

Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services on Participating California State University Campuses Spring 2001

Summary

A customer satisfaction survey of University Police Services was conducted in spring 2001 and completed by over 9200 students, faculty and staff on 12 CSU campuses: Chico, Dominguez Hills, Fresno, Los Angeles, Long Beach, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, Sonoma, and Stanislaus. Overall, students, faculty and staff expressed moderate levels of satisfaction with campus Police Services. The following items on the survey received the highest satisfaction ratings: the conduct of University Police employees is professional, University Police serve an essential role on my campus, and ease of contact with University Police. Among the lowest rated items were: presence of uniformed personnel on foot patrol, crime prevention presentation, procedure for investigating crimes, and University Police provide adequate communication regarding matters affecting the campus community. The survey identified several areas of customer need that are possibly not being met. Comparisons revealed Long Beach, San Diego, Dominguez Hills, and Fresno as the most highly rated campuses and that students overall were less satisfied with Police Services than either faculty or staff.

Survey Methods

This part of the report briefly describes the Police Services survey instrument, campus data collection methods, survey returns and response rates, and respondents to the survey.

Instrument

The University Police survey instrument was developed in fall 2001 jointly by the CSU systemwide Customer Satisfaction Survey Committee and the CSU Police Services Function Group. The survey contains 28 questions, of which 19 were designed to assess the importance, satisfaction, and/or value of University Police services.¹ Accompanying the main survey form are two separate booklets, the Student Booklet and the Faculty & Staff Booklet, for gathering demographic information (e.g., gender, ethnicity, etc.) and written comments and suggestions for improving services. A copy of the survey instrument, including booklets, can be found in **Appendix A: Customer Satisfaction Survey of University Police Services**.

¹ Importance rating scale: 5=Very important, 4, 3, 2, 1=Not at all important.

Satisfaction rating scale: 5=Very satisfied, 4=Satisfied, 3=Neutral, 2=Dissatisfied, 1=Very dissatisfied

Value rating scale: 5=Very much so, 4, 3, 2, 1=Not at all.

Data Collection

Survey data collection methods, number of completed surveys, and response rates are reported for each campus in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Data Collection Methods, Survey Returns and Response Rates by Campus

| Campus | Method | | Sample Size | Return Count | | | | Response Rate |
|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Faculty/Staff | Student | | Faculty/Staff | Student | Not Identified | Total | |
| Chico Dominguez Hills | Campus mail | U.S. mail | 2,742 | 162 | 326 | 36 | 524 | 19.1% |
| Fresno | Campus mail | Convenience | NA | 341 | 44 | 28 | 413 | NA |
| Los Angeles | NA | Classroom | 1,627 | 436 | 0 | 38 | 474 | 29.1% |
| Long Beach | Campus mail | U.S. mail | 3,370 | 772 | 924 | 366 | 2,062 | 61.2% |
| Sacramento | Campus mail | U.S. mail | 5,561 | 342 | 577 | 60 | 979 | 17.6% |
| San Bernardino | Campus mail | Classroom | 4,248 | 597 | 846 | 47 | 1,490 | 35.1% |
| San Diego | Campus mail | Classroom | 1,647 | 156 | 741 | 19 | 916 | 55.6% |
| San Luis Obispo | Campus mail | Convenience | 8,000 | 438 | 39 | 140 | 617 | 7.7% |
| San Marcos | Campus mail | Classroom | 2,555 | 421 | 480 | 54 | 955 | 37.4% |
| Sonoma | Campus mail | U.S. mail | 2,332 | 90 | 246 | 17 | 353 | 15.1% |
| Stanislaus | Campus mail | Classroom | 2,300 | 24 | 324 | 97 | 445 | 19.3% |
| | Campus mail | Convenience | 450 | 52 | 1 | 4 | 57 | 12.7% |
| Total | | | 34,832 | 3,831 | 4,548 | 906 | 9,285 | 26.7% |

All campuses distributed surveys to faculty and staff via intra-campus mail services. Student surveys were distributed by U.S. mail, administered in selected classrooms, or passed out and completed at various strategic on-campus locations (i.e., convenience sampling). The total number of students, faculty, and staff surveyed was 34,832. Of this number 9,285 surveys were completed for an overall response rate of 26.7 percent. Campus response rates ranged from a low of 7.7 percent to a high of 55.6 percent. The return count from Stanislaus was low, and with the exception of Los Angeles, San Bernardino, and San Luis Obispo, response rates were also low by survey research standards. It is important to emphasize that survey respondents from campuses with low response rates, return counts, or from campuses that employed convenience sampling may not be representative of their target populations. These campuses, therefore, need to be very cautious about generalizing survey results beyond their sample data.

