkable that only four respondents had negative gap scores across all five dimensions. All the overall average gap scores were positive. That is, students’ expectations are higher overall than their actual experiences at this school. It is also important to note that the majority of comments received on various questionnaires had to do with the staff, administration, and housing/dining operations at the school. Unweighted overall gap averages by year in school shows progressively larger average
scores for 1st-year through 3rd-year students, with 4th-year students having the smallest overall gap average of any class (See Figure 1). Females have a larger unweighted overall gap average (1.47) than do males (0.93). Females also have larger unweighted and weighted gap averages across all five dimensions.

Students were consistent in their assessment of the importance of the five dimensions regardless of year in school or gender. Reliability is consistently rated as the most important dimension. Responsiveness is consistently rated next most important followed by Tangibles, Assurance, and Empathy.

An interesting pattern emerges when analyzing gap averages by year in school. 1st-year and 4th-year students seem to track close together in their assessment of all five dimensions (See Figure 2) with 1st-year students having slightly larger gap averages on Tangibles and Reliability. That is, 1st-year students’ expectations on these two dimensions are not being met as much as 4th-year students’ expectations. While 2nd-year students have consistently larger gap averages than either 1st-year or 4th-year students across all five dimensions, 3rd-year students indicate the largest gap averages. In fact, 3rd-year students express a substantially larger weighted gap average than any other class on the key dimensions of Reliability and Responsiveness.

**Discussion**

The QISS instrument performed well with strong internal consistency. Students indicated more agreement about their expectations than they did their actual experiences with instructors at this school. Students report that their experiences with instructors
at this school consistently fall below their expectations. An important caution is in order here. It may be that students’ perceptions do not always line up with the kind of service they are actually receiving from their instructors. As stated previously, students must participate in the service interaction in order to realize the full value of the service. However, their perception is their reality and it is incumbent upon those seeking to provide excellent service to take note. It may also be that students’ expectations are unreasonably inflated. If so, instructors may have to emphasize what expectations are reasonable for their course. Whether this is a case of inflated expectations, invalid perceptions, or an accurate assessment of insufficient service is still at issue.

Students also consistently identify Reliability and Responsiveness as the most important dimensions of instructor service to students. That is, students place strong importance on instructors’ willingness to help students, to listen to and be responsive to students’ questions and comments, and to be available for appointments with students. Interestingly, students consistently rank Empathy as one of the least important of the five dimensions. Only 2nd-year students rank Assurance lower in importance than they do Empathy. This does not mean that Empathy is unimportant to students, rather it does not hold the same level of significance as the other dimensions. The fact that Empathy also has the smallest gap averages across gender and class suggests that students are relatively satisfied with the amount and kind of empathy they receive.

Overall, female students consistently report that their experiences with instructors at this school do not meet their expectations. The same holds true for males, but to a

Figure 2. Weighted gap averages by year in school

The larger the weighted gap average score, the more strongly the respondent feels that their expectations are not being met.
lesser degree. While males seem to feel the same about all five dimensions, females express the largest disparity when it comes to instructor Reliability. This seems to suggest that female students have a clearer set of instructor expectations when compared to their male counterparts. It may also suggest that male students lack specific expectations of instructors and/or are less critical.

Of particular interest is the increasing unweighted gap averages for 1st-year, 2nd-year, and 3rd-year students, and the break in that pattern by 4th-year students. The reasons for this are not altogether clear. Perhaps a longitudinal study tracking the same class throughout their college career would shed light on whether expectations are increasing or experiences are getting worse, or both. Barrington and Olsen (1987) submit that customers become more ‘savvy’ about what to expect (or not to expect) from service providers over a period of time. In essence, a sort of customer ‘training’ evolves from past service encounters.

Expectations are grounded in a student’s self-understanding and in knowledge about the school s/he attends. When applied to self, an expectation is like a plan or a goal. When directed at the institution, it is more of a requirement—a condition by which the student will measure his or her contentment with the institution. Expectations affect college experiences by acting as an organizational system or filter to help the student determine what is or is not worth attending to or putting effort toward. That is, expectations influence experience so as to construct what becomes reality for the student (Feldman, 1981). When a student’s expectations are met, he or she is more likely to remain in school and complete a degree. When expectations are unmet, the student may consider dropping out or transferring to an institution with a better fit (Braxton et al., 1995).

