



California State University, Long Beach

Division of Administration & Finance

2006 Customer Satisfaction Survey

Prepared by CSULB DAF Quality Improvement Program

Explanation of Results

The Quality Improvement program tabulated all results. The following reports display results for discrete work units. Categories of "strongly agree" and "agree" were combined into a category labeled "agree." Similarly, categories of "strongly disagree" and "disagree" were combined into the singular response of "disagree." Each response is rated using a color scheme determined by the DAF Management Team. Positive answers at 80% and above are indicated by green. Positive responses between 60% and 79.9% are indicated by yellow. Responses less than or equal to 59.9% are indicated by red.

Up and down arrows have been added to indicate satisfaction rates for repeat 2005/2006 questions that have increased or decreased since the April 2005 survey.

Grey colored cells denote 2005 questions not included in the 2006 survey.

The "% Sat" (meaning "% Satisfied") has also been broken out into relevant populations for further analysis. This includes Faculty, All Staff (includes MPP), MPP only, and Staff only (non-MPP).

Responses soliciting "other" and open-ended comments were transcribed. Content analyses of these responses were conducted and categorized. The responses were compiled into separate Microsoft Excel files for each discrete work unit.

List of Contents and How to Interpret Results Tables

	<u>Page</u>
Demographic Responses <hr/>	3
Response rates	
Demographic information for General Staff and General Faculty surveys combined	
Summary of General Staff and Faculty Surveys <hr/>	4-7
General Staff and Faculty survey results including all staff and faculty responses added together	
*% Satisfied = total percent of respondents who selected "Satisfied" or "Very Satisfied" combined	
*Resp." = respondents who answered this question with a score (1-4); excludes "Don't Know/NA"	
*"Total Respondents (including 'Don't Knows')" = highest number of respondents for questions for this work unit.	
Service Unit Results Breakout <hr/>	8-18
General Staff and Faculty summary results broken out into specific subgroups	
*Summary column broken out by faculty and staff	
*All Staff column broken out by MPP and Staff (Non MPP)	
Frequent User Survey Results <hr/>	19-21
Results from surveys created for a heavy user group	
*ASMs	
Customer Comments <hr/>	
Distributed separately to unit Directors	
Filtered for anonymity	
Categorized by Division service attributes (Accessibility, Ease of Use, Effective Results, Responsiveness, Staff Ability)	
Themes (if applicable) were highlighted	

Demographic Responses Spring 2006

Response Rates

	Response Rates		
	# Resp.	2006	2005
Staff	722	45.6%	48.3%
Faculty	351	17.0%	16.5%
Total Respondents	1073 of 3645	29.0%	28.0%

2006 Staff Totals

Division affiliation:

	# Resp.	% Resp.
Academic Affairs	188	28.9%
Administration and Finance	276	42.5%
Student Services	137	21.1%
University Relations & Development	27	4.2%
Department of Athletics or President's Office	22	3.4%
Total Respondents	650	100.0%

Position type:

	# Resp.	% Resp.
MPP	92	14.0%
Staff	564	86.0%
Total Respondents	656	100%

2006 Faculty Totals

Position type:

	# Resp.	% Resp.
Full Professor	68	20.1%
Associate Professor	42	12.4%
Assistant Professor	54	15.9%
Lecturer	132	38.9%
Other faculty	10	2.9%
Librarian	9	2.7%
Counselor	1	0.3%
Other (please specify)	23	6.8%
Total Respondents	339	100.0%

Summary of General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Results - Spring 2006

Benefits Services

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Benefits Services

	All Staff + Faculty			
	2005		2006	
	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	Resp.
Accessibility to Benefits staff when needed			92.4%	370
Timely response to your requests	90.7%	377	↑ 90.9%	363
Effective problem resolution	90.8%	347	↓ 90.3%	321
Knowledge of staff	94.7%	397	↓ 92.3%	364
Professionalism of staff	94.7%	397	↓ 94.1%	370
Offers appropriate training			87.8%	254
Easy to use Benefits Services website			83.7%	282
Provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting employees (e.g. enrollment process benefits changes services provided)			83.2%	358
Overall satisfaction with the services provided			91.8%	379
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		426		430

