

Evaluation of the implementation of the new National Student Survey in 2017

This report presents the findings from the first stage of an evaluation of the implementation of the new National Student Survey in 2017. The second stage will be undertaken after the 2018 results are published to capture the full cycle of institutions' implementation activity.

 www.hefce.ac.uk

 [Subscribe to email alerts](#)

 [@hefce](#)

Evaluation of the implementation of the new National Student Survey in 2017

To	Heads of HEFCE-funded higher education institutions Heads of HEFCE-funded further education colleges Heads of universities and further education colleges in Northern Ireland Heads of institutions in Scotland Heads of participating alternative providers of higher education
Of interest to those responsible for	National Student Survey, The Student Experience, Planning, Quality assurance and quality
Reference	2018/06
Publication date	28 March 2018
Enquiries to	NSS@hefce.ac.uk

Executive summary

1. This report presents the findings from the first stage of an evaluation of the implementation of the new National Student Survey (NSS) in 2017. The second stage will be undertaken after the 2018 NSS results are published, to capture the full cycle of institutions' implementation activity.
2. The evaluation has been undertaken by HEFCE on behalf of the UK higher education funding bodies. It is an evaluation of the implementation of the NSS in 2017, rather than an evaluation of the main NSS questionnaire as a survey instrument..
3. This first stage evaluation comprised the analysis of two online surveys: a student questionnaire completed by 84,435 students between January and April following the completion of the main NSS in 2017; and an institutional questionnaire, administered by HEFCE in June and July 2017, completed by 113 higher education providers.

Key points

4. The collective response from both questionnaires has been generally positive. Students responded positively to many of the usability questions and the majority found the questions easy to understand. The majority of institutional staff were satisfied with Ipsos MORI's running of the survey.
5. However, several responses to quantitative and qualitative open response questions identify a number of areas that may benefit from further consideration and investigation.

Student questionnaire main findings

6. Among student respondents, 31 per cent did not consider the NSS to be a strong and recognisable brand.
7. A total of 40 per cent were unaware of a promotional campaign running at their institution before completing the NSS main survey, and an analysis of open responses resulted in several recommendations for improving the usability of the NSS online.

Institutional staff questionnaire main findings

8. Of staff respondents, 38 per cent reported a preference for using their own campaign and marketing materials or a mixture of their own and those that are available. These materials are available, from Ipsos MORI, without cost to the institution.

9. Some 65 per cent agreed that 'there are no further changes that I would want to see made to the NSS' while 19 per cent reported that further changes were necessary and 17 per cent neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. However, qualitative comments indicate a perception among some respondents that the NSS questions have been drafted with traditional institutions and traditional programmes in mind, and need further updating to ensure the NSS meets the needs of smaller providers, alternative providers, further education colleges and specialist institutions.

10. In view of the fact that previous piloting and testing indicated the questions were applicable across the diversity of programmes, further work may be needed in the second stage of the institutional evaluation to understand the issues raised, particularly for alternative providers and further education colleges.

Next steps

11. The findings of the present evaluation indicate that students and institutions are broadly positive about the implementation of the survey in 2017.

12. The areas identified as needing further investigation, including how the effectiveness of marketing and communications can be improved, will be considered by the UK funding bodies in time to feed into arrangements for the NSS 2019.

13. The findings will inform the second stage of the evaluation to be undertaken in autumn 2018.

Action required

14. This report is for information only.

Background

15. This report summarises the findings of the first stage of a two-part evaluation of the implementation of the National Student Survey (NSS) in 2017. The work has been undertaken by HEFCE, on behalf of the UK higher education funding bodies. A second stage will take place in autumn 2018.

16. Although the NSS questionnaire was tested and piloted prior to implementation, it is important to ensure that the changes have been implemented successfully. The evaluation explores student and institutional staff experiences of the survey including their views of the service provided by Ipsos MORI, the organisation that currently holds the contract for administering the survey¹.

17. The second stage of the evaluation will undertake further research with institutions after the 2018 results are published. This will help ensure that the evaluation reflects institutions' full cycle of activity in relation to the NSS 2017, including the impact of changes they may have made for 2018 as a result of their 2017 data.

