

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Year * Job Category Crosstabulation

			Job Category					Total
			Exec/Adm	Faculty	Clerical	Tech	Service	
Year	1998	Count	49	22	62	26	2	161
		% within Year	30.4%	13.7%	38.5%	16.1%	1.2%	100.0%
	1999	Count	29	25	32	15	2	103
		% within Year	28.2%	24.3%	31.1%	14.6%	1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	31	36	42	15	6	130
		% within Year	23.8%	27.7%	32.3%	11.5%	4.6%	100.0%
Total	Count	109	83	136	56	10	394	
	% within Year	27.7%	21.1%	34.5%	14.2%	2.5%	100.0%	

Year * Employed by TAMIU Crosstabulation

			Employed by TAMIU					Total
			Less than 1 year	1-4 years	5-9 years	10-19 years	20-29 years	
Year	1998	Count	39	74	26	17	7	163
		% within Year	23.9%	45.4%	16.0%	10.4%	4.3%	100.0%
	1999	Count	17	45	26	14	3	105
		% within Year	16.2%	42.9%	24.8%	13.3%	2.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	24	55	30	18	4	131
		% within Year	18.3%	42.0%	22.9%	13.7%	3.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	80	174	82	49	14	399	
	% within Year	20.1%	43.6%	20.6%	12.3%	3.5%	100.0%	

Year * Gender Crosstabulation

			Gender		Total
			Male	Female	
Year	1998	Count	57	103	160
		% within Year	35.6%	64.4%	100.0%
	1999	Count	28	76	104
		% within Year	26.9%	73.1%	100.0%
	2000	Count	43	86	129
		% within Year	33.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	128	265	393	
	% within Year	32.6%	67.4%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

BUSINESS OFFICE

Year * How would you rate the services provided by the staff in the Accounts Payable section? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the services provided by the staff in the Accounts Payable section?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	29	72	28	4	29	162
		% within Year	17.9%	44.4%	17.3%	2.5%	17.9%	100.0%
	1999	Count	22	48	21	4	10	105
		% within Year	21.0%	45.7%	20.0%	3.8%	9.5%	100.0%
	2000	Count	27	47	22	11	23	130
		% within Year	20.8%	36.2%	16.9%	8.5%	17.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	78	167	71	19	62	397	
	% within Year	19.6%	42.1%	17.9%	4.8%	15.6%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the services provided by the staff in the Travel section? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the services provided by the staff in the Travel section?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	52	50	12	3	45	162
		% within Year	32.1%	30.9%	7.4%	1.9%	27.8%	100.0%
	1999	Count	49	35	5	2	14	105
		% within Year	46.7%	33.3%	4.8%	1.9%	13.3%	100.0%
	2000	Count	32	45	15	5	33	130
		% within Year	24.6%	34.6%	11.5%	3.8%	25.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	133	130	32	10	92	397	
	% within Year	33.5%	32.7%	8.1%	2.5%	23.2%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the services provided by the staff in the Cashier Section? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the services provided by the staff in the Cashier Section?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	35	79	33	4	9	160
		% within Year	21.9%	49.4%	20.6%	2.5%	5.6%	100.0%
	1999	Count	30	51	12	3	6	102
		% within Year	29.4%	50.0%	11.8%	2.9%	5.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	30	55	24	7	15	131
		% within Year	22.9%	42.0%	18.3%	5.3%	11.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	95	185	69	14	30	393	
	% within Year	24.2%	47.1%	17.6%	3.6%	7.6%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Business Office staff. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Business Office staff.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	35	85	31	9	3	163
		% within Year	21.5%	52.1%	19.0%	5.5%	1.8%	100.0%
	1999	Count	28	55	15	5	2	105
		% within Year	26.7%	52.4%	14.3%	4.8%	1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	27	65	24	6	9	131
		% within Year	20.6%	49.6%	18.3%	4.6%	6.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	90	205	70	20	14	399	
	% within Year	22.6%	51.4%	17.5%	5.0%	3.5%	100.0%	

Year * Please evaluate the overall services provided by the Business Office. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the overall services provided by the Business Office.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	30	95	26	8	3	162
		% within Year	18.5%	58.6%	16.0%	4.9%	1.9%	100.0%
	1999	Count	22	60	17	4	2	105
		% within Year	21.0%	57.1%	16.2%	3.8%	1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	24	71	21	6	7	129
		% within Year	18.6%	55.0%	16.3%	4.7%	5.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	76	226	64	18	12	396	
	% within Year	19.2%	57.1%	16.2%	4.5%	3.0%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCE

Year * How would you rate the efficiency of the HR staff in responding to questions and providing assistance regarding HR-related issues? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the efficiency of the HR staff in responding to questions and providing assistance regarding HR-related issues?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	80	64	14	2	3	163
		% within Year	49.1%	39.3%	8.6%	1.2%	1.8%	100.0%
	1999	Count	49	44	8	4		105
		% within Year	46.7%	41.9%	7.6%	3.8%		100.0%
	2000	Count	72	50	8	1		131
		% within Year	55.0%	38.2%	6.1%	.8%		100.0%
Total	Count	201	158	30	7	3	399	
	% within Year	50.4%	39.6%	7.5%	1.8%	.8%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the effectiveness of the HR recruiting efforts in attracting adequate applicants? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the effectiveness of the HR recruiting efforts in attracting adequate applicants?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	26	40	21	3	70	160
		% within Year	16.3%	25.0%	13.1%	1.9%	43.8%	100.0%
	1999	Count	15	26	15	3	46	105
		% within Year	14.3%	24.8%	14.3%	2.9%	43.8%	100.0%
	2000	Count	27	40	24	6	33	130
		% within Year	20.8%	30.8%	18.5%	4.6%	25.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	68	106	60	12	149	395	
	% within Year	17.2%	26.8%	15.2%	3.0%	37.7%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the assistance provided concerning benefits? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the assistance provided concerning benefits?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	48	49	13	2	49	161
		% within Year	29.8%	30.4%	8.1%	1.2%	30.4%	100.0%
	1999	Count	37	54	6	4	4	105
		% within Year	35.2%	51.4%	5.7%	3.8%	3.8%	100.0%
	2000	Count	53	65	10		3	131
		% within Year	40.5%	49.6%	7.6%		2.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	138	168	29	6	56	397	
	% within Year	34.8%	42.3%	7.3%	1.5%	14.1%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * How would you rate the clarity and comprehensibility of the benefits communicated throughout the year?
Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the clarity and comprehensibility of the benefits communicated throughout the year?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	35	54	20	1	51	161
		% within Year	21.7%	33.5%	12.4%	.6%	31.7%	100.0%
	1999	Count	41	50	11	2	1	105
		% within Year	39.0%	47.6%	10.5%	1.9%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	48	63	15	2	3	131
		% within Year	36.6%	48.1%	11.5%	1.5%	2.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	124	167	46	5	55	397	
	% within Year	31.2%	42.1%	11.6%	1.3%	13.9%	100.0%	

Year * Please evaluate how useful the staff development workshops offered by Texas A&M International University are to you? Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate how useful the staff development workshops offered by Texas A&M International University are to you?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	44	77	22	7	13	163
		% within Year	27.0%	47.2%	13.5%	4.3%	8.0%	100.0%
	1999	Count	17	49	23	4	12	105
		% within Year	16.2%	46.7%	21.9%	3.8%	11.4%	100.0%
	2000	Count	36	47	12	6	30	131
		% within Year	27.5%	35.9%	9.2%	4.6%	22.9%	100.0%
	Total	Count	97	173	57	17	55	399
		% within Year	24.3%	43.4%	14.3%	4.3%	13.8%	100.0%

Year * Do you feel you have adequate opportunity to attend staff development workshops on campus? Crosstabulation

			Do you feel you have adequate opportunity to attend staff development workshops on campus?				Total
			Yes	No	D	E	
Year	1998	Count	117	42			159
		% within Year	73.6%	26.4%			100.0%
	1999	Count	82	22		1	105
		% within Year	78.1%	21.0%		1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	91	30	1	4	126
		% within Year	72.2%	23.8%	.8%	3.2%	100.0%
Total	Count	290	94	1	5	390	
	% within Year	74.4%	24.1%	.3%	1.3%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * Where do you receive most of your information about HR-related topics? Crosstabulation

			Where do you receive most of your information about HR-related topics?					
			Hr Home Page	HR News & Views	Direct contact with HR staff	Other	E	
Year	1998	Count	7	85	60	8		160
		% within Year	4.4%	53.1%	37.5%	5.0%		100.0%
	1999	Count	1	62	36	6		105
		% within Year	1.0%	59.0%	34.3%	5.7%		100.0%
	2000	Count	7	62	48	12	1	130
		% within Year	5.4%	47.7%	36.9%	9.2%	.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	15	209	144	26	1	395	
	% within Year	3.8%	52.9%	36.5%	6.6%	.3%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the effectiveness of the HR News & Views in communicating news and information about HR-related issues? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the effectiveness of the HR News & Views in communicating news and information about HR-related issues?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	41	90	29	1	2	163
		% within Year	25.2%	55.2%	17.8%	.6%	1.2%	100.0%
	1999	Count	39	53	9	2	2	105
		% within Year	37.1%	50.5%	8.6%	1.9%	1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	47	64	16	2	2	131
		% within Year	35.9%	48.9%	12.2%	1.5%	1.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	127	207	54	5	6	399	
	% within Year	31.8%	51.9%	13.5%	1.3%	1.5%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the timeliness of news and information you receive in the HR News & Views? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the timeliness of news and information you receive in the HR News & Views?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	37	87	32	3	4	163
		% within Year	22.7%	53.4%	19.6%	1.8%	2.5%	100.0%
	1999	Count	32	55	15	1	2	105
		% within Year	30.5%	52.4%	14.3%	1.0%	1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	43	67	15	2	3	130
		% within Year	33.1%	51.5%	11.5%	1.5%	2.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	112	209	62	6	9	398	
	% within Year	28.1%	52.5%	15.6%	1.5%	2.3%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * When I receive the HR News and Views I, Crosstabulation