Controller's Office

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of the Controller's Office

	All Staff + Faculty			
	2005		2006	
	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	Resp.
Timeliness of travel and expense reimbursement	85.1%	235	↓ 68.2%	245
Ease of travel reimbursement process	80.1%	221	↓ 67.4%	242
The Controller's Office provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting the campus community	77.9%	226	↓ 71.1%	197
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	89.9%	258	↓ 71.6%	250
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		402		398

Facilities Management

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Facilities Management

	All Staff + Faculty			
	2005		2006	
	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	Resp.
Attractive and visually appealing campus grounds	96.3%	434	↓ 96.2%	421
Quality of exterior public area maintenance (e.g. litter gum on walkways trash cans cigarette urns general cleanliness)	88.0%	440	↑ 90.7%	421
Quality of interior lighting	87.4%	438	↓ 78.1%	421
Quality of exterior lighting	84.5%	427	↓ 75.4%	403
Building components function as they should (e.g. doors locks floor coverings white boards stairwells)	84.6%	435	↓ 82.3%	417
Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning function well (note: many buildings do not have A/C)	65.7%	429	↓ 58.7%	409
If dissatisfied with heating/air are you satisfied with response to hot/cold calls?	79.2%	308	↓ 64.3%	230
Timeliness of response to routine requests			77.4%	332
Timeliness of response to urgent/emergency problems			88.7%	293
Customer Service Center is helpful in resolving issues	87.5%	337	↓ 86.8%	257
Provides adequate communication about Facilities Management matters affecting the campus community			82.3%	328
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	90.8%	433	↓ 88.2%	408
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		447		423

Summary of General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Results - Spring 2006

Facilities Management

Quality of Custodial Services for:

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Office	78.6%	421	↑	83.4%	398
Restrooms	74.8%	436	↓	74.1%	417
Classrooms (includes Faculty responses only)				73.4%	158
Public Areas	91.2%	432	=	91.2%	408
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		444			421

Information Technology Services (Staff)

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of ITS according to Staff

	All Staff				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Effectiveness of desktop support	90.7%	269	↑	91.0%	100
Timeliness of desktop support resolutions	88.3%	265	↑	93.0%	100
Accessibility to ITS staff when needed				93.1%	102
Lotus Notes performance	95.7%	255	↓	94.1%	102
Reliability of telephone (voice network)				93.1%	102
Reliability of data network				96.1%	102
Easy to use Division of Administration web pages (including all DAF functions)				85.3%	95
Adequate communication regarding matters affecting you (e.g. upgrade notifications procedure changes services provided etc.)				91.3%	103
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	95.0%	281	↓	93.2%	103
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		305			108

Information Technology Services (Faculty)

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of ITS according to Faculty

	Faculty only				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Performance of campus email	88.8%	107	↓	88.0%	308
Reliability of telephone (voice network)				88.0%	275
Functions available on campus telephone system	80.8%	104	↓	72.8%	272
Availability of wireless connectivity				42.7%	232
Reliability of data network				86.4%	236
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		114			327

Summary of General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Results - Spring 2006

Mail Services

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Mail Services

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Timeliness of mail delivery to you	65.3%	406	↑	67.3%	364
Accuracy of mail delivery	71.6%	398	↑	72.0%	364
Timeliness of mail delivery to intended recipient when you are the sender	65.1%	367	↑	67.7%	322
Information or training on the preparation of mail delivery	71.5%	242	↓	64.7%	190
Provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting the campus community (e.g. mail schedule policy changes services provided)				65.7%	265
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	72.4%	406	↓	70.4%	355
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		518			395

Parking and Transportation Services

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Parking and Transportation Services

