

Texas A&M International University
1998 Finance & Administration Service Quality Survey

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Job Category

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Executive/administra	A	49	30.1	30.4	30.4
Faculty	B	22	13.5	13.7	44.1
Secretarial/clerical	C	62	38.0	38.5	82.6
Technical/paraprofes	D	26	16.0	16.1	98.8
Service and maintena	E	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Employed by TAMIU

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Less than 1 year	A	39	23.9	23.9	23.9
1-4 years	B	74	45.4	45.4	69.3
5-9 years	C	26	16.0	16.0	85.3
10-19 years	D	17	10.4	10.4	95.7
20-29 years	E	7	4.3	4.3	100.0
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 163 Missing cases 0

Gender

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Male	A	57	35.0	35.6	35.6
Female	B	103	63.2	64.4	100.0
		3	1.8	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 160 Missing cases 3

BUSINESS OFFICE

Rate Service of Accounts Payable

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	29	17.8	17.9	17.9
Good	B	72	44.2	44.4	62.3
Fair	C	28	17.2	17.3	79.6
Poor	D	4	2.5	2.5	82.1
N/A	E	29	17.8	17.9	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

Rate Travel Section Services

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	52	31.9	32.1	32.1
Good	B	50	30.7	30.9	63.0
Fair	C	12	7.4	7.4	70.4
Poor	D	3	1.8	1.9	72.2
N/A	E	45	27.6	27.8	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

Visited Cashier for Travel Reimbursement

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	97	59.5	60.2	60.2
No	B	64	39.3	39.8	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Visited Cashier for Registration

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	77	47.2	48.1	48.1
No	B	83	50.9	51.9	100.0
		3	1.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	160	Missing cases	3		

Visited Cashier for Grants/Scholarships

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	30	18.4	18.8	18.8
No	B	130	79.8	81.3	100.0
		3	1.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	160	Missing cases	3		

Visited Cashier for Loans/Stafford

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	38	23.3	23.9	23.9
No	B	121	74.2	76.1	100.0
		4	2.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	159	Missing cases	4		

Visited Cashier for Other services

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	108	66.3	68.4	68.4
No	B	50	30.7	31.6	100.0
		5	3.1	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	158	Missing cases	5		

Cashier Slow Due to Computer Problem

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	23	14.1	17.3	17.3
No	B	110	67.5	82.7	100.0
		30	18.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	133	Missing cases	30		

Cashier Slow Due To Check Not Ready

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	47	28.8	35.6	35.6
No	B	85	52.1	64.4	100.0
		31	19.0	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	132	Missing cases	31		

Rate Cashier Section

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	35	21.5	21.9	21.9
Good	B	79	48.5	49.4	71.3
Fair	C	33	20.2	20.6	91.9
Poor	D	4	2.5	2.5	94.4
N/A	E	9	5.5	5.6	100.0
		3	1.8	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 160 Missing cases 3

Evaluate Business Office Courtesy

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	35	21.5	21.5	21.5
Good	B	85	52.1	52.1	73.6
Fair	C	31	19.0	19.0	92.6
Poor	D	9	5.5	5.5	98.2
N/A	E	3	1.8	1.8	100.0
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 163 Missing cases 0

Evaluate Business Office Overall

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	30	18.4	18.5	18.5
Good	B	95	58.3	58.6	77.2
Fair	C	26	16.0	16.0	93.2
Poor	D	8	4.9	4.9	98.1
N/A	E	3	1.8	1.9	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Rate Efficiency of HR Staff

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	80	49.1	49.1	49.1
Good	B	64	39.3	39.3	88.3
Fair	C	14	8.6	8.6	96.9
Poor	D	2	1.2	1.2	98.2
N/A	E	3	1.8	1.8	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 163 Missing cases 0

Rate Recruiting Effectiveness

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	26	16.0	16.3	16.3
Good	B	40	24.5	25.0	41.3
Fair	C	21	12.9	13.1	54.4
Poor	D	3	1.8	1.9	56.3
N/A	E	70	42.9	43.8	100.0
		3	1.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 160 Missing cases 3

Rate Assistance Concerning Benefits

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	48	29.4	29.8	29.8
Good	B	49	30.1	30.4	60.2
Fair	C	13	8.0	8.1	68.3
Poor	D	2	1.2	1.2	69.6
N/A	E	49	30.1	30.4	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
Total		163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Rate Clarity of Benefits Communication