			When I receive the HR News and Views I,					Total
			Read it right away	Take it home	File it in my to read file	Scan and file for future reference	Do not read it	
Year	1998	Count	77	17	22	39	7	162
		% within Year	47.5%	10.5%	13.6%	24.1%	4.3%	100.0%
	1999	Count	59	5	13	25	3	105
		% within Year	56.2%	4.8%	12.4%	23.8%	2.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	65	13	30	18	4	130
		% within Year	50.0%	10.0%	23.1%	13.8%	3.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	201	35	65	82	14	397	
	% within Year	50.6%	8.8%	16.4%	20.7%	3.5%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the HR News and Views on length of overall newsletter/articles and readability? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the HR News and Views on length of overall newsletter/articles and readability?				Total
			Too short	Just right	Too Long	E	
Year	1998	Count	9	141	11		161
		% within Year	5.6%	87.6%	6.8%		100.0%
	1999	Count	7	90	6	1	104
		% within Year	6.7%	86.5%	5.8%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	14	109	6		129
		% within Year	10.9%	84.5%	4.7%		100.0%
Total	Count	30	340	23	1	394	
	% within Year	7.6%	86.3%	5.8%	.3%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the assistance provided by HR regarding Leave Policies? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the assistance provided by HR regarding Leave Policies?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	55	64	18	1	25	163
		% within Year	33.7%	39.3%	11.0%	.6%	15.3%	100.0%
	1999	Count	33	52	12	1	6	104
		% within Year	31.7%	50.0%	11.5%	1.0%	5.8%	100.0%
	2000	Count	48	57	11	1	14	131
		% within Year	36.6%	43.5%	8.4%	.8%	10.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	136	173	41	3	45	398	
	% within Year	34.2%	43.5%	10.3%	.8%	11.3%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * How would you rate the assistance provided by HR regarding Time Cards? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the assistance provided by HR regarding Time Cards?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	55	63	16	1	27	162
		% within Year	34.0%	38.9%	9.9%	.6%	16.7%	100.0%
	1999	Count	24	40	10	3	27	104
		% within Year	23.1%	38.5%	9.6%	2.9%	26.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	39	44	12	1	34	130
		% within Year	30.0%	33.8%	9.2%	.8%	26.2%	100.0%
Total	Count	118	147	38	5	88	396	
	% within Year	29.8%	37.1%	9.6%	1.3%	22.2%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the assistance provided by HR regarding Leave and/or compensatory time balances? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the assistance provided by HR regarding Leave and/or compensatory time balances?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	49	67	21	3	21	161
		% within Year	30.4%	41.6%	13.0%	1.9%	13.0%	100.0%
	1999	Count	29	49	12	4	10	104
		% within Year	27.9%	47.1%	11.5%	3.8%	9.6%	100.0%
	2000	Count	39	55	11	7	18	130
		% within Year	30.0%	42.3%	8.5%	5.4%	13.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	117	171	44	14	49	395	
	% within Year	29.6%	43.3%	11.1%	3.5%	12.4%	100.0%	

Year * Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Office of Human Resources staff. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Office of Human Resources staff.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	91	56	11	2	2	162
		% within Year	56.2%	34.6%	6.8%	1.2%	1.2%	100.0%
	1999	Count	61	38	4	2		105
		% within Year	58.1%	36.2%	3.8%	1.9%		100.0%
	2000	Count	67	51	12	1		131
		% within Year	51.1%	38.9%	9.2%	.8%		100.0%
Total	Count	219	145	27	5	2	398	
	% within Year	55.0%	36.4%	6.8%	1.3%	.5%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * Please evaluate the overall services provided by the Office of Human Resources. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the overall services provided by the Office of Human Resources.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	73	77	11	1		162
		% within Year	45.1%	47.5%	6.8%	.6%		100.0%
	1999	Count	49	46	5	4	1	105
		% within Year	46.7%	43.8%	4.8%	3.8%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	57	58	14	1		130
		% within Year	43.8%	44.6%	10.8%	.8%		100.0%
Total	Count	179	181	30	6	1	397	
	% within Year	45.1%	45.6%	7.6%	1.5%	.3%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

PURCHASING

Year * How would you rate the communication by Purchasing about purchasing policies, procedures, and proper use of forms? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the communication by Purchasing about purchasing policies, procedures, and proper use of forms?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	19	48	45	17	33	162
		% within Year	11.7%	29.6%	27.8%	10.5%	20.4%	100.0%
	1999	Count	13	33	30	9	20	105
		% within Year	12.4%	31.4%	28.6%	8.6%	19.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	26	42	23	14	26	131
		% within Year	19.8%	32.1%	17.6%	10.7%	19.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	58	123	98	40	79	398	
	% within Year	14.6%	30.9%	24.6%	10.1%	19.8%	100.0%	

Year * Please evaluate how efficiently your purchase orders are being processed. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate how efficiently your purchase orders are being processed.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	21	51	37	12	41	162
		% within Year	13.0%	31.5%	22.8%	7.4%	25.3%	100.0%
	1999	Count	16	42	15	4	27	104
		% within Year	15.4%	40.4%	14.4%	3.8%	26.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	29	36	24	9	33	131
		% within Year	22.1%	27.5%	18.3%	6.9%	25.2%	100.0%
Total	Count	66	129	76	25	101	397	
	% within Year	16.6%	32.5%	19.1%	6.3%	25.4%	100.0%	

