

Office of the VP for Workforce Education and Business Development														
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	115	4.00	1.18	59	4.20	1.06	81	4.04	1.39	78	4.26	0.92	0.22	0.26
promptness	114	3.85	1.32	59	3.97	1.19	81	4.00	1.36	78	4.08	1.10	0.08	0.23
service attitude	113	3.99	1.24	59	4.14	1.12	81	4.07	1.39	78	4.15	1.08	0.08	0.16

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	10.3%	11.9%	17.3%	7.7%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						Total
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
18	23.1%	3	3.8%	57	73.1%	78

Of the 746 survey respondents, 78 (10.5%) reported having requested or received services from the Grants Development office in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Office of the Dean, Applied Technologies, Multimedia, and Public Service														
Comparison of Survey Results														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	107	4.24	0.95	64	4.34	0.98	101	4.41	0.86	100	4.21	1.19	-0.20	-0.03
promptness	103	4.18	1.10	64	4.23	1.05	100	4.35	0.93	100	4.22	1.18	-0.13	0.04
service attitude	102	4.23	1.10	64	4.34	1.04	101	4.40	0.92	100	4.26	1.18	-0.14	0.03

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	3.7%	7.8%	6.9%	13.0%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						Total N
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	
15	14.7%	7	6.9%	80	78.4%	102

Of the 746 survey respondents, 102 (13.7%) reported having requested or received services from the Office of the Dean, Applied Technologies, Multimedia, and Public Service in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Office of the Dean, Business Studies Comparison of Survey Results														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	115	3.56	1.39	58	4.40	0.86	98	4.37	1.02	88	4.47	0.87	0.10	0.91
promptness	114	3.56	1.44	58	4.36	1.00	97	4.33	1.10	88	4.47	0.87	0.14	0.90
service attitude	111	3.62	1.42	58	4.41	0.86	98	4.36	1.06	88	4.50	0.84	0.14	0.88

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	22.4%	3.4%	8.2%	3.4%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						Total
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
23	26.1%	7	8.0%	58	65.9%	88

Of the 746 survey respondents, 88 (11.8%) reported having requested or received services from the Office of the Dean, Business Studies in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Office of the Dean, Computer Studies and Advanced Technology														
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	100	3.76	1.18	60	4.17	1.15	101	4.15	1.14	75	4.24	0.90	0.09	0.48
promptness	99	3.66	1.28	60	4.18	1.17	98	4.08	1.18	74	4.15	0.99	0.07	0.49
service attitude	100	3.80	1.22	60	4.25	1.10	101	4.16	1.13	75	4.19	0.97	0.03	0.39

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	14.9%	13.3%	11.9%	4.0%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						Total
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
11	14.7%	6	8.0%	58	77.3%	75

Of the 746 survey respondents, 75 (10.1%) reported having requested or received services from the Office of the Dean, Computer Studies and Advanced Technology in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Office of the Executive Dean, Health Sciences														
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	126	4.30	0.96	66	4.64	0.78	128	4.50	0.75	103	4.45	0.93	-0.05	0.15
promptness	125	4.22	1.04	66	4.59	0.72	126	4.56	0.73	104	4.34	1.06	-0.22	0.12
service attitude	125	4.25	1.04	66	4.65	0.75	128	4.55	0.74	104	4.38	1.03	-0.17	0.14

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	6.3%	3.0%	3.1%	7.8%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						Total N
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
29	27.6%	5	4.8%	71	67.6%	105

Of the 746 survey respondents, 105 (14.1%) reported having requested or received services from the Office of the Executive Dean, Health Sciences in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Adult Education														
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	93	3.96	1.11	72	3.92	1.21	115	4.08	1.09	103	4.20	0.95	0.13	0.25
promptness	91	3.91	1.17	72	3.82	1.25	114	4.00	1.12	102	4.12	1.07	0.12	0.21
service attitude	90	4.00	1.19	72	3.90	1.29	115	4.10	1.10	103	4.18	1.05	0.09	0.18

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	9.7%	15.3%	11.3%	5.8%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
11	10.5%	10	9.5%	84	80.0%	105

Of the 746 survey respondents, 105 (14.1%) reported having requested or received services from Adult Education office in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

International Programs Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	81	3.62	1.30	41	3.66	1.33	83	4.05	1.14	63	4.21	1.12	0.16	0.59
promptness	79	3.54	1.30	40	3.70	1.38	83	4.07	1.16	63	4.13	1.22	0.05	0.58
service attitude	82	3.72	1.32	42	3.76	1.38	83	4.05	1.18	63	4.22	1.14	0.17	0.50

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	18.5%	24.4%	9.6%	9.5%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
9	13.8%	3	4.6%	53	81.5%	65

Of the 746 survey respondents, 65 (8.7%) reported having requested or received services from the International Programs office in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Office of the Executive Dean, Continuing Education														
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	117	3.85	1.24	71	3.73	1.30	126	4.05	1.03	102	4.06	1.14	0.01	0.20
promptness	115	3.82	1.29	72	3.61	1.38	126	4.07	1.07	102	4.06	1.15	-0.01	0.24
service attitude	115	3.89	1.24	72	3.69	1.42	127	4.04	1.09	102	4.00	1.25	-0.04	0.11

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	11.0%	19.7%	9.5%	12.7%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						Total
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
11	10.7%	10	9.7%	82	79.6%	103