Respondents

Faculty and staff, including administrators/managers, who responded to the survey, were predominantly full-time (86%), female (60%), white (65%), employed at the campus more than 10 years (47%) in the division of Academic Affairs (42%). Student respondents were mostly upper-division (55%), female (64%), White (51%), 21 –

25 years old (43%), and working (74%). Additional survey detail on the demographic characteristics of survey respondents is provided in **Appendix B: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents to the Customer Satisfaction Survey of University Police Services**.

Results

Survey results presented below focus on addressing five key issues:

- **Overall Satisfaction: Overall, how satisfied are faculty, staff and students with University Police Services?**
- **Strengths and Weaknesses: In what areas of University Police Services are faculty, staff and students most and least satisfied?**
- **Gap Analysis: To what extent is University Police Services meeting faculty, staff and student needs/expectations?**
- **Highly Rated Campuses: How does customer satisfaction with University Police Services compare across campuses?**
- **Customer Differences: Are there important differences among faculty, staff and student in their level of satisfaction with University Police Services?**

Survey results pertinent to these issues are summarized in Table 2, which draws on more detailed survey results reported in **Appendix C: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Campus**, **Appendix D: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Customer Type**, and **Appendix E: Gap Analysis of University Police Services by Campus**.

Under the column heading, “CSU Ratings”, in Table 2, the following data are provided: number of respondents (**N**), the mean satisfaction rating (**Mean**), the percentage of respondents who reported they were either “very satisfied” or “satisfied” (**Sat**), the percentage of respondents who reported they were either “very dissatisfied” or “dissatisfied” (**Dis**), the relative standing (**Rank**) of the item based on the mean satisfaction rating (1=highest ranked item), and the numerical difference (**Gap**) between the mean score on “Importance” and the mean score on “Satisfaction”.

Under the heading, “Campus Ratings (Means)”, the mean score of the highest (**High**) and the lowest (**Low**) rated campus is given, along with the names of the five top-rated campuses (**Top Half**) in descending order of their mean satisfaction ratings.

The last part of Table 2, “Customer Ratings (Means)”, displays the mean satisfaction ratings for each customer type: Students, Faculty, and Staff. The results

shown in Table 2 are discussed below in terms of the five guiding questions outlined above.

Overall Satisfaction

Students, faculty and staff overall expressed moderate levels of satisfaction with University Police Services. Ratings shown in Table 2 on the first set of 11 items that specifically measure customer satisfaction with specific University Police services range from a low of 3.1 to a high of 3.8. Fifty percent or more of respondents reported they were either “Very satisfied” or “Satisfied” on 6 measures, while fewer than 50 percent reported similar levels of satisfaction on five measures.

The percentage of respondents who reported they were either “Very dissatisfied” or “Dissatisfied” with University Police services is between 10 percent and 15 percent on 8 of the 11 measures and as high as 25 percent.

The item measuring satisfaction with “Overall University Police services” received a mean rating of 3.5. A majority of faculty, staff and students (56%) reported they are satisfied with “Overall police services” while only 11 percent reported they are dissatisfied.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The highest rated measures (3.8 - 3.9) on the survey in terms of customer opinion or perception are:

- The conduct of University Police employees is professional
- University Police serve an essential role on my campus
- Ease of contact with University Police

Falling closely behind are the following areas rated 3.6 to 3.7:

- Feeling safe on campus during the night
- Feeling safe on campus during the day
- Police sensitivity to the cultural diversity of the campus

Although no area of police services was rated poorly (below 3.0), customer satisfaction was relatively low (3.1 - 3.2) in four areas:

- Presence of uniformed personnel on foot patrol
- Crime prevention presentation
- Procedure for investigating crimes
- University Police provide adequate communication regarding matters affecting the campus community

About one out of four respondents is dissatisfied with the lack of presence of police on foot patrol and nearly that many are dissatisfied with police communication to the campus.