About the NSS

18. The NSS secures feedback on the courses of final year undergraduates in England, Wales, Northern Ireland, and Scotland. The survey collects student views on various aspects of their undergraduate programmes to support quality improvement and quality assurance and to help prospective students make study choices. The NSS is designed to allow comparison between courses in the same subject at different institutions based on students' perceptions of their experiences.

19. The first comprehensive review of the NSS was commissioned by the UK funding bodies in 2014 and formed a part of the wider review of the provision of information. It concluded in 2016, with the changes made for NSS 2017 being tested and piloted before implementation². The new survey in 2017 incorporated a series of student engagement questions as well as revisions to some of the existing questions³.

Specific aims

20. The specific aims of the evaluation were to explore student experiences of completing the survey and institutional staff experiences of supporting the survey and its management, including whether there were any differences by types of provider – for instance, between higher education institutions (HEIs), further education colleges (FECs) and alternative providers (APs).

About the evaluation method

21. To understand how well the changes were received by students and institutional staff, two bespoke questionnaires were developed. The items in both questionnaires were designed to explore the management of the survey, including the overall marketing and advertising campaign as experienced by students and providers, as this is a key component in delivering a high target response rate for providers.

¹ Further information and evidence about the development of the NSS 2017 is available at www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/nss/.

² See the 'Review of the National Student Survey' (www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rereports/year/2014/nssreview/), for further information.

³ See www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/nss/review/ for further information.

22. All students eligible to participate in the NSS 2017 main survey were automatically eligible to take part in this initial evaluation⁴. However, students were only invited to respond to the evaluation questions if they completed the NSS online. For the institutional staff questionnaire, the NSS lead at each participating higher education provider was invited to complete the survey electronically.

23. The method and draft questions were agreed by the Student Information Advisory Group, which advises the UK funding bodies on information about access and participation, learning and teaching, the student experience and student outcomes⁵.

Student experience questionnaire

24. A short set of 11 questions and statements was developed to explore students' experience of participating in the NSS 2017. These covered usability, communications, branding and the survey items themselves. Open response questions were also included, for students to expand on their responses or provide additional commentary. See Annex A for a complete list of these items.

Institutional experience questionnaire

25. The institutional questionnaire was slightly longer and included 20 items. It also included or adapted items from the Ipsos MORI annual stakeholder survey, to minimise the burden on providers. It included free-text options for institutional staff, to allow a deeper understanding of their experience. The final questions are grouped into support, change and communications categories for presentational purposes. See Annex B for a full list of institutional questions.

26. The final set of questions was input into the SmartSurvey platform and published in June 2017⁶. The survey closed in July 2017. The survey was also translated into Welsh by the Higher Education Funding Council for Wales in line with its duties under the Welsh Language (Wales) Measure 2011, although no responses were received to the Welsh version of the survey.

Findings

27. The questionnaires used similar response formats that were, in themselves, similar to those used in the NSS main survey. The majority of survey items used Likert-type response, whereas a simple yes-no response was used for other questions. Open response options were also included, to gain a deeper understanding of respondents' experiences or identify issues not covered by the closed questions.

28. The percentage response rate is reported for each relevant item and the findings of most interest are highlighted in the tables that follow. Institutional responses have been analysed by provider type and reported where differences have been observed. In all tables, the percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding.

29. The open student responses are analysed using the principles of open-text mining. As a result the counts provided are indicative. Institutional staff responses were qualitatively analysed by coding and categorising into themes.

⁴ NSS eligibility criteria can be found at www.thestudentsurvey.com.

⁵ See www.hefce.ac.uk/lt/roiconsult/UKSIAG/ for further information.

⁶ See <https://www.smartsurvey.co.uk/> for further information about the survey platform.

Student questionnaire

30. A total of 84,435 individual responses were received from students. This represents 28 per cent of those who responded to the main survey.

Table 1: Percentage agreement for Likert items in the student experience questionnaire

	Definitely agree	Mostly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly disagree	Definitely disagree
1 The NSS questionnaire was easy to access	85	13	1	0	0
2 The survey was easy to navigate	88	11	1	0	0
4 The purpose and aims of the NSS are clear	60	27	8	3	2
5 The NSS questions are easy to understand	77	21	2	1	0
6 The NSS has a strong recognisable brand	43	27	21	7	3

31. Table 1 shows the percentage response rate to five of the student experience items. Students reported the NSS to be: easy to access (98 per cent 'Agree' or 'Mostly agree' in response to Question 1), easy to navigate (99 per cent in Question 2), easy to understand (97 per cent, Question 5) and the purpose and aims clear (87 per cent, Question 4). However, fewer students reported the NSS to be a strong and recognisable brand (69 per cent, Question 6).