Of the 746 survey respondents, 103 (13.8%) reported having requested or received services from the Office of the Executive Dean, Continuing Education in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Business and Industry Institute														
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	28	4.25	0.80	16	4.50	1.10	0.25	n/a
promptness	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	28	4.21	0.79	16	4.50	1.10	0.29	n/a
service attitude	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	28	4.21	0.83	16	4.50	1.10	0.29	n/a

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	n/a	n/a	3.6%	6.3%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1	5.6%	1	5.6%	16	88.9%	18

Of the 746 survey respondents, 18 (2.4%) reported having requested or received services from the Business and Industry Institute in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Business Assessment Center														
Mean Ratings (2205 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	45	3.73	1.29	29	4.28	0.88	36	4.36	0.76	27	4.52	0.85	0.16	0.79
promptness	44	3.77	1.27	29	4.14	0.88	36	4.31	0.82	28	4.43	0.84	0.12	0.66
service attitude	44	3.82	1.26	29	4.31	0.89	36	4.33	0.76	28	4.54	0.79	0.20	0.72

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	10.9%	3.4%	2.8%	3.7%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
1	3.6%	2	7.1%	25	89.3%	28

Of the 746 survey respondents, 28 (3.8%) reported having requested or received services from the Business Assessment Center in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Community Programs														
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	69	3.64	1.24	59	3.92	1.18	51	4.33	0.82	72	4.10	1.26	-0.24	0.46
promptness	66	3.50	1.30	59	3.85	1.22	51	4.33	0.86	72	4.03	1.27	-0.31	0.53
service attitude	67	3.54	1.34	59	3.98	1.24	51	4.37	0.80	72	4.03	1.36	-0.34	0.49

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	18.8%	18.6%	3.9%	15.3%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
8	11.0%	8	11.0%	57	78.1%	73

Of the 746 survey respondents, 73 (9.8%) reported having requested or received services from the Community Programs office in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Continuing Education Business Operations														
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	63	3.89	1.28	31	4.00	1.21	78	4.21	1.06	77	4.19	1.06	-0.01	0.31
promptness	60	3.92	1.27	31	4.00	1.24	78	4.13	1.12	77	4.23	1.07	0.11	0.32
service attitude	60	3.93	1.29	31	4.03	1.20	78	4.18	1.13	77	4.23	1.05	0.05	0.30

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	11.1%	12.9%	9.0%	9.1%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						Total
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
13	16.7%	8	10.3%	57	73.1%	78

Of the 746 survey respondents, 78 (10.5%) reported having requested or received services from the Continuing Education Business Services in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Customized Training														
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	64	3.42	1.22	30	3.83	1.34	48	4.00	1.05	38	3.61	1.41	-0.39	0.18
promptness	63	3.30	1.36	30	3.83	1.32	48	3.96	1.05	39	3.72	1.28	-0.24	0.42
service attitude	62	3.44	1.36	30	3.87	1.33	48	4.02	1.02	39	3.72	1.34	-0.30	0.28

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	21.9%	23.3%	10.4%	23.7%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						Total
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
2	5.0%	3	7.5%	35	87.5%	40

Of the 746 survey respondents, 40 (5.4%) reported having requested or received services from the Customized Training office in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

HBC Room Scheduling														
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	133	4.17	1.12	96	4.29	0.92	181	4.46	0.86	142	4.26	1.00	-0.20	0.10
promptness	132	4.11	1.21	96	4.21	1.00	181	4.41	0.91	142	4.17	1.14	-0.25	0.06
service attitude	132	4.05	1.25	96	4.24	0.98	181	4.48	0.83	141	4.28	1.00	-0.19	0.24

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	7.5%	6.3%	5.0%	9.2%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						Total N
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
25	17.5%	9	6.3%	109	76.2%	143

Of the 746 survey respondents, 143 (19.2%) reported having requested or received services from the HBC Room Scheduling in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

Health Professions Institute Comparison of Survey Results														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	87	4.10	1.09	53	4.42	0.80	69	4.41	0.83	57	4.54	0.89	0.14	0.44
promptness	86	4.08	1.12	53	4.42	0.84	69	4.45	0.78	57	4.60	0.75	0.15	0.52
service attitude	86	4.07	1.16	53	4.55	0.72	69	4.41	0.85	57	4.56	0.87	0.16	0.49

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	6.9%	3.8%	2.9%	5.3%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						Total
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
15	26.3%	2	3.5%	40	70.2%	57

Of the 746 survey respondents, 57 (7.6%) reported having requested or received services from the Health Professions Institute in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

High Tech Institute Comparison of Survey Results														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	38	4.34	0.94	25	4.48	0.96	0.14	n/a
promptness	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	38	4.26	1.00	25	4.44	1.00	0.18	n/a
service attitude	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	38	4.24	1.02	25	4.44	1.00	0.20	n/a

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

Satisfaction Scores: 1=Very Dissatisfied, 2=Dissatisfied, 3=Neutral, 4=Satisfied, 5=Very Satisfied

	Percent Dissatisfaction ¹			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	n/a	n/a	5.3%	4.0%

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)						Total
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
3	11.5%	3	11.5%	20	76.9%	26

Of the 746 survey respondents, 26 (3.5%) reported having requested or received services from the High Tech Institute in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/technical Employees

Satisfaction Scores
1= Very Dissatisfied
2= Dissatisfied
3= Neutral
4= Satisfied
5= Very Satisfied

Satisfaction Scores
1= Very Dissatisfied
2= Dissatisfied
3= Neutral
4= Satisfied
5= Very Satisfied