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
The ease of obtaining an employee permit	94.0%	415	↓	89.4%	386
The staff advice regarding your parking needs	87.3%	369	↑	88.2%	338
Effective enforcement of parking violations				73.6%	329
The overall experience with parking facilities (lot conditions landscape cleanliness lighting)	88.2%	417	↓	85.9%	404
The overall experience with parking equipment (gate arms gate key cards)	92.8%	414	↑	93.1%	378
The overall experience with peak demand efforts (staff assistance radio station off-campus parking & shuttle)	82.8%	326	↓	80.4%	260
The overall experience with parking information (signage lot closure notification message boards web site maps events radio station)	85.3%	401	↑	86.4%	354
Easy to use parking website				88.5%	156
Overall satisfaction with the services provided				90.3%	404
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		435			423

Payroll Services

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Payroll Services

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Accessibility to Payroll staff when needed				90.1%	353
Timely response to your requests	90.7%	377	↓	88.0%	343
Effective problem resolution	90.8%	347	↓	86.8%	319
Knowledge of staff	94.7%	397	↓	88.4%	336
Professionalism of staff	94.7%	397	↓	90.9%	350
Easy to use Payroll Services website				88.1%	226
Provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting employees (e.g. pay schedule policy changes deduction explanations services provided)				81.2%	329
Overall satisfaction with the services provided				91.3%	369
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		426			430

Summary of General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Results - Spring 2006

Training and Development Programs provided by Benefits and Staff HR

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Training Services

	All Staff				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Quality of course offerings	89.9%	218	↓	84.7%	215
Variety of course offerings	84.8%	224	↓	70.1%	231
Relevant (to your job) course offerings				65.9%	226
Frequency of course offerings				69.3%	225
Quality of instruction	93.8%	208	↓	88.3%	197
Convenient scheduling	91.7%	217	↓	82.9%	216
Ease of registering for training classes via the web	95.0%	202	↓	88.3%	206
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	92.6%	231	↓	80.4%	225
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")					296

University Police

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of University Police

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
General feeling of safety	95.6%	385	↓	94.1%	409
Visibility of police	91.3%	380	↓	87.1%	389
Ease of contact with University Police (e.g. accessibility emergency phone locations)				94.1%	323
Timeliness of police response	84.2%	19	↑	93.5%	261
Knowledge of staff	72.7%	22	↑	92.9%	267
Professionalism of staff	72.7%	22	↑	93.8%	290
Ease and quality of CSO escort services	97.4%	114	↓	92.5%	120
Provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting the campus community (e.g. phone numbers warnings crime trends services provided)				85.4%	288
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	94.3%	335	↑	94.8%	381
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")					425

Employee Relations

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Employee Relations

	MPPs	
	2006	
	% Sat	Resp.
Effectiveness of advice or recommended action	81.3%	48
Responsiveness to your initial contact	93.8%	48
Timeliness of actions regarding your issue	85.4%	48
Timeliness of communication regarding next steps	87.0%	46
Effective investigation of grievances and/or complaints	77.8%	36
Effective investigation efforts throughout the disciplinary process	81.8%	33
Overall satisfaction with services provided	87.8%	49
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		80

**General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Survey Results
Spring 2006**

Benefits Services

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Benefits Services

	All Staff + Faculty			Faculty			All Staff			MPPs			Staff Only (Non-MPP)			
	2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		
	% Sat		% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.
Accessibility to Benefits staff when needed			92.4%	370		93.3%	120		92.0%	250		92.7%	41		91.9%	209
Timely response to your requests	90.7%	↑	90.9%	363	86.7%	89.9%	119	92.6%	91.4%	244	95.7%	90.2%	41	91.9%	91.6%	203
Effective problem resolution	90.8%	↓	90.3%	321	87.3%	88.9%	99	92.4%	91.0%	222	95.5%	94.3%	35	91.7%	90.4%	187
Knowledge of staff	94.7%	↓	92.3%	364		89.6%	115		93.6%	249		95.0%	40		93.3%	209
Professionalism of staff	94.7%	↓	94.1%	370		95.0%	120		93.6%	250		94.9%	39		93.4%	211
Offers appropriate training			87.8%	254		88.5%	61		87.6%	193		93.3%	30		86.5%	163
Easy to use Benefits Services website			83.7%	282		80.8%	78		84.8%	204		92.9%	28		83.5%	176
Provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting employees (e.g. enrollment process benefits changes services provided)			83.2%	358		81.5%	108		84.0%	250		92.5%	40		82.4%	210
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	94.6%	↓	91.8%	379	89.6%	92.6%	122	96.8%	91.4%	257	98.0%	95.1%	41	96.5%	90.7%	216