Gap Analysis

Students rated each survey item on Importance and Satisfaction to assess differences or “gaps” between the two. The areas identified as most important (4.0 or above) to students but gained least satisfaction were:

- Procedure for investigating crimes
- Procedure for reporting crimes
- Evening guide/escort services

These findings suggest the above three areas become targets for further improvement in order to meet student needs and increase customer satisfaction. More detailed gap analysis results can be found in **Appendix E: Gap Analysis of University Police Services by Campus.**

Highly Rated Campuses

Table 2 lists the campuses that achieved the highest level of customer satisfaction with University Police Services. The campuses that are most consistently highly rated across all 19 satisfaction and opinion measures (i.e., potentially “best practice” campuses) are:

- Long Beach
- San Diego
- Dominguez Hills
- Fresno

More detailed campus comparisons are presented in **Appendix C: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Campus.**

Customer Differences

One clear pattern is revealed in the data reported in Table 2 comparing student, faculty and staff satisfaction ratings: Students are much less satisfied with police Services than are faculty or staff. Student satisfaction ratings on all 19 measures are consistently lower compared with faculty and staff ratings. Student ratings range from 2.9 to 3.6 whereas faculty/staff range from 3.2 to 4.0. While large differences between students and faculty/staff exist in almost all areas, the following items show the largest differences:

- University Police serve an essential role on my campus
- When you contact University Police with a problem, are they concerned with helping you resolve your problem?

- Responding to your information requests
- Ease of contact with University Police
- University Police provide adequate communication regarding matters affecting the campus community

Comprehensive survey results on customer differences are reported in **Appendix D: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Customer Type.**

Table 2. Summary of University Police Services Customer Satisfaction Survey - Spring 2001

| Item | CSU Ratings | | | | | Gap | Campus Ratings (Means) | | | Customer Ratings (Means) | | |
|---|-------------|------|---------|---------|------|------|------------------------|------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------|-------|
| | N | Mean | Sat (%) | Dis (%) | Rank | | High | Low | Top Half (descending) | Students | Faculty | Staff |
| Evening guide/escort services | 3,879 | 3.49 | 51 | 14 | 12 | 0.78 | 3.89 | 3.13 | LB, FRE, DH, SD, CHI, SB | 3.36 | 3.79 | 3.62 |
| Crime prevention presentations | 3,947 | 3.29 | 40 | 15 | 16 | 0.64 | 3.65 | 3.12 | SD, LB, SLO, STAN, FRE, DH | 3.17 | 3.43 | 3.42 |
| Procedure for reporting crimes | 3,862 | 3.41 | 47 | 13 | 15 | 0.78 | 3.73 | 3.09 | SD, DH, FRE, SM, LB, SLO | 3.19 | 3.58 | 3.61 |
| Procedure for investigating crimes | 3,422 | 3.25 | 39 | 17 | 18 | 0.97 | 3.58 | 3.04 | SD, DH, FRE, LB, SM, SB | 3.10 | 3.42 | 3.40 |
| Responding to your information requests | 4,652 | 3.51 | 53 | 13 | 10.5 | 0.72 | 3.85 | 3.29 | SD, DH, FRE, LB, STAN, SM | 3.25 | 3.75 | 3.70 |
| Requesting a vehicle door be unlocked | 3,007 | 3.45 | 45 | 12 | 14 | 0.44 | 3.62 | 3.05 | SB, STAN, LB, LA, SD, SAC | 3.35 | 3.73 | 3.49 |
| Requesting a campus door/gate be unlocked | 4,124 | 3.51 | 53 | 14 | 10.5 | 0.51 | 3.79 | 3.20 | FRE, SD, LB, DH, SON, SAC | 3.25 | 3.87 | 3.60 |
| Presence of uniformed personnel on foot patrol | 6,321 | 3.18 | 40 | 25 | 19 | 1.02 | 3.43 | 2.97 | SD, DH, SON, LB, CHI, STAN | 3.08 | 3.31 | 3.24 |
| Overall university police services | 6754 | 3.55 | 56 | 11 | 9 | 0.87 | 3.87 | 3.30 | SD, FRE, DH, LB, STAN, CHI | 3.37 | 3.76 | 3.70 |
| Ease of contact with University Police | 6,627 | 3.80 | 69 | 9 | 3 | NA | 4.14 | 3.60 | FRE, SD, DH, LB, STAN, SLO | 3.54 | 4.00 | 4.03 |
| Timeliness of service | 5,730 | 3.60 | 59 | 12 | 8 | NA | 3.86 | 3.30 | SD, FRE, LB, DH, SLO, STAN | 3.37 | 3.80 | 3.75 |
| Contributes to teaching and learning * | 5634 | 3.48 | 53 | 18 | 13 | NA | 3.85 | 3.06 | FRE, SD, DH, LB, STAN, SAC | 3.26 | 3.60 | 3.69 |
| Provides adequate communication * | 5823 | 3.27 | 45 | 23 | 17 | NA | 3.73 | 3.02 | SD, STAN, DH, FRE, LB, SLO | 2.99 | 3.42 | 3.47 |
| Serve an essential role on my campus * | 7280 | 3.89 | 67 | 11 | 2 | NA | 4.34 | 3.49 | SD, FRE, STAN, DH, LB, SAC | 3.59 | 4.09 | 4.17 |
| ... concerned with helping resolve your problem | 4827 | 3.66 | 60 | 15 | 7 | NA | 3.95 | 3.34 | FRE, DH, LB, SD, SM, STAN | 3.31 | 3.82 | 3.86 |
| ... feel safe during the day * | 7525 | 3.69 | 60 | 14 | 5.5 | NA | 3.95 | 3.45 | DH, SD, FRE, LB, STAN, LA | 3.53 | 3.70 | 3.88 |
| ... feel safe during the night * | 7153 | 3.74 | 63 | 18 | 4 | NA | 4.05 | 3.47 | DH, LB, FRE, SD, STAN, LA | 3.65 | 3.79 | 3.84 |
| Conduct of employees is professional * | 6307 | 3.90 | 70 | 9 | 1 | NA | 4.21 | 3.63 | SD, DH, SM, LB, FRE, STAN | 3.68 | 4.07 | 4.07 |
| Employees are sensitive to cultural diversity * | 3803 | 3.69 | 60 | 13 | 5.5 | NA | 4.07 | 3.33 | SM, SD, FRE, DH, LB, CHI | 3.50 | 3.85 | 3.82 |