Year * Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Purchasing department staff. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Purchasing department staff.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	20	63	36	7	35	161
		% within Year	12.4%	39.1%	22.4%	4.3%	21.7%	100.0%
	1999	Count	14	33	25	12	21	105
		% within Year	13.3%	31.4%	23.8%	11.4%	20.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	33	37	28	8	25	131
		% within Year	25.2%	28.2%	21.4%	6.1%	19.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	67	133	89	27	81	397	
	% within Year	16.9%	33.5%	22.4%	6.8%	20.4%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * Please evaluate the overall services provided by the purchasing Department. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the overall services provided by the purchasing Department?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	22	61	34	11	34	162
		% within Year	13.6%	37.7%	21.0%	6.8%	21.0%	100.0%
	1999	Count	14	39	22	7	23	105
		% within Year	13.3%	37.1%	21.0%	6.7%	21.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	34	43	18	12	24	131
		% within Year	26.0%	32.8%	13.7%	9.2%	18.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	70	143	74	30	81	398	
	% within Year	17.6%	35.9%	18.6%	7.5%	20.4%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the response time given to your request(s)? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the response time given to your request(s)?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	56	63	7	3	33	162
		% within Year	34.6%	38.9%	4.3%	1.9%	20.4%	100.0%
	1999	Count	43	45	5		12	105
		% within Year	41.0%	42.9%	4.8%		11.4%	100.0%
	2000	Count	49	53	9	1	18	130
		% within Year	37.7%	40.8%	6.9%	.8%	13.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	148	161	21	4	63	397	
	% within Year	37.3%	40.6%	5.3%	1.0%	15.9%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the quality and selection of supplies being stocked in Central Stores? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the quality and selection of supplies being stocked in Central Stores?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	25	77	32	7	21	162
		% within Year	15.4%	47.5%	19.8%	4.3%	13.0%	100.0%
	1999	Count	24	51	18		12	105
		% within Year	22.9%	48.6%	17.1%		11.4%	100.0%
	2000	Count	37	56	18	1	18	130
		% within Year	28.5%	43.1%	13.8%	.8%	13.8%	100.0%
	Total	Count	86	184	68	8	51	397
		% within Year	21.7%	46.3%	17.1%	2.0%	12.8%	100.0%

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * How would you rate the response time given to your printing request? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the response time given to your printing request?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	48	59	18	5	32	162
		% within Year	29.6%	36.4%	11.1%	3.1%	19.8%	100.0%
	1999	Count	35	42	11		17	105
		% within Year	33.3%	40.0%	10.5%		16.2%	100.0%
	2000	Count	48	45	15	1	21	130
		% within Year	36.9%	34.6%	11.5%	.8%	16.2%	100.0%
Total	Count	131	146	44	6	70	397	
	% within Year	33.0%	36.8%	11.1%	1.5%	17.6%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the quality of finished product from the Print Shop? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the quality of finished product from the Print Shop?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	44	57	26	6	29	162
		% within Year	27.2%	35.2%	16.0%	3.7%	17.9%	100.0%
	1999	Count	35	37	13	3	17	105
		% within Year	33.3%	35.2%	12.4%	2.9%	16.2%	100.0%
	2000	Count	44	47	20	3	16	130
		% within Year	33.8%	36.2%	15.4%	2.3%	12.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	123	141	59	12	62	397	
	% within Year	31.0%	35.5%	14.9%	3.0%	15.6%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the system used by the Mail Room to handle special requests? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the system used by the Mail Room to handle special requests?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	32	73	17	2	38	162
		% within Year	19.8%	45.1%	10.5%	1.2%	23.5%	100.0%
	1999	Count	32	46	5	2	20	105
		% within Year	30.5%	43.8%	4.8%	1.9%	19.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	42	46	10	2	29	129
		% within Year	32.6%	35.7%	7.8%	1.6%	22.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	106	165	32	6	87	396	
	% within Year	26.8%	41.7%	8.1%	1.5%	22.0%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * How would you rate the accuracy and timeliness of the mail distribution? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the accuracy and timeliness of the mail distribution?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	37	75	25	4	21	162
		% within Year	22.8%	46.3%	15.4%	2.5%	13.0%	100.0%
	1999	Count	37	46	15	1	5	104
		% within Year	35.6%	44.2%	14.4%	1.0%	4.8%	100.0%
	2000	Count	41	56	18	3	11	129
		% within Year	31.8%	43.4%	14.0%	2.3%	8.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	115	177	58	8	37	395	
	% within Year	29.1%	44.8%	14.7%	2.0%	9.4%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the notification process used to advise you that a package has arrived for you in Receiving? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the notification process used to advise you that a package has arrived for you in Receiving?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	45	71	14	8	24	162
		% within Year	27.8%	43.8%	8.6%	4.9%	14.8%	100.0%
	1999	Count	39	48	7	2	9	105
		% within Year	37.1%	45.7%	6.7%	1.9%	8.6%	100.0%
	2000	Count	47	50	15	5	13	130
		% within Year	36.2%	38.5%	11.5%	3.8%	10.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	131	169	36	15	46	397	
	% within Year	33.0%	42.6%	9.1%	3.8%	11.6%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the communication by this area about procedures for the issue/transfer of University property and reporting stolen, damaged, or lost University Property? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the communication by this area about procedures for the issue/transfer of University property and reporting stolen, damaged, or lost University Property?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	16	59	29	7	50	161
		% within Year	9.9%	36.6%	18.0%	4.3%	31.1%	100.0%
	1999	Count	16	39	13	7	30	105
		% within Year	15.2%	37.1%	12.4%	6.7%	28.6%	100.0%
	2000	Count	25	32	24	10	38	129
		% within Year	19.4%	24.8%	18.6%	7.8%	29.5%	100.0%
	Total	Count	57	130	66	24	118	395
		% within Year	14.4%	32.9%	16.7%	6.1%	29.9%	100.0%

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Support Services staff. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Support Services staff.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	48	89	8	2	13	160
		% within Year	30.0%	55.6%	5.0%	1.3%	8.1%	100.0%
	1999	Count	39	55	3		8	105
		% within Year	37.1%	52.4%	2.9%		7.6%	100.0%
	2000	Count	54	58	11		7	130
		% within Year	41.5%	44.6%	8.5%		5.4%	100.0%
	Total	Count	141	202	22	2	28	395
		% within Year	35.7%	51.1%	5.6%	.5%	7.1%	100.0%