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")

430

**General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Survey Results
Spring 2006**

Controller's Office

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of the Controller's Office

	All Staff + Faculty				Faculty			All Staff			MPPs			Staff Only (Non-MPP)		
	2005		2006		2005		2006	2005		2006	2005		2006	2005		2006
	% Sat		% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.
Timeliness of travel and expense reimbursement	85.1%	↓	68.2%	245	80.6%	57.4%	94	87.1%	74.3%	148	90.7%	75.0%	36	85.8%	74.1%	112
Ease of travel reimbursement process	80.1%	↓	67.4%	242	71.8%	52.7%	93	84.0%	76.0%	146	82.1%	70.6%	34	84.7%	77.7%	112
The Controller's Office provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting the campus community	77.9%	↓	71.1%	197	77.8%	66.7%	66	77.9%	72.9%	129	73.2%	63.0%	27	79.5%	75.5%	102
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	89.9%	↓	71.6%	250	88.6%	62.0%	92	90.5%	76.8%	155	90.7%	69.4%	36	90.4%	79.0%	119

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")

398

**General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Survey Results
Spring 2006**

Facilities Management

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Facilities Management

	All Staff + Faculty			Faculty			All Staff			MPPs			Staff Only (Non-MPP)			
	2005	↓	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006	
	% Sat		% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.
Attractive and visually appealing campus grounds	96.3%	↓	96.2%	421	97.3%	93.8%	161	96.0%	97.7%	260	98.1%	97.1%	35	95.5%	97.8%	225
Quality of exterior public area maintenance (e.g. litter gum on walkways trash cans cigarette urns general cleanliness)	88.0%	↑	90.7%	421	88.6%	90.1%	161	87.7%	91.2%	260	92.5%	94.3%	35	86.8%	90.7%	225
Quality of interior lighting	87.4%	↓	78.1%	421	77.9%	67.3%	162	90.8%	84.9%	259	96.5%	88.6%	35	89.7%	84.4%	224
Quality of exterior lighting	84.5%	↓	75.4%	403	80.0%	69.9%	153	86.1%	78.8%	250	96.2%	73.5%	34	84.0%	79.6%	216
Building components function as they should (e.g. doors locks floor coverings white boards stairwells)	84.6%	↓	82.3%	417	75.0%	76.5%	162	87.9%	85.9%	255	92.3%	94.3%	35	87.0%	84.5%	220
Heating Ventilation and Air Conditioning function well (note: many buildings do not have A/C)	65.7%	↓	58.7%	409	48.6%	51.0%	157	71.7%	63.5%	252	80.4%	82.9%	35	69.9%	60.4%	217
If dissatisfied with heating/air are you satisfied with response to hot/cold calls?	79.2%	↓	64.3%	230	64.5%	49.4%	77	82.9%	71.9%	153	88.2%	84.2%	19	82.0%	70.1%	134
Timeliness of response to routine requests	82.0%	↓	77.4%	332	77.6%	64.8%	108	83.1%	83.5%	224	86.7%	90.6%	32	82.4%	82.3%	192
Timeliness of response to urgent/emergency problems			88.7%	293		81.2%	85		91.8%	208		96.6%	29		91.1%	179
Customer Service Center is helpful in resolving issues	87.5%	↓	86.8%	257	75.4%	74.6%	67	90.2%	91.1%	190	97.4%	93.3%	30	89.0%	90.6%	160
Provides adequate communication about Facilities Management matters affecting the campus community			82.3%	328		77.1%	105		84.8%	223		93.5%	31		83.3%	192
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	90.8%	↓	88.2%	408	84.8%	80.9%	157	92.8%	92.8%	251	96.2%	97.1%	35	92.1%	92.1%	216

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")

423

**General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Survey Results
Spring 2006**

Quality of Custodial Services for:

	All Staff + Faculty			Faculty			All Staff			MPPs			Staff Only (Non-MPP)			
	2005		2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006	
	% Sat		% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.
Office	78.6%	↑	83.4%	398	73.4%	78.5%	149	80.4%	86.3%	249	84.6%	96.8%	31	79.5%	84.9%	218
Restrooms	74.8%	↓	74.1%	417	78.1%	71.4%	161	73.6%	75.8%	256	83.0%	81.8%	33	71.5%	74.9%	223
Classrooms						73.4%	158									
Public Areas	91.2%	=	91.2%	408	88.3%	88.4%	155	92.2%	92.9%	253	94.3%	97.1%	34	91.7%	92.2%	219

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")

421

General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Survey Results Spring 2006

Information Technology Services (Staff)

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of ITS according to Staff

	All Staff				MPPs			Staff Only (Non-MPP)		
	2005		2006		2005	2006		2005	2006	
	% Sat		% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.
Effectiveness of desktop support	90.7%	↑	91.0%	100	77.8%	82.4%	17	94.0%	92.8%	83
Timeliness of desktop support resolutions	88.3%	↑	93.0%	100	77.8%	88.2%	17	91.0%	94.0%	83
Accessibility to ITS staff when needed			93.1%	102		88.2%	17		94.1%	85
Lotus Notes performance	95.7%	↓	94.1%	102	96.6%	88.9%	18	95.4%	95.2%	84
Reliability of telephone (voice network)			93.1%	102		100.0%	18		91.7%	84
Reliability of data network			96.1%	102		100.0%	18		95.2%	84
Easy to use Division of Administration web pages (including all DAF functions)			85.3%	95		83.3%	18		85.7%	77
Adequate communication regarding matters affecting you (e.g. upgrade notifications procedure changes services provided etc.)			91.3%	103		82.4%	17		93.0%	86
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	95.0%	↓	93.2%	103	91.4%	83.3%	18	96.0%	95.3%	85

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows") 108

Information Technology Services (Faculty)

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of ITS according to Faculty

	Faculty only			
	2005		2006	
	% Sat		% Sat	Resp.
Performance of campus email	88.8%	↓	88.0%	308
Reliability of telephone (voice network)			88.0%	275
Functions available on campus telephone system	80.8%	↓	72.8%	272
Availability of wireless connectivity			42.7%	232
Reliability of data network			86.4%	236

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows") 327

**General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Survey Results
Spring 2006**

Mail Services

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Mail Services

	All Staff + Faculty				Faculty			All Staff			MPPs			Staff Only (Non-MPP)		
	2005	↑	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006	
	% Sat		% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.
Timeliness of mail delivery to you	65.3%	↑	67.3%	364	64.7%	65.2%	138	65.5%	68.2%	223	50.0%	64.1%	39	69.1%	69.0%	184
Accuracy of mail delivery	71.6%	↑	72.0%	364	84.8%	81.6%	136	66.4%	65.8%	225	60.0%	69.2%	39	68.0%	65.1%	186
Timeliness of mail delivery to intended recipient when you are the sender	65.1%	↑	67.7%	322	65.7%	71.8%	117	64.9%	64.9%	202	52.9%	63.9%	36	67.8%	65.1%	166
Information or training on the preparation of mail delivery	71.5%	↓	64.7%	190	71.9%	69.2%	52	71.4%	62.5%	136	68.6%	61.9%	21	72.0%	62.6%	115
Provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting the campus community (e.g. mail schedule policy changes services provided)			65.7%	265		65.5%	87		65.3%	176		70.4%	27		64.4%	149
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	72.4%	↓	70.4%	355	71.7%	74.8%	135	72.7%	67.3%	217	64.2%	69.2%	39	74.7%	66.9%	178

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")

395

**General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Survey Results
Spring 2006**

Parking and Transportation Services

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Parking and Transportation Services