* Items rated on the following scale: 5=Very much so, 4, 3, 2, 1=Not at all

f
f
f
f
f
f
f
f
f
f

J

Customer Satisfaction Survey
Spring 2001
UNIVERSITY POLICE

| | | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|---|
| BOOKLET ID | | | | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 |
| 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 |

IMPORTANT!
COPY YOUR BOOKLET NUMBER
HERE. THIS NUMBER IS PRINTED
IN RED ON THE TOP OF YOUR
BOOKLET.

Listed below are standard services provided by your campus police. On the **LEFT**, rate how **IMPORTANT** each service is to you. On the **RIGHT**, rate your **SATISFACTION** with the item during the last 12 months. If you cannot rate the item (or it's not applicable), darken the oval in the **Don't Know** column.

| <u>IMPORTANCE</u> | | | | | <u>SATISFACTION</u> | | | | | | |
|-------------------|---|---|---|----------------------|---------------------|---|-----------|---------|--------------|-------------------|------------|
| Very Important | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all Important | 1 | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't Know |
| f | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1. Evening guide/escort services | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2. Crime prevention presentations | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3. Procedure for reporting crimes | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4. Procedure for investigating crimes | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 5. Responding to your information requests | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6. Requesting a vehicle door be unlocked | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 7. Requesting a campus door/gate be unlocked | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 8. Presence of uniformed personnel on foot patrol | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 9. Overall University Police services | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

Rate your satisfaction with the following two items:

| | Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Neutral | Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Don't Know |
|---|----------------|-----------|---------|--------------|-------------------|------------|
| f 10. Ease of contact with University Police (e.g., accessibility, emergency phone, etc.) | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f 11. Timeliness of services provided by University Police | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

Rate each of the following items. If you cannot rate the item, darken the oval in the Don't Know column.