Year * Please evaluate the overall services provided by Support Services. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the overall services provided by Support Services.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	42	95	9	1	14	161
		% within Year	26.1%	59.0%	5.6%	.6%	8.7%	100.0%
	1999	Count	37	54	5		8	104
		% within Year	35.6%	51.9%	4.8%		7.7%	100.0%
	2000	Count	51	60	11		9	131
		% within Year	38.9%	45.8%	8.4%		6.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	130	209	25	1	31	396	
	% within Year	32.8%	52.8%	6.3%	.3%	7.8%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

BUDGET/PAYROLL/GRANTS & CONTRACTS

Year * How would you rate the manner in which the annual budget process is currently being administered? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the manner in which the annual budget process is currently being administered?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	10	24	22	9	96	161
		% within Year	6.2%	14.9%	13.7%	5.6%	59.6%	100.0%
	1999	Count	5	16	18	6	59	104
		% within Year	4.8%	15.4%	17.3%	5.8%	56.7%	100.0%
	2000	Count	16	19	21	11	62	129
		% within Year	12.4%	14.7%	16.3%	8.5%	48.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	31	59	61	26	217	394	
	% within Year	7.9%	15.0%	15.5%	6.6%	55.1%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the level of participation extended to you in the budget process? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the level of participation extended to you in the budget process?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	11	20	22	13	95	161
		% within Year	6.8%	12.4%	13.7%	8.1%	59.0%	100.0%
	1999	Count	5	15	14	10	60	104
		% within Year	4.8%	14.4%	13.5%	9.6%	57.7%	100.0%
	2000	Count	12	17	20	17	64	130
		% within Year	9.2%	13.1%	15.4%	13.1%	49.2%	100.0%
Total	Count	28	52	56	40	219	395	
	% within Year	7.1%	13.2%	14.2%	10.1%	55.4%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the length of time allotted for the annual budget preparation? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the length of time allotted for the annual budget preparation?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	6	21	24	8	101	160
		% within Year	3.8%	13.1%	15.0%	5.0%	63.1%	100.0%
	1999	Count	6	12	15	10	61	104
		% within Year	5.8%	11.5%	14.4%	9.6%	58.7%	100.0%
	2000	Count	11	15	24	15	65	130
		% within Year	8.5%	11.5%	18.5%	11.5%	50.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	23	48	63	33	227	394	
	% within Year	5.8%	12.2%	16.0%	8.4%	57.6%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * How would you rate the assistance provided concerning the annual budget process and/or other budget information? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the assistance provided concerning the annual budget process and/or other budget information?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	13	27	12	12	97	161
		% within Year	8.1%	16.8%	7.5%	7.5%	60.2%	100.0%
	1999	Count	6	18	13	7	59	103
		% within Year	5.8%	17.5%	12.6%	6.8%	57.3%	100.0%
	2000	Count	15	13	14	14	74	130
		% within Year	11.5%	10.0%	10.8%	10.8%	56.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	34	58	39	33	230	394	
	% within Year	8.6%	14.7%	9.9%	8.4%	58.4%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the assistance provided concerning your payroll check and/or other payroll information? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the assistance provided concerning your payroll check and/or other payroll information?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	50	77	22	7	5	161
		% within Year	31.1%	47.8%	13.7%	4.3%	3.1%	100.0%
	1999	Count	43	50	9		2	104
		% within Year	41.3%	48.1%	8.7%		1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	48	52	14	1	16	131
		% within Year	36.6%	39.7%	10.7%	.8%	12.2%	100.0%
Total	Count	141	179	45	8	23	396	
	% within Year	35.6%	45.2%	11.4%	2.0%	5.8%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the clarity and comprehensibility of the information on your payroll stub? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the clarity and comprehensibility of the information on your payroll stub?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	45	81	31	5		162
		% within Year	27.8%	50.0%	19.1%	3.1%		100.0%
	1999	Count	39	48	9	7	1	104
		% within Year	37.5%	46.2%	8.7%	6.7%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	49	49	13	5	13	129
		% within Year	38.0%	38.0%	10.1%	3.9%	10.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	133	178	53	17	14	395	
	% within Year	33.7%	45.1%	13.4%	4.3%	3.5%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * How would you rate the manner in which payroll checks are distributed to you? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the manner in which payroll checks are distributed to you?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	67	75	17	2	1	162
		% within Year	41.4%	46.3%	10.5%	1.2%	.6%	100.0%
	1999	Count	57	38	7		2	104
		% within Year	54.8%	36.5%	6.7%		1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	64	46	5	1	14	130
		% within Year	49.2%	35.4%	3.8%	.8%	10.8%	100.0%
	Total	Count	188	159	29	3	17	396
		% within Year	47.5%	40.2%	7.3%	.8%	4.3%	100.0%

