



2022 CSU San Marcos CSS Budget Office

Facilitate campus budget planning, development, administration and mid-year review processes. Support data warehouse reporting, labor cost distribution and assist with ad-hoc financial analytics.

2022

41
respondents

Strengths

- Helpful Staff
- Provides Effective Advice, Guidance
- Accessible to Customers

2019

60 respondents

Opportunities


- Understands My Needs and Requirements
- Responds to Requests Within an Acceptable Time Frame
- Effectively Uses Websites, Online Documentation

Overall Satisfaction

Thinking of your OVERALL experience with this department, how would you rate your satisfaction with it during the past 12 months in meeting your department's needs?

3.97
mean

Standard Deviation
0.95



Mean Score

Mean Scores Below 3.00 - Low | 3.00 to 3.59 - Marginal | 3.60 to 4.29 - Good | 4.30 & above - Excellent

#	Question	2018	2019	2022	2022 change from prior year
1	Thinking of your OVERALL experience with the Budget Office, how would you rate your satisfaction with it during the past 12 months?	4.12	3.95	3.97	↑
2	Understands my needs and requirements	4.16	3.86	3.95	↑
3	Accessible to customers (via phone, voicemail, e-mail, etc.)	4.15	4.04	3.97	↓
4	Responsive to requests within an acceptable time frame	4.16	3.89	3.77	↓
5	Provides effective advice, support, and guidance	4.17	3.96	4.00	↑
6	Facilitates problem resolution	4.21	3.96	4.08	↑
7	Knowledgeable staff	4.13	4.02	4.24	↑
8	Helpful staff	4.27	4.09	4.21	↑
9	Effectively uses website to provide access to information and services	3.86	3.75	3.62	↓
10	Moving in a positive direction to better meet my needs	4.18	3.80	3.91	↑

Change - Increase/Decrease of 0.09 or greater


Background

- 4th annual Customer Satisfaction Survey
- Survey Period: April 18 - May 20, 2022; 22 departments participated
-
-
-
-
- and 3 open-ended questions (like, improve, recognition)
- Contact vpfas@csusm.edu for questions about this report or additional analysis of survey data



Facilitate campus budget planning, development, administration and mid-year review processes. Support data warehouse reporting, labor cost distribution and assist with ad-hoc financial analytics.

2022 Satisfaction Question Response Frequencies



Mean (Average) Scores - Below 3.00 - Low | 3.00 to 3.59 - Marginal | 3.60 to 4.29 - Good | 4.30 & above - Excellent



Net Promoter Score

Below 0 - Low | 0-19 - Marginal | 20-49 - Good | 50 & above - Excellent

The Customer Satisfaction Survey includes the question "How likely is it that you would share a positive impression of the Budget Office with others? (10 being extremely likely and 0 being not at all likely)" answered on a scale from 0 to 10. The Net Promoter Score is calculated as follows: the percent falling in the lowest segment (red section below) is subtracted from the percent falling in the highest segment (blue section below) to determine the Net Promoter (NPS) score.

2018	2019	2022
36 NPS	22 NPS	16 NPS
50.0% - 14.0% = 36	43.1% - 21.6% = 22	48.6% - 32.4% = 16

NPS Breakdown for 2022

Detractor						Passive		Promoter		
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		3%		3%	16%	11%	5%	14%	22%	27%
		1		1	6	4	2	5	8	10

About NPS

The Net Promoter Score (NPS) is widely used in business to determine growth potential [1]. Different types of customers can have positive or negative effects on the success of the survey unit. The NPS identifies them as follows:

Detractors

Score 0-6 on the Recommend question. These are dissatisfied customers who will not promote or recommend the survey unit at all and may provide negative information to others.

Passives

Score in the neutral sections of the Recommend question (7-8). These are passive, neutral customers, who, while perhaps satisfied, are likely to do nothing to actively contribute to the success of the survey unit.

Promoters

Score 9-10 on the Recommend question. These are satisfied and enthusiastic customers.