| | Very Much So | | | | Not at all | Don't Know |
|--|--------------|---|---|---|------------|------------|
| f 12. University Police services contribute to the University's mission of teaching and learning. | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f 13. University Police provide adequate communication regarding matters affecting the campus community. | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f 14. University Police serve an essential role on my campus. | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f 15. When you contact University Police with a problem, are they concerned with helping you resolve your problem? | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f 16. Presence of University Police make you feel safe on campus: | | | | | | |
| a) during the day | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| b) during the night | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f 17. The conduct of University Police employees is professional. | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |
| f 18. University Police employees are sensitive to the cultural diversity of this campus. | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ | ~ |

Appendix B: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents to the Customer Satisfaction Survey of University Police Services Spring 2001

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of Faculty and Staff Respondents

| | Adm.Mgr | | Faculty | | Staff | | All | |
|------------------------|---------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | N | % | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| Status | | | | | | | | |
| Full-time | 507 | 99.0 | 812 | 69.2 | 1,948 | 92.2 | 3,267 | 86.0 |
| Part-time | 5 | 1.0 | 361 | 30.8 | 164 | 7.8 | 530 | 14.0 |
| All | 512 | 100.0 | 1,173 | 100.0 | 2,112 | 100.0 | 3,797 | 100.0 |
| Years on Campus | | | | | | | | |
| Less than 1 year | 40 | 7.8 | 124 | 10.5 | 216 | 10.2 | 380 | 10.0 |
| 1 - 2 years | 67 | 13.0 | 108 | 9.1 | 298 | 14.1 | 473 | 12.4 |
| 3 - 4 years | 52 | 10.1 | 130 | 11.0 | 269 | 12.7 | 451 | 11.8 |
| 5 - 6 years | 51 | 9.9 | 105 | 8.9 | 208 | 9.8 | 364 | 9.5 |
| 7 - 8 years | 29 | 5.6 | 60 | 5.1 | 109 | 5.2 | 198 | 5.2 |
| 9 - 10 years | 23 | 4.5 | 54 | 4.6 | 74 | 3.5 | 151 | 4.0 |
| More than 10 years | 252 | 49.0 | 602 | 50.9 | 941 | 44.5 | 1,795 | 47.1 |
| All | 514 | 100.0 | 1,183 | 100.0 | 2,115 | 100.0 | 3,812 | 100.0 |
| Division | | | | | | | | |
| Academic | 158 | 31.2 | 745 | 75.1 | 555 | 27.5 | 1,458 | 41.5 |
| Administration | 132 | 26.1 | 1 | 0.1 | 400 | 19.8 | 533 | 15.2 |
| Student Services | 98 | 19.4 | 10 | 1.0 | 450 | 22.3 | 558 | 15.9 |
| Other | 118 | 23.3 | 236 | 23.8 | 614 | 30.4 | 968 | 27.5 |
| All | 506 | 100.0 | 992 | 100.0 | 2,019 | 100.0 | 3,517 | 100.0 |
| Gender | | | | | | | | |
| Female | 254 | 49.3 | 519 | 44.5 | 1,484 | 70.5 | 2,257 | 59.6 |
| Male | 261 | 50.7 | 646 | 55.5 | 621 | 29.5 | 1,528 | 40.4 |
| All | 515 | 100.0 | 1,165 | 100.0 | 2,105 | 100.0 | 3,785 | 100.0 |
| Age | | | | | | | | |
| Under 20 | . | . | . | . | 3 | 0.1 | 3 | 0.1 |
| 20 - 29 | 22 | 4.3 | 39 | 3.4 | 296 | 14.1 | 357 | 9.5 |
| 30 - 39 | 79 | 15.5 | 179 | 15.4 | 468 | 22.3 | 726 | 19.3 |
| 40 - 49 | 155 | 30.4 | 289 | 24.9 | 659 | 31.4 | 1,103 | 29.3 |
| 50 - 59 | 211 | 41.4 | 419 | 36.1 | 575 | 27.4 | 1,205 | 32.0 |
| 60 - 69 | 42 | 8.2 | 221 | 19.0 | 92 | 4.4 | 355 | 9.4 |
| 70 or over | 1 | 0.2 | 14 | 1.2 | 6 | 0.3 | 21 | 0.6 |
| All | 510 | 100.0 | 1,161 | 100.0 | 2,099 | 100.0 | 3,770 | 100.0 |
| Race/Ethnicity | | | | | | | | |
| Amer.Ind./Alaskan Nat | 5 | 1.0 | 7 | 0.6 | 21 | 1.0 | 33 | 0.9 |
| Asian | 16 | 3.2 | 87 | 7.9 | 155 | 7.7 | 258 | 7.1 |
| Black/African Amer. | 41 | 8.1 | 29 | 2.6 | 168 | 8.3 | 238 | 6.6 |
| Filipino | 5 | 1.0 | 7 | 0.6 | 49 | 2.4 | 61 | 1.7 |
| Mex. Amer./Hispanic | 63 | 12.5 | 60 | 5.4 | 373 | 18.4 | 496 | 13.7 |
| Pacific Islander | 1 | 0.2 | 1 | 0.1 | 18 | 0.9 | 20 | 0.6 |
| White | 349 | 69.1 | 854 | 77.4 | 1,145 | 56.6 | 2,348 | 64.6 |
| Other | 25 | 5.0 | 58 | 5.3 | 95 | 4.7 | 178 | 4.9 |
| All | 505 | 100.0 | 1,103 | 100.0 | 2,024 | 100.0 | 3,632 | 100.0 |