Year * How are you being paid? Crosstabulation

			How are you being paid?				Total
			Bi-weekly	Monthly	C	E	
Year	1998	Count	96	64	1		161
		% within Year	59.6%	39.8%	.6%		100.0%
	1999	Count	53	49		1	103
		% within Year	51.5%	47.6%		1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	64	64		1	129
		% within Year	49.6%	49.6%		.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	213	177	1	2	393	
	% within Year	54.2%	45.0%	.3%	.5%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate your satisfaction with the method (biweekly/monthly) in which you are being paid? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate your satisfaction with the method (biweekly/monthly) in which you are being paid?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	68	50	16	21	6	161
		% within Year	42.2%	31.1%	9.9%	13.0%	3.7%	100.0%
	1999	Count	51	37	8	6	1	103
		% within Year	49.5%	35.9%	7.8%	5.8%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	63	49	12	5	1	130
		% within Year	48.5%	37.7%	9.2%	3.8%	.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	182	136	36	32	8	394	
	% within Year	46.2%	34.5%	9.1%	8.1%	2.0%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * How would you rate the assistance provided concerning proposals, financial status, reporting, monitoring, and completion of grant reports? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the assistance provided concerning proposals, financial status, reporting, monitoring, and completion of grant reports?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	2	13	11	5	129	160
		% within Year	1.3%	8.1%	6.9%	3.1%	80.6%	100.0%
	1999	Count	5	18	3	4	73	103
		% within Year	4.9%	17.5%	2.9%	3.9%	70.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	7	16	11	8	85	127
		% within Year	5.5%	12.6%	8.7%	6.3%	66.9%	100.0%
Total	Count	14	47	25	17	287	390	
	% within Year	3.6%	12.1%	6.4%	4.4%	73.6%	100.0%	

Year * Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Office of Budget/Payroll/Grants and Contracts staff. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Office of Budget/Payroll/Grants and Contracts staff.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	36	74	23	3	26	162
		% within Year	22.2%	45.7%	14.2%	1.9%	16.0%	100.0%
	1999	Count	31	46	14	1	12	104
		% within Year	29.8%	44.2%	13.5%	1.0%	11.5%	100.0%
	2000	Count	31	55	11	3	27	127
		% within Year	24.4%	43.3%	8.7%	2.4%	21.3%	100.0%
	Total	Count	98	175	48	7	65	393
		% within Year	24.9%	44.5%	12.2%	1.8%	16.5%	100.0%

Year * Please evaluate the overall services provided by the Office of Budget/Payroll/Grants & Contracts. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the overall services provided by the Office of Budget/Payroll/Grants & Contracts.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	29	83	18	6	26	162
		% within Year	17.9%	51.2%	11.1%	3.7%	16.0%	100.0%
	1999	Count	24	52	16	1	11	104
		% within Year	23.1%	50.0%	15.4%	1.0%	10.6%	100.0%
	2000	Count	28	56	11	4	28	127
		% within Year	22.0%	44.1%	8.7%	3.1%	22.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	81	191	45	11	65	393	
	% within Year	20.6%	48.6%	11.5%	2.8%	16.5%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

COMPUTER AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

Year * How would you rate the efficiency of the CTS staff in responding to your service request(s)? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the efficiency of the CTS staff in responding to your service request(s)?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	36	64	43	10	9	162
		% within Year	22.2%	39.5%	26.5%	6.2%	5.6%	100.0%
	1999	Count	24	48	23	8	1	104
		% within Year	23.1%	46.2%	22.1%	7.7%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	28	52	28	17	5	130
		% within Year	21.5%	40.0%	21.5%	13.1%	3.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	88	164	94	35	15	396	
	% within Year	22.2%	41.4%	23.7%	8.8%	3.8%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the solution or outcome of CTS service request(s)? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the solution or outcome of CTS service request(s)?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	29	73	43	9	8	162
		% within Year	17.9%	45.1%	26.5%	5.6%	4.9%	100.0%
	1999	Count	21	47	31	4	1	104
		% within Year	20.2%	45.2%	29.8%	3.8%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	30	48	36	12	5	131
		% within Year	22.9%	36.6%	27.5%	9.2%	3.8%	100.0%
	Total	Count	80	168	110	25	14	397
		% within Year	20.2%	42.3%	27.7%	6.3%	3.5%	100.0%

Year * How would you rate the communication by CTS regarding its services? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the communication by CTS regarding its services?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	42	69	35	8	8	162
		% within Year	25.9%	42.6%	21.6%	4.9%	4.9%	100.0%
	1999	Count	23	57	20	4	1	105
		% within Year	21.9%	54.3%	19.0%	3.8%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	29	55	29	15	3	131
		% within Year	22.1%	42.0%	22.1%	11.5%	2.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	94	181	84	27	12	398	
	% within Year	23.6%	45.5%	21.1%	6.8%	3.0%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the CTS staff? Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the CTS staff?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	46	80	26	5	5	162
		% within Year	28.4%	49.4%	16.0%	3.1%	3.1%	100.0%
	1999	Count	34	55	9	3	2	103
		% within Year	33.0%	53.4%	8.7%	2.9%	1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	38	57	26	7	3	131
		% within Year	29.0%	43.5%	19.8%	5.3%	2.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	118	192	61	15	10	396	
	% within Year	29.8%	48.5%	15.4%	3.8%	2.5%	100.0%	

Year * Please rate the overall services provided by CTS. Crosstabulation

			Please rate the overall services provided by CTS.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	41	78	28	9	6	162
		% within Year	25.3%	48.1%	17.3%	5.6%	3.7%	100.0%
	1999	Count	25	53	19	4	2	103
		% within Year	24.3%	51.5%	18.4%	3.9%	1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	31	56	31	10	3	131
		% within Year	23.7%	42.7%	23.7%	7.6%	2.3%	100.0%
Total	Count	97	187	78	23	11	396	
	% within Year	24.5%	47.2%	19.7%	5.8%	2.8%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