The NPS score can potentially range from +100, where all customers are Promoters, to -100, where all customers are Detractors. Evaluation of the NPS is based on the following scale:

- Below 0 – LOW
- 0 to 19 – MARGINAL
- 20 to 49 – GOOD
- 50 & above - EXCELLENT

The cut-off points were developed by examining the distribution of NPS scores from over 300 survey departments rated by over 24,000 total customers from seven Universities (CSU Cal Poly, CSU Chancellor's Office, CSU Fullerton, CSU San Marcos, UC Davis, UC Riverside, and UC San Diego) participating in customer surveys. Along with Overall Satisfaction and unit Strengths and Opportunities, the NPS provides an externally-validated benchmark to help track progress over the course of future evaluations.


[1] Reichheld, Frederick F. (December 2003). "One Number You Need to Grow". *Harvard Business Review*.



Facilitate campus budget planning, development, administration and mid-year review processes. Support data warehouse reporting, labor cost distribution and assist with ad-hoc financial analytics.

Correlation with "Overall Satisfaction"

Strengths and Opportunities by Survey Question With Axes at the Average Question Mean and Average Question by "Overall Satisfaction" Correlation
 Correlation Coefficient Average = **0.81**, Mean Average = **3.97**



List of Strengths & Opportunities by Question ST - Strength | IS - Influential Strength | PO - Primary Opportunity | SO - Secondary Opportunity

#	Question	Mean	Corr	Str/Opps
2	Understands my needs and requirements	3.95	0.88	PO
3	Accessible to customers (via phone, voicemail, e-mail, etc.)	3.97	0.81	ST
4	Responsive to requests within an acceptable time frame	3.77	0.84	PO
5	Provides effective advice, support, and guidance	4.00	0.82	IS
6	Facilitates problem resolution	4.08	0.76	ST
7	Knowledgable staff	4.24	0.67	ST
8	Helpful staff	4.21	0.83	IS
9	Effectively uses website to provide access to information and services	3.62	0.80	SO
10	Moving in a positive direction to better meet my needs	3.91	0.85	PO



2022 CSU San Marcos CSS

Budget Office

Satisfaction Mean Scores by Classification **Below 3.00 - Low** | **3.00 to 3.59 - Marginal** | **3.60 to 4.29 - Good** | **4.30 & above - Excellent**

	Overall Satisfaction	Understands My Needs and Requirements	Accessible to Customers	Responds to Requests Within an Acceptable Time Frame	Provides Effective Advice, Guidance	Facilitates Problem Resolution	Knowledgeable Staff	Helpful Staff	Effectively Uses Websites, Online Documentation	Moving in a Positive Direction
Academic/Faculty	2.33	2.67	3.00	1.67	2.67	3.33	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00
Staff	4.11 (36)	4.05 (37)	4.06 (35)	3.94 (36)	4.11 (36)	4.15 (33)	4.34 (35)	4.31 (35)	3.75 (24)	3.97 (33)

Number of respondents in parenthesis: (n). The (n) is not shown when the number of respondents is fewer than five
Blank cells: respondents did not provide an answer to the question.



Satisfaction Mean Scores by Division and Classification **Below 3.00 - Low** | **3.00 to 3.59 - Marginal** | **3.60 to 4.29 - Good** | **4.30 & above - Excellent**

		Overall Satisfaction	Understands My Needs and Requirements	Accessible to Customers	Responds to Requests Within an Acceptable Time Frame	Provides Effective Advice, Guidance	Facilitates Problem Resolution	Knowledgeable Staff	Helpful Staff	Effectively Uses Websites, Online Documentation	Moving in a Positive Direction
Academic Affairs	Academic/Faculty	2.33	2.67	3.00	1.67	2.67	3.33	3.00	3.00	2.00	2.00
	Staff	3.77 (13)	3.77 (13)	3.54 (13)	3.23 (13)	3.46 (13)	3.42 (12)	3.69 (13)	3.62 (13)	3.38 (13)	3.42 (12)
Finance and Administrative Services	Staff	4.42 (19)	4.47 (19)	4.37 (19)	4.47 (19)	4.63 (19)	4.67 (18)	4.84 (19)	4.74 (19)	4.44 (9)	4.33 (18)
Non-division Areas (e.g., CRUE, IPC, IPA, OIE, and Communications)	Staff	4.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.50	2.00	4.00
Student Affairs	Staff	2.00	1.50		3.00	3.00					
University Advancement	Staff	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	4.00

Number of respondents in parenthesis: (n). The (n) is not shown when the number of respondents is fewer than five.
 Blank cells: respondents did not provide an answer to the question.