	All Staff + Faculty			Faculty			All Staff			MPPs			Staff Only (Non-MPP)			
	2005	↑ ↓	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006	
	% Sat		% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.
The ease of obtaining an employee permit	94.0%	↓	89.4%	386	87.1%	82.7%	150	96.7%	94.0%	232	100.0%	97.1%	34	96.0%	93.4%	198
The staff advice regarding your parking needs	87.3%	↑	88.2%	338	81.7%	85.8%	120	89.1%	89.8%	215	92.3%	96.7%	30	88.9%	88.6%	185
Effective enforcement of parking violations			73.6%	329		68.8%	112		76.3%	215		89.7%	29		74.2%	186
The overall experience with parking facilities (lot conditions landscape cleanliness lighting)	88.2%	↓	85.9%	404	84.6%	80.1%	151	89.7%	89.2%	249	95.7%	85.7%	35	88.5%	89.7%	214
The overall experience with parking equipment (gate arms gate key cards)	92.8%	↑	93.1%	378	89.4%	92.2%	141	94.0%	94.0%	233	100.0%	100.0%	33	92.9%	93.0%	200
The overall experience with peak demand efforts (staff assistance radio station off-campus parking & shuttle)	82.8%	↓	80.4%	260	76.3%	69.8%	86	84.8%	86.6%	172	89.5%	90.9%	22	83.9%	86.0%	150
The overall experience with parking information (signage lot closure notification message boards web site maps events radio station)	85.3%	↑	86.4%	354	87.5%	83.7%	123	84.5%	88.1%	227	91.1%	96.8%	31	83.7%	86.7%	196
Easy to use parking website			88.5%	156		75.7%	37		92.4%	118		90.9%	11		92.5%	107
Overall satisfaction with the services provided			90.3%	404		84.2%	152		94.8%	248		97.1%	35		94.4%	213

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")

423

**General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Survey Results
Spring 2006**

Payroll Services

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Payroll Services

	All Staff + Faculty			Faculty			All Staff			MPPs			Staff Only (Non-MPP)			
	2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		
	% Sat		% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.
Accessibility to Payroll staff when needed			90.1%	353		91.5%	118		89.4%	235		92.1%	38		88.8%	197
Timely response to your requests	90.7%	↓	88.0%	343	86.7%	89.7%	116	92.6%	87.2%	227	95.7%	86.5%	37	91.9%	87.4%	190
Effective problem resolution	90.8%	↓	86.8%	319	87.3%	87.8%	98	92.4%	86.4%	221	95.5%	88.9%	36	91.7%	85.9%	185
Knowledge of staff	94.7%	↓	88.4%	336		88.3%	111		88.4%	225		89.2%	37		88.3%	188
Professionalism of staff	94.7%	↓	90.9%	350		92.9%	113		89.9%	237		94.7%	38		88.9%	199
Easy to use Payroll Services website			88.1%	226		79.7%	64		91.4%	162		91.3%	23		91.4%	139
Provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting employees (e.g. pay schedule policy changes deduction explanations services provided)			81.2%	329		74.3%	105		84.4%	224		87.1%	31		83.9%	193
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	94.6%	↓	91.3%	369	89.6%	91.3%	127	96.8%	91.3%	242	98.0%	92.1%	38	96.5%	91.2%	204

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")

430

General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Survey Results Spring 2006

Training and Development Programs provided by Benefits and Staff HR

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Training Services

	All Staff				MPPs			Staff Only (Non-MPP)		
	2005	2006		Resp.	2005	2006		2005	2006	
	% Sat		% Sat		% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.
Quality of course offerings	89.9%	↓	84.7%	215	100.0%	97.3%	37	87.5%	82.0%	178
Variety of course offerings	84.8%	↓	70.1%	231	97.7%	90.0%	40	81.8%	66.0%	191
Relevant (to your job) course offerings			65.9%	226		78.9%	38		63.3%	188
Frequency of course offerings			69.3%	225		79.5%	39		67.2%	186
Quality of instruction	93.8%	↓	88.3%	197	97.6%	96.9%	32	92.8%	86.7%	165
Convenient scheduling	91.7%	↓	82.9%	216	97.6%	89.7%	39	90.3%	81.4%	177
Ease of registering for training classes via the web	95.0%	↓	88.3%	206	97.5%	97.3%	37	94.4%	86.4%	169
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	92.6%	↓	80.4%	225	97.7%	97.4%	38	91.4%	77.0%	187