Table 2: Percentage agreement for yes/no response items in the student experience questionnaire

	Yes (%)	No (%)
7 I am aware of the NSS promotional campaign at my institution	60	40
9 I understand anonymised NSS responses will be shared with my institution	97	3
10 I am aware NSS data are available publicly	86	14

32. It can be seen in Table 2 that 40 per cent of students had no prior awareness that a promotional campaign had been running at their respective institution during the run-up to completing the 2017 survey (Question 7). There was a high degree of awareness that the data is shared with institutions (97 per cent, Question 9) and that data is made publicly available (86 per cent, Question 10).

Student open responses

33. The three remaining student experience questions (Questions 3, 8 and 11) provided an open response option. This was to encourage respondents to expand on their quantitative responses, and provide a deeper understanding of how they thought the NSS design and promotion could be improved in the future and identify issues not covered by the closed questions.

- **Question 3** – How can the survey’s overall layout and look and feel be improved?
- **Question 8** – What is your overall impression of the branding and/or promotion of the NSS?
- **Question 11** – Do you have any other comments?

34. There was a substantial number of responses to Questions 3 (16,370) and 8 (20,435). However, the quality of responses were variable and many valid responses contained only short, generic and positive responses such as ‘good’ and ‘fine’. The open responses did not always directly relate to the question, as respondents often used the open response to provide general feedback, irrespective of the question topic.

35. Thus, although relevant comments were made, they were made by relatively few respondents compared with the overall number of open comments reported. To be included in this section, each theme must have been mentioned more than 100 times and be pertinent to the evaluation.

36. Although students responded positively to many of the usability questions, the qualitative findings contain some recommendations to enhance further the user experience of completing the NSS electronically online. These are:

- An extension of the parameters of the progress bar, so that it relates to the whole survey as opposed to each section.
- The navigation controls being improved, to prevent having to click back through every question to change a response.
- The response scale could be revised, because student respondents felt that the distance between ‘mostly disagree’ and ‘neither agree nor disagree’ was too great. The same was true for the corresponding agree options.
- Some comments specifically noted that though there were two separate fields, a technical error prevented them from entering the negative field.
- Other comments included requests for: more open response options in the survey; differentiation between teaching and administrative staff; differentiation between modules; and adjustments to take into account those studying for joint honours awards.
- The student experience aspect of this evaluation did not explicitly ask questions about students’ experience of communicating with Ipsos MORI. However, Question 8 asked ‘What is your overall impression of the branding and/or promotion of the NSS?’ This question elicited comments relating to the ‘over-promotion of the NSS by telephone and email’. Student respondents reported feeling ‘harassed’, which left them with feelings of ‘frustration’. While this was said of emails as well as phone calls, there were also some positive comments about emails being a helpful reminder.

Institutional response questionnaire

37. Responses to the institutional experience questionnaire were received from 113 individual higher education providers. This is a 28 per cent response rate among those eligible to participate. Of these, 55 (49 per cent) were HEIs, 25 (22 per cent) APs and 33 (29 per cent) FECs.

38. The analysis of institutional experience items included a breakdown of responses by provider type, and is reported only where a potential difference has been observed. However, only descriptive analysis has been performed so the significance of this observed difference cannot be assumed.

39. The majority of institutional staff responding to the survey reported having overall responsibility for the NSS at their institution. Analysis by provider type shows this percentage to increase to 84 per cent among APs only (Question 3).

40. Overall responsibility for the NSS in the institution was reported by 61 per cent of institutional staff, while the remaining 39 per cent expressed a responsibility for only a particular aspect of the NSS programme, such as survey promotion and publicity (Question 1).