Effective customer service does not happen by accident. The best way to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the university’s instructional service is to assess it. Information provided from this kind of assessment provides a means of identifying areas where student satisfaction is already strong and areas where it can be improved. Strategies for improvement can be developed that will have a positive impact on student satisfaction with their instructional experience. An ongoing assessment will provide tangible evidence of the effectiveness of such strategies. This study suggests that the QISS instrument is both a reliable and versatile instrument that may be an attractive alternative to institutional researchers seeking to measure student satisfaction with instructor service. Utilizing the QISS is also a more cost-effective approach than retaining outside consulting firms such as Noel-Levitz, Inc. (2003).

If customer service is to be the number one priority, it must be a core value of the institution—one that is clearly defined and measured. This sort of endeavor can go a long way toward increased student retention.
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Appendix 1. Quality of Instructor Service to Students Questionnaire

This is a three-part questionnaire. **Part I** asks what you expect of excellent instructors in general. **Part II** asks how important different instructional service features are to you. **Part III** asks what your feelings are about instructors at this school overall. **It is important that you answer every question.** The results will help us to provide the best possible instructional service in the future.

**Part I**

Based on your experiences, please think about what you expect of your instructors. For each statement below, circling a (1) means that you strongly DISAGREE that your instructors should have this feature. Circling a (7) means that you strongly AGREE that your instructors should have this feature. If your feelings are not as strong, circle one of the numbers in the middle. There are no right or wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I expect my instructors to hold class in modern classrooms with comfortable seating, heating, air conditioning, and instructional equipment.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I expect my instructors to use texts and readings that are relevant to student success in the course.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I expect my instructors to possess the appropriate experience and qualifications to teach their courses.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I expect my instructors to provide class materials (such as syllabi and class schedules) that clearly explain course policies.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I expect my instructors to begin class on time and follow the course schedule.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I expect my instructors to provide students with stimulating and interesting class sessions that enhance the learning process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I expect my instructors to grade and return tests and assignments by the time they promise to do so.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I expect my instructors to keep accurate records of student scores and attendance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I expect my instructors to keep regular office hours and be available for appointments with students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I expect my instructors to be responsive to students’ questions and comments.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I expect my instructors to be willing to help students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I expect my instructors to NOT be too busy to listen to students’ requests.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II

Based on your experiences, please think about what you expect of excellent instructors. Listed below are five features pertaining to instructors and the service they offer. We would like to know how important each of these features is to you. Please allocate a total of 100 points among the five features according to how important each feature is to you. The more important a feature is to you, the more points you should allocate to it. Please make sure that the points you allocate to the five features add up to 100 points.

1. The appearance of the classroom, student seating, instructional equipment, required texts, and course materials (syllabi, class schedules, etc.) __________ points
2. The instructor's ability to instruct the course dependably and accurately. __________ points
3. The instructor's willingness to help students and to respond to students' questions and comments. __________ points
4. The instructor's knowledge and ability to convey trust and confidence to students. __________ points
5. The caring, individualized attention the instructor provides to his/her students. __________ points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. I expect my instructors to instill confidence in students.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. I expect my instructors to evaluate students consistently and fairly.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15. I expect my instructors to be courteous to students.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16. I expect my instructors to have the knowledge to answer students' questions.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. I expect my instructors to want their students to succeed in the course.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>18. I expect my instructors to offer to give students individual attention.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19. I expect my instructors to understand the specific needs of their students.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20. I expect my instructors to have their students' best interests at heart.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total points allocated: 100 points
Circle your response to these two questions.

1. What is your gender? Female Male

2. What year are you in school? Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior (1st-year) (2nd-year) (3rd-year) (4th-year)

Part III

The following statements relate to your feelings about instructors at THIS school overall. For each statement below, circling a (1) means that you strongly DISAGREE that instructors at THIS school have this feature. Circling a (7) means that you strongly AGREE that instructors at THIS school have this feature. If your feelings are not as strong, circle one of the numbers in the middle. There are no right or wrong answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Instructors at this school hold class in modern classrooms with</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfortable seating, heating, air conditioning, and instructional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructors at this school use texts and readings that are relevant to</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student success in their courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Instructors at this school possess the appropriate experience and</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualifications to teach their courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Instructors at this school provide class materials (such as syllabi</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and class schedules) that clearly explain course policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Instructors at this school begin class on time and follow the</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Instructors at this school provide students with stimulating and</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesting class sessions that enhance the learning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Instructors at this school grade and return tests and assignments by</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the time they promise to do so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instructors at this school keep accurate records of student scores</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and attendance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Instructors at this school keep regular office hours and are available</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for appointments with students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Instructors at this school are responsive to students’ questions and</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Instructors at this school are willing to help students.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Instructors at this school are NOT too busy to listen to students’</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requests.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for the time you have spent completing this questionnaire. The results will help us to provide the best possible instructional service in the future.

Comments