**Appendix B: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents to the
Customer Satisfaction Survey of University Police Services
Spring 2001**

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Student Respondents

| | N | % |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|
| <u>Class Level</u> | | |
| Freshmen | 473 | 10.5 |
| Sophomore | 456 | 10.1 |
| Junior | 1,092 | 24.3 |
| Senior | 1,643 | 36.5 |
| Grad/Postbacc | 835 | 18.6 |
| All | 4,499 | 100.0 |
| <u>Employment</u> | | |
| Not working | 1,189 | 26.4 |
| 1 - 10 hours | 383 | 8.5 |
| 11 - 20 hours | 1,016 | 22.6 |
| 21 - 30 hours | 880 | 19.6 |
| 31 - 40 hours | 676 | 15.0 |
| More than 40 hours | 352 | 7.8 |
| All | 4,496 | 100.0 |
| <u>Race/Ethnicity</u> | | |
| Amer.Ind./Alaskan Nat | 26 | 0.6 |
| Asian | 550 | 12.6 |
| Black/African Amer. | 239 | 5.5 |
| Filipino | 138 | 3.2 |
| Mex. Amer./Hisp. | 909 | 20.8 |
| Pacific Islander | 18 | 0.4 |
| White | 2,231 | 50.9 |
| Other | 268 | 6.1 |
| All | 4,379 | 100.0 |
| <u>Day/Evening</u> | | |
| Day student | 2,163 | 48.3 |
| Evening student | 733 | 16.4 |
| Both day & evening | 1,552 | 34.7 |
| Weekend student | 27 | 0.6 |
| All | 4,475 | 100.0 |
| <u>Residence</u> | | |
| On campus | 364 | 8.2 |
| Off campus | 4,070 | 91.8 |
| All | 4,434 | 100.0 |
| <u>Gender</u> | | |
| Female | 2,898 | 64.4 |
| Male | 1,603 | 35.6 |
| All | 4,501 | 100.0 |

**Appendix B: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents to the
Customer Satisfaction Survey of University Police Services
Spring 2001**

Table 2. Demographic Characteristics of Student Respondents

| | N | % |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|
| <u>Age</u> | | |
| Under 18 | 12 | 0.3 |
| 18 - 20 | 1,073 | 23.9 |
| 21 - 25 | 1,939 | 43.1 |
| 26 - 30 | 631 | 14.0 |
| 31 - 40 | 490 | 10.9 |
| Over 40 | 349 | 7.8 |
| All | 4,494 | 100.0 |
| <u>Years on Campus</u> | | |
| New student | 215 | 4.8 |
| Less than 1 year | 1,119 | 24.9 |
| 1 - 2 years | 1,477 | 32.8 |
| 3 - 4 years | 1,127 | 25.1 |
| 5 - 6 years | 349 | 7.8 |
| 7 - 8 years | 82 | 1.8 |
| 9 - 10 years | 36 | 0.8 |
| More than 10 years | 94 | 2.1 |
| All | 4,499 | 100.0 |

Appendix C: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Campus Spring 2001