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	35	21.5	21.7	21.7
Good	B	54	33.1	33.5	55.3
Fair	C	20	12.3	12.4	67.7
Poor	D	1	.6	.6	68.3
N/A	E	51	31.3	31.7	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	161	Missing cases	2		

Evaluate Usefulness of SD Workshops

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	44	27.0	27.0	27.0
Good	B	77	47.2	47.2	74.2
Fair	C	22	13.5	13.5	87.7
Poor	D	7	4.3	4.3	92.0
N/A	E	13	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	163	Missing cases	0		

Adequate Opportunity/Attend Workshops

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	117	71.8	73.6	73.6
No	B	42	25.8	26.4	100.0
		4	2.5	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	159	Missing cases	4		

Receive Most HR-Related Topics

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Hr Home Page	A	7	4.3	4.4	4.4
HR News & Views	B	85	52.1	53.1	57.5
Direct contact with	C	60	36.8	37.5	95.0
Other	D	8	4.9	5.0	100.0
		3	1.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	160	Missing cases	3		

Rate Effectiveness/HR News & Views

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	41	25.2	25.2	25.2
Good	B	90	55.2	55.2	80.4
Fair	C	29	17.8	17.8	98.2
Poor	D	1	.6	.6	98.8
N/A	E	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	163	Missing cases	0		

Rate Timeliness/HR News & Views

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	37	22.7	22.7	22.7
Good	B	87	53.4	53.4	76.1
Fair	C	32	19.6	19.6	95.7
Poor	D	3	1.8	1.8	97.5
N/A	E	4	2.5	2.5	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	163	Missing cases	0		

When I receive the HR News & Views I:

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Read it right away	A	77	47.2	47.5	47.5
Take it home	B	17	10.4	10.5	58.0
File it in my to rea	C	22	13.5	13.6	71.6
Scan and file for fu	D	39	23.9	24.1	95.7
Do not read it	E	7	4.3	4.3	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

Rate the HR News & Views on Length

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Too short	A	9	5.5	5.6	5.6
Just right	B	141	86.5	87.6	93.2
Too Long	C	11	6.7	6.8	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Rate HR Assistance on Leave Policies

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	55	33.7	33.7	33.7
Good	B	64	39.3	39.3	73.0
Fair	C	18	11.0	11.0	84.0
Poor	D	1	.6	.6	84.7
N/A	E	25	15.3	15.3	100.0
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 163 Missing cases 0

Rate HR Assistance on Time Cards

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	55	33.7	34.0	34.0
Good	B	63	38.7	38.9	72.8
Fair	C	16	9.8	9.9	82.7
Poor	D	1	.6	.6	83.3
N/A	E	27	16.6	16.7	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

Rate HR Assistance on Balances

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	49	30.1	30.4	30.4
Good	B	67	41.1	41.6	72.0
Fair	C	21	12.9	13.0	85.1
Poor	D	3	1.8	1.9	87.0
N/A	E	21	12.9	13.0	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Evaluate Courtesy of HR Staff

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	91	55.8	56.2	56.2
Good	B	56	34.4	34.6	90.7
Fair	C	11	6.7	6.8	97.5
Poor	D	2	1.2	1.2	98.8
N/A	E	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

Evaluate HR Overall

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	73	44.8	45.1	45.1
Good	B	77	47.2	47.5	92.6
Fair	C	11	6.7	6.8	99.4
Poor	D	1	.6	.6	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

PURCHASING

Rate Purchasing Policy Communication

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	19	11.7	11.7	11.7
Good	B	48	29.4	29.6	41.4
Fair	C	45	27.6	27.8	69.1
Poor	D	17	10.4	10.5	79.6
N/A	E	33	20.2	20.4	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

Evaluate Efficiency of PO Process

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	21	12.9	13.0	13.0
Good	B	51	31.3	31.5	44.4
Fair	C	37	22.7	22.8	67.3
Poor	D	12	7.4	7.4	74.7
N/A	E	41	25.2	25.3	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

Evaluate Courtesy of Purchasing Staff

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	20	12.3	12.4	12.4
Good	B	63	38.7	39.1	51.6
Fair	C	36	22.1	22.4	73.9
Poor	D	7	4.3	4.3	78.3
N/A	E	35	21.5	21.7	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Evaluate Purchasing Services Overall

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	22	13.5	13.6	13.6
Good	B	61	37.4	37.7	51.2
Fair	C	34	20.9	21.0	72.2
Poor	D	11	6.7	6.8	79.0
N/A	E	34	20.9	21.0	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