PHYSICAL PLANT

Year * How would you rate the response time given to your service request(s)? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the response time given to your service request(s)?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	47	59	31	7	17	161
		% within Year	29.2%	36.6%	19.3%	4.3%	10.6%	100.0%
	1999	Count	34	36	19	4	10	103
		% within Year	33.0%	35.0%	18.4%	3.9%	9.7%	100.0%
	2000	Count	30	56	22	8	14	130
		% within Year	23.1%	43.1%	16.9%	6.2%	10.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	111	151	72	19	41	394	
	% within Year	28.2%	38.3%	18.3%	4.8%	10.4%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the solution or outcome of Physical Plant service request(s)? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the solution or outcome of Physical Plant service request(s)?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	37	84	22	1	17	161
		% within Year	23.0%	52.2%	13.7%	.6%	10.6%	100.0%
	1999	Count	30	41	18	4	10	103
		% within Year	29.1%	39.8%	17.5%	3.9%	9.7%	100.0%
	2000	Count	37	57	17	5	13	129
		% within Year	28.7%	44.2%	13.2%	3.9%	10.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	104	182	57	10	40	393	
	% within Year	26.5%	46.3%	14.5%	2.5%	10.2%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the cleanliness of the campus facilities? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the cleanliness of the campus facilites?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	59	78	16	3	5	161
		% within Year	36.6%	48.4%	9.9%	1.9%	3.1%	100.0%
	1999	Count	50	37	6	8	2	103
		% within Year	48.5%	35.9%	5.8%	7.8%	1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	49	58	14	5	4	130
		% within Year	37.7%	44.6%	10.8%	3.8%	3.1%	100.0%
Total	Count	158	173	36	16	11	394	
	% within Year	40.1%	43.9%	9.1%	4.1%	2.8%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * How would you rate the attractiveness/maintenance of the campus landscaping? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the attractiveness/maintenance of the campus landscaping?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	67	71	14	4	5	161
		% within Year	41.6%	44.1%	8.7%	2.5%	3.1%	100.0%
	1999	Count	53	33	13	2	2	103
		% within Year	51.5%	32.0%	12.6%	1.9%	1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	58	48	14	6	4	130
		% within Year	44.6%	36.9%	10.8%	4.6%	3.1%	100.0%
	Total	Count	178	152	41	12	11	394
		% within Year	45.2%	38.6%	10.4%	3.0%	2.8%	100.0%

Year * How would you rate the communication by Physical Plant about its services and procedures? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the communication by Physical Plant about its services and procedures?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	31	77	32	6	15	161
		% within Year	19.3%	47.8%	19.9%	3.7%	9.3%	100.0%
	1999	Count	22	43	24	8	6	103
		% within Year	21.4%	41.7%	23.3%	7.8%	5.8%	100.0%
	2000	Count	35	53	26	8	8	130
		% within Year	26.9%	40.8%	20.0%	6.2%	6.2%	100.0%
Total	Count	88	173	82	22	29	394	
	% within Year	22.3%	43.9%	20.8%	5.6%	7.4%	100.0%	

Year * Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Physical Plant staff. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the Physical Plant staff.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	52	82	16	4	7	161
		% within Year	32.3%	50.9%	9.9%	2.5%	4.3%	100.0%
	1999	Count	48	38	12	3	2	103
		% within Year	46.6%	36.9%	11.7%	2.9%	1.9%	100.0%
	2000	Count	54	53	10	8	5	130
		% within Year	41.5%	40.8%	7.7%	6.2%	3.8%	100.0%
	Total	Count	154	173	38	15	14	394
		% within Year	39.1%	43.9%	9.6%	3.8%	3.6%	100.0%

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * Please evaluate the overall services provided by Physical Plant. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the overall services provided by Physical Plant.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	45	92	17	1	6	161
		% within Year	28.0%	57.1%	10.6%	.6%	3.7%	100.0%
	1999	Count	38	47	13	4	1	103
		% within Year	36.9%	45.6%	12.6%	3.9%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	46	58	16	5	5	130
		% within Year	35.4%	44.6%	12.3%	3.8%	3.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	129	197	46	10	12	394	
	% within Year	32.7%	50.0%	11.7%	2.5%	3.0%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

UNIVERSITY POLICE DEPARTMENT

Year * How would you rate the level of safety on campus? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the level of safety on campus?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	47	67	35	10	2	161
		% within Year	29.2%	41.6%	21.7%	6.2%	1.2%	100.0%
	1999	Count	23	52	18	10		103
		% within Year	22.3%	50.5%	17.5%	9.7%		100.0%
	2000	Count	39	53	26	11		129
		% within Year	30.2%	41.1%	20.2%	8.5%		100.0%
	Total	Count	109	172	79	31	2	393
		% within Year	27.7%	43.8%	20.1%	7.9%	.5%	100.0%