Table 1. Campus and Systemwide Mean Satisfaction Ratings

| Satisfaction With | Data Type | Chico | Dominguez Hills | Fresno | Los Angeles | Long Beach | Sacramento | San Bernardino | San Diego | San Luis Obispo | San Marcos | Sonoma | Stanislaus | All |
|--|-----------|-------|-----------------|--------|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|------------|--------|------------|-------|
| Evening guide/escort services | Mean | 3.48 | 3.74 | 3.75 | 3.35 | 3.89 | 3.35 | 3.43 | 3.74 | 3.36 | 3.16 | 3.22 | 3.13 | 3.49 |
| | S.D. | 0.95 | 0.91 | 0.94 | 1.03 | 0.97 | 0.98 | 0.94 | 0.98 | 0.89 | 1.18 | 1.03 | 1.26 | 1.00 |
| | N | 197 | 223 | 179 | 768 | 562 | 475 | 420 | 249 | 477 | 145 | 153 | 31 | 3,879 |
| Crime prevention presentations | Mean | 3.19 | 3.28 | 3.34 | 3.19 | 3.45 | 3.19 | 3.21 | 3.65 | 3.39 | 3.12 | 3.27 | 3.35 | 3.29 |
| | S.D. | 0.83 | 0.96 | 0.84 | 0.99 | 0.86 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 0.93 | 0.82 | 0.88 | 0.90 | 0.91 | 0.93 |
| | N | 213 | 205 | 202 | 815 | 441 | 492 | 422 | 278 | 548 | 147 | 153 | 31 | 3,947 |
| Procedure for reporting crimes | Mean | 3.09 | 3.67 | 3.58 | 3.28 | 3.47 | 3.38 | 3.26 | 3.73 | 3.43 | 3.49 | 3.38 | 3.29 | 3.41 |
| | S.D. | 0.99 | 0.89 | 0.83 | 0.99 | 0.88 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.86 | 0.81 | 0.94 | 0.89 | 0.85 | 0.93 |
| | N | 187 | 221 | 229 | 845 | 380 | 545 | 376 | 304 | 472 | 121 | 154 | 28 | 3,862 |
| Procedure for investigating crimes | Mean | 3.12 | 3.53 | 3.42 | 3.14 | 3.36 | 3.09 | 3.29 | 3.58 | 3.23 | 3.30 | 3.15 | 3.04 | 3.25 |
| | S.D. | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.91 | 1.02 | 0.89 | 1.06 | 0.89 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.82 | 1.04 | 1.07 | 0.98 |
| | N | 176 | 202 | 194 | 774 | 316 | 469 | 357 | 248 | 413 | 100 | 150 | 23 | 3,422 |
| Responding to your information requests | Mean | 3.47 | 3.77 | 3.77 | 3.29 | 3.67 | 3.45 | 3.39 | 3.85 | 3.49 | 3.62 | 3.51 | 3.65 | 3.51 |
| | S.D. | 0.98 | 0.88 | 0.84 | 1.06 | 0.96 | 1.06 | 0.94 | 0.96 | 0.84 | 0.78 | 1.04 | 0.92 | 0.99 |
| | N | 254 | 284 | 294 | 1032 | 455 | 595 | 479 | 350 | 521 | 143 | 205 | 40 | 4,652 |
| Requesting a vehicle door be unlocked | Mean | 3.27 | 3.48 | 3.45 | 3.51 | 3.52 | 3.49 | 3.62 | 3.50 | 3.15 | 3.05 | 3.32 | 3.61 | 3.45 |
| | S.D. | 0.83 | 1.07 | 0.99 | 1.03 | 1.01 | 1.03 | 0.99 | 1.06 | 0.89 | 1.06 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 1.01 |
| | N | 113 | 163 | 134 | 715 | 323 | 401 | 409 | 161 | 340 | 94 | 131 | 23 | 3,007 |
| Requesting a campus door/gate be unlocked | Mean | 3.47 | 3.66 | 3.79 | 3.20 | 3.74 | 3.59 | 3.33 | 3.79 | 3.47 | 3.52 | 3.60 | 3.59 | 3.51 |
| | S.D. | 1.07 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 1.14 | 0.97 | 0.99 | 0.97 | 1.05 | 0.86 | 1.05 | 0.98 | 1.06 | 1.05 |