Response Time of Central Stores/SS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	56	34.4	34.6	34.6
Good	B	63	38.7	38.9	73.5
Fair	C	7	4.3	4.3	77.8
Poor	D	3	1.8	1.9	79.6
N/A	E	33	20.2	20.4	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

Rate Quality of Supplies/Central Stores

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	25	15.3	15.4	15.4
Good	B	77	47.2	47.5	63.0
Fair	C	32	19.6	19.8	82.7
Poor	D	7	4.3	4.3	87.0
N/A	E	21	12.9	13.0	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

Rate Response of Printing Request

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	48	29.4	29.6	29.6
Good	B	59	36.2	36.4	66.0
Fair	C	18	11.0	11.1	77.2
Poor	D	5	3.1	3.1	80.2
N/A	E	32	19.6	19.8	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

Rate Quality of Finished Products(PS)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	44	27.0	27.2	27.2
Good	B	57	35.0	35.2	62.3
Fair	C	26	16.0	16.0	78.4
Poor	D	6	3.7	3.7	82.1
N/A	E	29	17.8	17.9	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

Rate Handling of Special Mail Request

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	32	19.6	19.8	19.8
Good	B	73	44.8	45.1	64.8
Fair	C	17	10.4	10.5	75.3
Poor	D	2	1.2	1.2	76.5
N/A	E	38	23.3	23.5	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

Rate Accuracy/Timeliness of Mail

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	37	22.7	22.8	22.8
Good	B	75	46.0	46.3	69.1
Fair	C	25	15.3	15.4	84.6
Poor	D	4	2.5	2.5	87.0
N/A	E	21	12.9	13.0	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

Rate Receiving Notification Process

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	45	27.6	27.8	27.8
Good	B	71	43.6	43.8	71.6
Fair	C	14	8.6	8.6	80.2
Poor	D	8	4.9	4.9	85.2
N/A	E	24	14.7	14.8	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

Rate Property Inventory Communication

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	16	9.8	9.9	9.9
Good	B	59	36.2	36.6	46.6
Fair	C	29	17.8	18.0	64.6
Poor	D	7	4.3	4.3	68.9
N/A	E	50	30.7	31.1	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	161	Missing cases	2		

Rate Courtesy of Support Services Staff

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	48	29.4	30.0	30.0
Good	B	89	54.6	55.6	85.6
Fair	C	8	4.9	5.0	90.6
Poor	D	2	1.2	1.3	91.9
N/A	E	13	8.0	8.1	100.0
		3	1.8	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	160	Missing cases	3		

Evaluate Support Services Overall

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	42	25.8	26.1	26.1
Good	B	95	58.3	59.0	85.1
Fair	C	9	5.5	5.6	90.7
Poor	D	1	.6	.6	91.3
N/A	E	14	8.6	8.7	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	161	Missing cases	2		

BUDGET/PAYROLL/GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

Rate Annual Budget Process(ABP)

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	10	6.1	6.2	6.2
Good	B	24	14.7	14.9	21.1
Fair	C	22	13.5	13.7	34.8
Poor	D	9	5.5	5.6	40.4
N/A	E	96	58.9	59.6	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Rate Participation Extended to You in (A

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	11	6.7	6.8	6.8
Good	B	20	12.3	12.4	19.3
Fair	C	22	13.5	13.7	32.9
Poor	D	13	8.0	8.1	41.0
N/A	E	95	58.3	59.0	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Rate Time Allotted for Budget Preparation

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	6	3.7	3.8	3.8
Good	B	21	12.9	13.1	16.9
Fair	C	24	14.7	15.0	31.9
Poor	D	8	4.9	5.0	36.9
N/A	E	101	62.0	63.1	100.0
		3	1.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 160 Missing cases 3

Rate Assistance Provided for ABP

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	13	8.0	8.1	8.1
Good	B	27	16.6	16.8	24.8
Fair	C	12	7.4	7.5	32.3
Poor	D	12	7.4	7.5	39.8
N/A	E	97	59.5	60.2	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Rate Assistance Concerning Payroll

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	50	30.7	31.1	31.1
Good	B	77	47.2	47.8	78.9
Fair	C	22	13.5	13.7	92.5
Poor	D	7	4.3	4.3	96.9
N/A	E	5	3.1	3.1	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Rate Clarity of Information in Payroll Stub