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")

296

**General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Survey Results
Spring 2006**

University Police

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of University Police

	All Staff + Faculty				Faculty			All Staff			MPPs			Staff Only (Non-MPP)		
	2005	↓	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006		2005	2006	
	% Sat		% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.	% Sat	% Sat	Resp.
General feeling of safety	95.6%	↓	94.1%	409	97.3%	94.6%	147	94.9%	93.8%	259	97.9%	94.3%	35	94.3%	93.8%	224
Visibility of police	91.3%	↓	87.1%	389	90.7%	83.5%	133	91.6%	88.9%	253	95.7%	91.2%	34	90.7%	88.6%	219
Ease of contact with University Police (e.g. accessibility emergency phone locations)			94.1%	323		90.2%	102		95.9%	218		96.8%	31		95.7%	187
Timeliness of police response	84.2%	↑	93.5%	261	60.0%	87.8%	74	92.9%	95.7%	184	100.0%	96.0%	25	90.0%	95.6%	159
Knowledge of staff	72.7%	↑	92.9%	267	60.0%	93.1%	72	76.5%	92.7%	192	100.0%	93.5%	31	69.2%	92.5%	161
Professionalism of staff	72.7%	↑	93.8%	290	60.0%	92.6%	81	76.5%	94.2%	206	100.0%	100.0%	32	69.2%	93.1%	174
Ease and quality of CSO escort services	97.4%	↓	92.5%	120	100.0%	97.4%	38	96.6%	90.0%	80	100.0%	100.0%	8	96.1%	88.9%	72
Provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting the campus community (e.g. phone numbers warnings crime trends services provided)			85.4%	288		83.3%	84		86.1%	201		96.2%	26		84.6%	175
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	94.3%	↑	94.8%	381	94.2%	93.3%	134	94.4%	95.5%	244	97.7%	94.3%	35	93.7%	95.7%	209

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")

425

General Staff and Faculty Customer Satisfaction Survey Results Spring 2006

Employee Relations

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Employee Relations

	MPPs	
	2006	
	% Sat	Resp.
Effectiveness of advice or recommended action	81.3%	48
Responsiveness to your initial contact	93.8%	48
Timeliness of actions regarding your issue	85.4%	48
Timeliness of communication regarding next steps	87.0%	46
Effective investigation of grievances and/or complaints	77.8%	36
Effective investigation efforts throughout the disciplinary process	81.8%	33
Overall satisfaction with services provided	87.8%	49

Total respondents (including "Don't Knows") 80

ASM Customer Satisfaction Survey Results - Spring 2006

Benefits Services

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Benefits Services

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Ease of use of forms and procedures for benefits				86.7%	15
Timeliness of response to benefits questions/requests				100.0%	15
Effective problem resolution	68.0%	19	↑	100.0%	15
Effectiveness of Benefits recommendations	83.0%	18	↑	92.9%	14
Working relations with your department	95.0%	19	↑	100.0%	15
Easy to use Benefits Services website				100.0%	10
Usefulness of benefits self service functions (myCSULB)				84.6%	13
Provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting employees (e.g. enrollment process changes to benefits services provided etc)				86.7%	15
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	100.0%	19	↓	93.3%	15
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")					17

Controller's Office

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of the Controller's Office

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Knowledge and professionalism of staff	100.0%	18	↓	86.7%	15
Timeliness of payment to vendors	83.0%	18	↓	80.0%	15
Effective handling of invoices (2005: Effective timeliness in handling invoices)	83.0%	18	↓	73.3%	15
Responsiveness of staff to your request/question	89.0%	18	↑	93.3%	15
Timeliness of GL changes and/or adjustments	83.0%	18	↑	92.9%	14
Clear easy to follow policies and procedures	76.0%	17	↓	66.7%	15
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	100.0%	17	↓	73.3%	15
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")					16