Table 3: Percentage agreement for Likert items focusing on support received

		Definitely agree	Mostly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly disagree	Definitely disagree
4	Our institution felt adequately supported by Ipsos MORI during the NSS 2017	41	40	16	4	0
5	Ipsos MORI's campaign to support the implementation of the NSS 2017 was appropriately pitched for our institution	24	50	12	12	1
7	Ipsos MORI made sure that supportive campaign materials e.g. posters and pens were fit for purpose	35	41	18	5	1
9	We do all that we can to encourage students to participate in the survey	88	12	1	0	0
17	Our promotional and marketing materials were designed & produced internally instead of using those from Ipsos MORI	18	20	17	22	23

41. The questions grouped in Table 3 show the responses for survey items focusing on the support available to providers and students during the 2017 NSS.

42. A total of 81 per cent of providers felt adequately supported during the 2017 census (Question 4). The available support was appropriately pitched for respective providers, with 74 per cent either definitely or mostly agreeing to Question 5.

43. The campaign materials, available to providers of higher education without charge, were reported as being fit for purpose by 76 per cent of institutional respondents (Question 7). However, 38 per cent either mostly or definitely agreed that they preferred to use their own campaign materials or a combination of the two (Question 17).

Table 4: Percentage agreement for Likert items associated with change

		Definitely agree	Mostly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly disagree	Definitely disagree
11	The questions in the NSS cover topics relevant to my institution	30	57	9	4	0
12	There are no further changes that I would want to see made to the new NSS in 2018	30	35	17	12	6
14	Overall, I am satisfied with the way Ipsos MORI ran the NSS in 2017	43	42	12	3	1
18	The response rate that Ipsos MORI achieved on our behalf was satisfactory	33	46	12	4	4
19	The process for Ipsos MORI to collect information from our institution needs improving	11	14	37	28	11

44. The questions reported in Table 4 sought to explore how well the 2017 survey had been implemented, and to provide an indication of provider satisfaction with the NSS implementation process and the work completed on the providers' behalf. This would include the institutional level response rate.

45. Some 87 per cent of staff agreed that items in the NSS 2017 were relevant to their institution (Question 11), and 65 per cent agreed that no further changes were necessary in the NSS for 2018 and beyond (Q12). However, the fact that 35 per cent did not agree with the second item may require further investigation.

46. A total of 85 per cent of staff reported a high degree of satisfaction with the way Ipsos MORI had managed the NSS in 2017 (Question 14), and 79 per cent were satisfied with the response rate achieved on their behalf (Question 18). Responses to Question 19 ('The process for Ipsos MORI to collect information from our institution needs improving') were less clear, with 25 per cent agreement, 37 per cent neither agreeing nor disagreeing and 39 per cent disagreement.

Table 5: Percentage agreement for Likert items associated with communication

		Definitely agree	Mostly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Mostly disagree	Definitely disagree
6	The staff at Ipsos MORI have a polite and helpful attitude	55	26	17	2	1
10	I was fully aware that the NSS had changed and the changes had been made clear to me before the survey started.	80	10	7	2	1
15	Communications between Ipsos MORI and my institution have been effective	42	43	12	3	0
16	The customer service I received from Ipsos MORI has met my expectations	50	31	17	3	0

47. Items in Table 5 sought to explore how helpful and effective the communications between Ipsos MORI and providers were in supporting the completion of the NSS 2017.

48. The staff at Ipsos MORI were reported to have a polite and helpful attitude by 81 per cent of institutional staff who responded to the survey (Question 6), while the agreement rate of 90 per cent to Question 10 demonstrates a high degree of awareness that the 2017 survey had changed before implementation. Communications between Ipsos and institutional staff were thought to be effective by 81 per cent of respondents, and the customer services received during the survey period had met the institutions' expectations (Question 16).

Institutions' open responses

49. The closed questions produced satisfactory evaluative outcomes in terms of the percentage agreement with survey items. However, an analysis of qualitative data has produced findings that may benefit from further consideration, specifically relating to staff satisfaction with the support received during the NSS 2017 campaign and the quality and utility of campaign materials.

50. The open responses were coded and categorised into a number of themes. Of these, 61 per cent were associated with the theme of **support and communication from Ipsos MORI customer service**. Recommendations for improvement included the data collection process, general comments about Ipsos customer service, the pitching of the NSS to individual institutions and the free availability of promotional materials.