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	45	27.6	27.8	27.8
Good	B	81	49.7	50.0	77.8
Fair	C	31	19.0	19.1	96.9
Poor	D	5	3.1	3.1	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

Rate Payroll Checks Distribution

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	67	41.1	41.4	41.4
Good	B	75	46.0	46.3	87.7
Fair	C	17	10.4	10.5	98.1
Poor	D	2	1.2	1.2	99.4
N/A	E	1	.6	.6	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

How are you being paid?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Bi-weekly	A	96	58.9	59.6	59.6
Monthly	B	64	39.3	39.8	99.4
	C	1	.6	.6	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	161	Missing cases	2		

Rate Satisfaction with Pay Method

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	68	41.7	42.2	42.2
Good	B	50	30.7	31.1	73.3
Fair	C	16	9.8	9.9	83.2
Poor	D	21	12.9	13.0	96.3
N/A	E	6	3.7	3.7	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	161	Missing cases	2		

Rate Assistance of Grants & Contracts

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	2	1.2	1.3	1.3
Good	B	13	8.0	8.1	9.4
Fair	C	11	6.7	6.9	16.3
Poor	D	5	3.1	3.1	19.4
N/A	E	129	79.1	80.6	100.0
		3	1.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 160 Missing cases 3

Rate Instruction on Preparing Proposals

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	2	1.2	1.3	1.3
Good	B	11	6.7	6.9	8.1
Fair	C	12	7.4	7.5	15.6
Poor	D	5	3.1	3.1	18.8
N/A	E	130	79.8	81.3	100.0
		3	1.8	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 160 Missing cases 3

Evaluate Courtesy of Budget/Payroll

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	36	22.1	22.2	22.2
Good	B	74	45.4	45.7	67.9
Fair	C	23	14.1	14.2	82.1
Poor	D	3	1.8	1.9	84.0
N/A	E	26	16.0	16.0	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

Evaluate Overall Budget/Payroll Services

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	29	17.8	17.9	17.9
Good	B	83	50.9	51.2	69.1
Fair	C	18	11.0	11.1	80.2
Poor	D	6	3.7	3.7	84.0
N/A	E	26	16.0	16.0	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

COMPUTER AND TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICES

Rate CTS Efficiency to Service Requests

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	36	22.1	22.2	22.2
Good	B	64	39.3	39.5	61.7
Fair	C	43	26.4	26.5	88.3
Poor	D	10	6.1	6.2	94.4
N/A	E	9	5.5	5.6	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

Rate CTS Service Request Outcome

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	29	17.8	17.9	17.9
Good	B	73	44.8	45.1	63.0
Fair	C	43	26.4	26.5	89.5
Poor	D	9	5.5	5.6	95.1
N/A	E	8	4.9	4.9	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

Rate CTS Communication on Services

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	42	25.8	25.9	25.9
Good	B	69	42.3	42.6	68.5
Fair	C	35	21.5	21.6	90.1
Poor	D	8	4.9	4.9	95.1
N/A	E	8	4.9	4.9	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 162 Missing cases 1

CTS uses technology to its potential?

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	101	62.0	66.9	66.9
No	B	50	30.7	33.1	100.0
		12	7.4	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	151	Missing cases	12		

Evaluate Courtesy of CTS Staff

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	46	28.2	28.4	28.4
Good	B	80	49.1	49.4	77.8
Fair	C	26	16.0	16.0	93.8
Poor	D	5	3.1	3.1	96.9
N/A	E	5	3.1	3.1	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

Rate Overall Services Provided by CTS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	41	25.2	25.3	25.3
Good	B	78	47.9	48.1	73.5
Fair	C	28	17.2	17.3	90.7
Poor	D	9	5.5	5.6	96.3
N/A	E	6	3.7	3.7	100.0
		1	.6	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	162	Missing cases	1		

PHYSICAL PLANT

Rate Physical Plant Response Time

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	47	28.8	29.2	29.2
Good	B	59	36.2	36.6	65.8
Fair	C	31	19.0	19.3	85.1
Poor	D	7	4.3	4.3	89.4
N/A	E	17	10.4	10.6	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Rate Outcome of Physical Plant Services

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	37	22.7	23.0	23.0
Good	B	84	51.5	52.2	75.2
Fair	C	22	13.5	13.7	88.8
Poor	D	1	.6	.6	89.4
N/A	E	17	10.4	10.6	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Rate Cleanliness of Campus Facilities