Year * How would you rate the accessibility and visibility of the Police Officers to the University community? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the accessibility and visibility of the Police Officers to the University community?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	34	55	47	24	1	161
		% within Year	21.1%	34.2%	29.2%	14.9%	.6%	100.0%
	1999	Count	18	34	35	15	1	103
		% within Year	17.5%	33.0%	34.0%	14.6%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	24	49	32	24		129
		% within Year	18.6%	38.0%	24.8%	18.6%		100.0%
Total	Count	76	138	114	63	2	393	
	% within Year	19.3%	35.1%	29.0%	16.0%	.5%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the response time given to calls from the University community? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the response time given to calls from the University community?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	29	57	28	12	35	161
		% within Year	18.0%	35.4%	17.4%	7.5%	21.7%	100.0%
	1999	Count	13	41	22	7	20	103
		% within Year	12.6%	39.8%	21.4%	6.8%	19.4%	100.0%
	2000	Count	25	37	21	18	28	129
		% within Year	19.4%	28.7%	16.3%	14.0%	21.7%	100.0%
Total	Count	67	135	71	37	83	393	
	% within Year	17.0%	34.4%	18.1%	9.4%	21.1%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * Does the University Police Department's escort service provide a useful service to you? Crosstabulation

			Does the University Police Department's escort service provide a useful service to you?				Total
			Yes	No	Have never used	E	
Year	1998	Count	25	8	122		155
		% within Year	16.1%	5.2%	78.7%		100.0%
	1999	Count	15	7	76		98
		% within Year	15.3%	7.1%	77.6%		100.0%
	2000	Count	23	12	93	2	130
		% within Year	17.7%	9.2%	71.5%	1.5%	100.0%
Total	Count	63	27	291	2	383	
	% within Year	16.4%	7.0%	76.0%	.5%	100.0%	

Year * Does the University Police Department's motor assistance program provide a useful service to you? Crosstabulation

			Does the University Police Department's motor assistance program provide a useful service to you?				Total
			Yes	No	Have never used	E	
Year	1998	Count	42	7	107		156
		% within Year	26.9%	4.5%	68.6%		100.0%
	1999	Count	24	6	73		103
		% within Year	23.3%	5.8%	70.9%		100.0%
	2000	Count	35	10	84	1	130
		% within Year	26.9%	7.7%	64.6%	.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	101	23	264	1	389	
	% within Year	26.0%	5.9%	67.9%	.3%	100.0%	

Year * How would you rate the communication by the Police department about its services? Crosstabulation

			How would you rate the communication by the Police department about its services?					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	14	70	47	7	20	158
		% within Year	8.9%	44.3%	29.7%	4.4%	12.7%	100.0%
	1999	Count	8	40	27	14	14	103
		% within Year	7.8%	38.8%	26.2%	13.6%	13.6%	100.0%
	2000	Count	16	48	26	20	20	130
		% within Year	12.3%	36.9%	20.0%	15.4%	15.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	38	158	100	41	54	391	
	% within Year	9.7%	40.4%	25.6%	10.5%	13.8%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * Have you received the "Personal Awareness" pamphlets? Crosstabulation

			Have you received the "Personal Awareness" pamphlets?		Total
			Yes	No	
Year	1998	Count	95	60	155
		% within Year	61.3%	38.7%	100.0%
	1999	Count	79	24	103
		% within Year	76.7%	23.3%	100.0%
	2000	Count	75	50	125
		% within Year	60.0%	40.0%	100.0%
Total	Count	249	134	383	
	% within Year	65.0%	35.0%	100.0%	

Year * Have you received the "Safety and Security" pamphlet? Crosstabulation

			Have you received the "Safety and Security" pamphlet?		Total
			Yes	No	
Year	1998	Count	110	45	155
		% within Year	71.0%	29.0%	100.0%
	1999	Count	85	18	103
		% within Year	82.5%	17.5%	100.0%
	2000	Count	84	41	125
		% within Year	67.2%	32.8%	100.0%
Total	Count	279	104	383	
	% within Year	72.8%	27.2%	100.0%	

Texas A&M International University
Finance & Administration - Service Quality Survey
1998 - 2000 Comparison

Year * Have you received the pamphlet "You Deserve An Environment Free From Sexual Harassment: It's the Law"? Crosstabulation

			Have you received the pamplet "You Deserve An Environment Free From Sexual Harassment: It's the Law"?		Total
			Yes	No	
Year	1998	Count	111	43	154
		% within Year	72.1%	27.9%	100.0%
	1999	Count	90	10	100
		% within Year	90.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	89	37	126
		% within Year	70.6%	29.4%	100.0%
Total	Count	290	90	380	
	% within Year	76.3%	23.7%	100.0%	

Year * Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the University Police Department staff. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the courtesy and professionalism of the University Police Department staff.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	47	70	28	12	2	159
		% within Year	29.6%	44.0%	17.6%	7.5%	1.3%	100.0%
	1999	Count	31	46	17	8	1	103
		% within Year	30.1%	44.7%	16.5%	7.8%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	41	47	19	19		126
		% within Year	32.5%	37.3%	15.1%	15.1%		100.0%
Total	Count	119	163	64	39	3	388	
	% within Year	30.7%	42.0%	16.5%	10.1%	.8%	100.0%	

Year * Please evaluate the overall services provided by the University Police Department. Crosstabulation

			Please evaluate the overall services provided by the University Police Department.					Total
			Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	N/A	
Year	1998	Count	47	65	29	12	2	155
		% within Year	30.3%	41.9%	18.7%	7.7%	1.3%	100.0%
	1999	Count	29	42	21	6	1	99
		% within Year	29.3%	42.4%	21.2%	6.1%	1.0%	100.0%
	2000	Count	40	46	20	20		126
		% within Year	31.7%	36.5%	15.9%	15.9%		100.0%
Total	Count	116	153	70	38	3	380	
	% within Year	30.5%	40.3%	18.4%	10.0%	.8%	100.0%	