51. In relation to the **data collection process**, institutional staff respondents acknowledged recent improvements in targeting the right cohort, yet required more flexibility with managing the survey population. Others mentioned that the process for amendments was unclear, and suggested that HEFCE involvement slowed the processes down considerably. Other respondents remarked that while the changes to the questions were known, other substantial changes, for instance to the methodology, were undertaken without any prior consultation or notification.

52. Comments about **Ipsos customer service** included that responses to online message boards were too slow, support from the helpline was not always helpful, and the premature start to the survey was also unhelpful. Others reported feeling that their calls to Ipsos MORI were not always welcome.

53. In the comments on the campaign and promotional material, some respondents reported that the NSS was **not pitched for their institution**, suggesting that the information, including briefings, needed to be better targeted towards FECs and APs as at present it was more suited to a 'traditional institution'.

54. In relation to the **free availability of materials**, materials were frequently reported as arriving too late or in poor condition. It was reported that the design delay caused unnecessary printing pressures and that pens, pencils and rulers were a waste. Some respondents called for the return of specific marketing products that had been discontinued, or reported a noticeable decline in the quality and quantity of these materials in recent years.

55. The theme of **changes to the NSS** produced some relevant findings. Of the 54 responses included in this theme, 40 made reference to the notion that the NSS questions **were not relevant to all higher education providers**. Rather, respondents suggested that the NSS was more appropriate for traditional three-year degree programmes, while others stated that it was 'HEI-centred' and did not account for the differences between HEIs, APs and FECs.

56. A further concept to emerge focused on **changes to the questions** in the NSS. It was suggested that the 'new question decisions' were somewhat subjective in nature; there were suggestions about the removal or re-ordering of the questions about students' unions; and it was suggested that the NSS would be more accurately described as measuring 'people's perceptions about their courses'.

57. Respondents also suggested **changing the calculation method**, feeling that the way that 'agreement' is currently reported distorts the true findings. Related suggestions included reporting results with whole numbers rather than to two decimal places, and adjusting the response scale. In the 12 neutrally coded responses it was clear that these respondents considered it too soon to consider any further changes to the NSS. Some suggested that further changes could be disruptive, and that the NSS 2017 needed time to accrue enough data for annual comparisons and a full evaluation of the impact of the 2017 changes before further revisions were planned.

58. The evaluation survey questions that focused on satisfaction with the **service and response rate** achieved on the institution's behalf were Questions 14 and 18. The data from these questions suggest that, overall, the institutional staff who responded were happy with the service they had received from Ipsos MORI (85 per cent) while 79 per cent were satisfied with the response rate that was achieved on their behalf in the 2017.

59. The analysis of qualitative data found that 11 per cent (27) of all open comments were coded to the theme of **response rates**. Institutional staff showed mixed views in attributing success in delivering a satisfactory response rate. Many institutions attributed success internally, stating that their final response rate was a product their own hard work as opposed to being externally attributable to Ipsos MORI. Other institutional respondents reported disappointment that their response rate was negatively affected by the National Union of Students' boycott, while others stated they did not receive the dedicated help they were promised. One respondent asked

for more information on which students have not completed the survey to be available before the end of the census period.

Conclusion

60. The headline finding of this initial evaluation is that students' and providers' experience has generally been positive, but that there are a number of findings that would benefit from a more in-depth follow-up.

Marketing and promotion of the survey

61. Findings from the student and institutional surveys indicate that there may be scope for improvements to the marketing and promotion of the survey.

62. Some 31 per cent of students did not associate the NSS with a strong and recognisable brand. In view of the extensive promotion of survey to prospective students as a tool for decision making, for example through Unistats and within institutions, it may be helpful to explore whether there is room for improvement in approaches to promoting the survey.

63. A total of 40 per cent of students were unaware of a promotional campaign running at their institution before completing the survey in 2017. The promotional campaign has, to date, been considered to make a substantial contribution to the response rate achieved. Further exploration to understand the relationship between campaigns and response rates may be helpful, to inform potential improvements to the promotion of the survey.

64. Of institutional staff, 38 per cent reported a preference for using their own campaign and marketing materials, or a mixture of their own and those that are available without cost from Ipsos MORI.

65. Analysis of institutions' open-text responses suggests that there are concerns about the quality of the campaign materials, and that resources are too focused on traditional providers and traditional programmes of study. Students' open responses indicate that some students view the NSS as being over-promoted.