Facilities Management

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Facilities Management

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Knowledge and professionalism of staff	94.0%	17	↑	100.0%	15
Ease of use of key issue process	88.0%	16	↓	85.7%	14
The electronic work order meets my needs	100.0%	12	↓	85.7%	14
Timeliness of billing process	59.0%	17	↑	80.0%	15
Accuracy of the billing process	89.0%	18	↓	73.3%	15
Timeliness of response to routine requests	83.0%	18	↓	81.3%	16
Timeliness of response to urgent/emergency problems	88.0%	17	↑	93.8%	16
Quality of landscaping and grounds	89.0%	18	↑	93.8%	16
Quality of custodial services provided	75.0%	16	↑	93.8%	16
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	82.0%	17	↑	93.8%	16
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")					16

ASM Customer Satisfaction Survey Results - Spring 2006

Mail Services

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Mail Services

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Timeliness of mail delivery to you	64.0%	14	↑	93.8%	16
Accuracy of mail delivery	69.0%	16	↑	87.5%	16
Timeliness of mail delivery to intended recipient when you are the sender	69.0%	13	↑	81.3%	16
Information or training on the preparation of mail delivery	67.0%	12	↑	81.8%	11
Provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting the campus community (e.g. mail schedule changes in policies services provided etc)				85.7%	14
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	63.0%	16	↑	87.5%	16
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		19			16

Financial Management Information Systems

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of FMIS

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Timeliness in completing PS Finance User ID changes	85.0%	13	↑	100.0%	11
Responsiveness in resolving issues reported to FIS helpdesk (PS Finance)	83.0%	18	↓	81.8%	11
Quality of technical support provided for PeopleSoft Finance System	93.0%	15	↓	83.3%	12
Timeliness of weekly and monthly PS Finance reports	94.0%	17	↑	100.0%	14
Availability of reports to meet end users needs	83.0%	18	↓	78.6%	14
Timeliness and quality (meets specifications) of new end user reports requested	77.0%	13	↑	81.8%	11
Overall satisfaction with services provided	94.0%	17	↓	86.7%	15
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		18			16

Payroll Services

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Payroll Services

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Ease of use of forms and procedures for timekeeping	84.0%	19	↑	94.1%	17
Timeliness of response to timekeeping questions/requests	94.0%	18	↑	100.0%	17
Effective problem resolution	68.0%	19	↑	82.4%	17
Effectiveness of Payroll recommendations	83.0%	18	↑	86.7%	15
Working relations with your department	95.0%	19	↓	94.1%	17
Easy to use Payroll Services website				90.0%	10
Usefulness of payroll self service functions (myCSULB)				80.0%	15
Provides adequate communication regarding matters affecting employees (e.g. pay schedule policy changes deduction explanations services provided etc)				64.7%	17
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	100.0%	19	↓	94.1%	17
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")		19			17

ASM Customer Satisfaction Survey Results - Spring 2006

Budget Management

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Budget Management

	All Staff				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Timely and accurate budget data provided upon request	100.0%	18	=	100.0%	16
Responsiveness to and correction of payroll distribution errors	94.0%	18	↓	93.3%	15
Timeliness of budget transfers and Position Action Forms	94.0%	18	↑	100.0%	15
Providing tools for budget projections	92.0%	13	↓	90.0%	10
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	100.0%	18	=	100.0%	16
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")					17

Safety and Risk Management

Rating levels of satisfaction with the following attributes of Safety and Risk Management

	All Staff + Faculty				
	2005			2006	
	% Sat	Resp.		% Sat	Resp.
Ease of use of forms and procedures for S&RM	75.0%	4	↑	92.9%	14
Accessibility of S&RM personnel when needed	100.0%	4	=	100.0%	14
Responsiveness of unit/staff to your request/question	75.0%	4	↑	100.0%	15
Knowledge and professionalism of staff	75.0%	4	↑	100.0%	15
Effectiveness of service/advice regarding your issue	75.0%	4	↑	100.0%	14
Effectiveness of website regarding your issue	100.0%	2	↓	90.9%	11
Effectiveness of training	100.0%	2	=	100.0%	14
Overall satisfaction with the services provided	100.0%	4	=	100.0%	15
Total respondents (including "Don't Knows")					16