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	59	36.2	36.6	36.6
Good	B	78	47.9	48.4	85.1
Fair	C	16	9.8	9.9	95.0
Poor	D	3	1.8	1.9	96.9
N/A	E	5	3.1	3.1	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Rate Attractiveness of Landscaping

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	67	41.1	41.6	41.6
Good	B	71	43.6	44.1	85.7
Fair	C	14	8.6	8.7	94.4
Poor	D	4	2.5	2.5	96.9
N/A	E	5	3.1	3.1	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	161	Missing cases	2		

Rate Communication by Physical Plant

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	31	19.0	19.3	19.3
Good	B	77	47.2	47.8	67.1
Fair	C	32	19.6	19.9	87.0
Poor	D	6	3.7	3.7	90.7
N/A	E	15	9.2	9.3	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	161	Missing cases	2		

Evaluate Courtesy of Physical Plant Staff

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	52	31.9	32.3	32.3
Good	B	82	50.3	50.9	83.2
Fair	C	16	9.8	9.9	93.2
Poor	D	4	2.5	2.5	95.7
N/A	E	7	4.3	4.3	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	161	Missing cases	2		

Evaluate Physical Plant Overall

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	45	27.6	28.0	28.0
Good	B	92	56.4	57.1	85.1
Fair	C	17	10.4	10.6	95.7
Poor	D	1	.6	.6	96.3
N/A	E	6	3.7	3.7	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	161	Missing cases	2		

UNIVERSITY POLICE DEPARTMENT

Rate Level of Safety on Campus

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	47	28.8	29.2	29.2
Good	B	67	41.1	41.6	70.8
Fair	C	35	21.5	21.7	92.5
Poor	D	10	6.1	6.2	98.8
N/A	E	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Rate Accessibility /Visibility of Officers

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	34	20.9	21.1	21.1
Good	B	55	33.7	34.2	55.3
Fair	C	47	28.8	29.2	84.5
Poor	D	24	14.7	14.9	99.4
N/A	E	1	.6	.6	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Rate Response Time Given to Calls

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	29	17.8	18.0	18.0
Good	B	57	35.0	35.4	53.4
Fair	C	28	17.2	17.4	70.8
Poor	D	12	7.4	7.5	78.3
N/A	E	35	21.5	21.7	100.0
		2	1.2	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 161 Missing cases 2

Usefulness of Police escort service

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	25	15.3	16.1	16.1
No	B	8	4.9	5.2	21.3
Have never used	C	122	74.8	78.7	100.0
		8	4.9	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 155 Missing cases 8

Usefulness of Police Motor Assistance

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	42	25.8	26.9	26.9
No	B	7	4.3	4.5	31.4
Have never used	C	107	65.6	68.6	100.0
		7	4.3	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 156 Missing cases 7

Rate Police Communication on Services

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	14	8.6	8.9	8.9
Good	B	70	42.9	44.3	53.2
Fair	C	47	28.8	29.7	82.9
Poor	D	7	4.3	4.4	87.3
N/A	E	20	12.3	12.7	100.0
		5	3.1	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	

Valid cases 158 Missing cases 5

Pamphlets on Personal Awareness

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	95	58.3	61.3	61.3
No	B	60	36.8	38.7	100.0
		8	4.9	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	155	Missing cases	8		

Pamphlets on Safety and Security

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	110	67.5	71.0	71.0
No	B	45	27.6	29.0	100.0
		8	4.9	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	155	Missing cases	8		

Pamphlets on Sexual Harassment

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Yes	A	111	68.1	72.1	72.1
No	B	43	26.4	27.9	100.0
		9	5.5	Missing	
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	154	Missing cases	9		

Evaluate Courtesy of Police Department

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	47	28.8	29.6	29.6
Good	B	70	42.9	44.0	73.6
Fair	C	28	17.2	17.6	91.2
Poor	D	12	7.4	7.5	98.7
N/A	E	2	1.2	1.3	100.0
		4	2.5	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	159	Missing cases	4		

Evaluate Police Department Overall

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
Very Good	A	47	28.8	30.3	30.3
Good	B	65	39.9	41.9	72.3
Fair	C	29	17.8	18.7	91.0
Poor	D	12	7.4	7.7	98.7
N/A	E	2	1.2	1.3	100.0
		8	4.9	Missing	
	Total	163	100.0	100.0	
Valid cases	155	Missing cases	8		