66. As the production and dissemination of the campaign materials is paid for by the funding bodies, consideration may need to be given to the quality and relevance of resources, approaches and roles in marketing the survey overall.

The questionnaire

67. Findings suggest the survey instrument has largely been well received, but that the experience of diverse types of provider would benefit from further consideration, and some adjustments to the survey interface would be helpful to improve usability.

68. Among institutional respondents, 65 per cent agreed with the statement 'There are no further changes that I would want to see made to the NSS' while the remaining third (17 per cent) neither agreed nor disagreed; 18 per cent agreed that further changes were necessary.

69. The qualitative findings suggest a perception that the NSS questions have been drafted with traditional institutions and traditional programmes in mind, and need further updating to ensure they meet the needs of smaller institutions, APs, FECs and specialist institutions.

70. In view of the fact that previous piloting and testing indicated the questions were applicable across the diversity of programmes, further work may be needed in the second stage of institutional evaluation, to understand the issues raised particularly for APs and FECs.

71. The analysis of open-text responses provided several recommendations for improving the usability of the online survey for students and their experience. These are:

- improving the progress and navigational adjustments
- addressing the view, from some students, that the NSS 2017 was over-promoted, resulting in feelings of harassment and frustration
- solving a potential technical error with the electronic survey.

Next steps

72. The areas identified for further investigation and improvement, including how the effectiveness of marketing and communications can be increased, will be considered by the UK funding bodies in time to feed into arrangements for NSS 2019.

73. The findings will inform development of the second stage of the evaluation, to be undertaken in autumn 2018.

Annex A: Student survey items

1. **The NSS questionnaire was easy to access** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
2. **The survey is easy to navigate** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
3. **How can the survey's overall layout and look and feel be improved?** (open response)
4. **The purpose and aims of the NSS are clear** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
5. **The NSS questions are easy to understand** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
6. **The NSS is a strong recognisable brand** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
7. **I am aware of the promotional campaign at my institution** (yes or no)
8. **What is your overall impression of the branding and/or promotion of the NSS?** (open response)
9. **I understand anonymised NSS responses will be shared with my institution** (yes or no)
10. **I am aware NSS data are available publicly** (yes or no)
11. **Do you have any other comments?** (open response)

Annex B: Institutional staff questionnaire

1. **Please select the main areas of responsibility that you have in relation to the NSS at your institution** (Overall responsibility; preparing target list and sample; survey promotion and publicity; monitoring response rates; results analysis and dissemination; no responsibility over the NSS; other (please specify))
2. **Which institution do you work for?** (open response)
3. **Was this the first year that you worked on the NSS within your institution** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
4. **Our institution felt adequately supported by Ipsos MORI during the NSS 2017** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
5. **Ipsos MORI's campaign to support the implementation of the NSS 2017 was appropriately pitched for our institution** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
6. **The staff at Ipsos MORI have a polite and helpful attitude** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
7. **Ipsos MORI made sure that supportive campaign materials e.g. posters and pens were fit for purpose** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
8. **Our institution devoted a lot of time and resources to effectively run the NSS in 2017** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
9. **We do all that we can to encourage students to participate in the survey** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
10. **I was fully aware that the NSS had changed and the changes had been made clear to me before surveying started** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
11. **The questions in the NSS had changed and the changes had been made clear to me before surveying started** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
12. **There are no further changes that I would want to see made to the NSS in 2018** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
13. **Please use the space provided here to expand on or contextualise the answers you have already given** (open response)
14. **Overall I am satisfied with the way Ipsos MORI ran the new NSS in 2017** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)

15. **Communication between Ipsos MORI and my institution has been effective** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
16. **The customer service I received from Ipsos MORI has met my expectations** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
17. **Our promotional and marketing materials were designed and produced internally instead of using those provided by Ipsos MORI** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
18. **The response rate that Ipsos MORI achieved on our behalf was satisfactory** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
19. **The process for Ipsos MORI to collect information from our institution needs improving** (definitely agree, mostly agree, neither agree nor disagree, mostly disagree, definitely disagree)
20. **Please use this space to provide comments and any additional information to questions 15-19 above. Please state which question this refers to** (open response)