| | N | 207 | 278 | 341 | 913 | 410 | 437 | 401 | 325 | 419 | 155 | 194 | 44 | 4,124 |
| Presence of uniformed personnel on foot patrol | Mean | 3.23 | 3.28 | 3.19 | 3.12 | 3.25 | 3.22 | 3.10 | 3.43 | 2.97 | 3.11 | 3.27 | 3.23 | 3.18 |
| | S.D. | 0.98 | 1.14 | 0.92 | 1.09 | 1.07 | 1.09 | 1.07 | 1.05 | 0.97 | 1.16 | 1.03 | 0.99 | 1.06 |
| | N | 367 | 313 | 361 | 1269 | 749 | 929 | 598 | 442 | 678 | 272 | 299 | 44 | 6,321 |
| Overall university police services | Mean | 3.57 | 3.79 | 3.81 | 3.30 | 3.70 | 3.48 | 3.50 | 3.87 | 3.52 | 3.54 | 3.46 | 3.65 | 3.55 |
| | S.D. | 0.81 | 0.84 | 0.70 | 1.03 | 0.87 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.82 | 0.81 | 0.92 | 0.89 | 0.81 | 0.91 |
| | N | 397 | 359 | 408 | 1385 | 756 | 947 | 620 | 482 | 771 | 275 | 306 | 48 | 6,754 |
| Ease of contact with University Police | Mean | 3.77 | 4.01 | 4.14 | 3.60 | 3.95 | 3.72 | 3.69 | 4.06 | 3.83 | 3.69 | 3.81 | 3.90 | 3.80 |
| | S.D. | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.74 | 0.99 | 0.88 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 0.84 | 0.83 | 1.06 | 0.88 | 0.92 | 0.94 |
| | N | 397 | 372 | 424 | 1421 | 713 | 899 | 577 | 490 | 742 | 233 | 308 | 51 | 6,627 |
| Timeliness of service | Mean | 3.48 | 3.77 | 3.85 | 3.30 | 3.78 | 3.55 | 3.56 | 3.86 | 3.75 | 3.60 | 3.65 | 3.71 | 3.60 |
| | S.D. | 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.89 | 1.06 | 0.93 | 1.02 | 0.98 | 0.91 | 0.83 | 0.96 | 0.93 | 0.87 | 0.98 |
| | N | 311 | 350 | 401 | 1285 | 560 | 756 | 508 | 452 | 600 | 190 | 269 | 48 | 5,730 |
| Contributes to teaching and learning | Mean | 3.18 | 3.74 | 3.85 | 3.39 | 3.69 | 3.43 | 3.38 | 3.82 | 3.36 | 3.39 | 3.06 | 3.45 | 3.48 |
| | S.D. | 1.19 | 1.17 | 1.04 | 1.25 | 1.15 | 1.19 | 1.29 | 1.02 | 1.12 | 1.16 | 1.22 | 1.02 | 1.20 |
| | N | 321 | 287 | 359 | 1154 | 623 | 819 | 508 | 453 | 598 | 222 | 248 | 42 | 5,634 |

**Appendix C: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Campus
Spring 2001**

Table 1. Campus and Systemwide Mean Satisfaction Ratings

| Satisfaction With | Data Type | Chico | Dominguez Hills | Fresno | Los Angeles | Long Beach | Sacramento | San Bernardino | San Diego | San Luis Obispo | San marcos | Sonoma | Stanislaus | All |
|---|-----------|-------|-----------------|--------|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|------------|--------|------------|-------|
| Provides adequate communication ... | Mean | 3.02 | 3.55 | 3.55 | 3.22 | 3.31 | 3.05 | 3.19 | 3.73 | 3.26 | 3.03 | 3.04 | 3.65 | 3.27 |
| | S.D. | 1.13 | 1.06 | 0.97 | 1.19 | 1.09 | 1.16 | 1.19 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.17 | 1.06 | 0.96 | 1.13 |
| | N | 368 | 327 | 382 | 1230 | 570 | 820 | 469 | 483 | 662 | 214 | 250 | 48 | 5,823 |
| Serve an essential role... | Mean | 3.70 | 4.07 | 4.30 | 3.78 | 4.07 | 3.86 | 3.73 | 4.34 | 3.75 | 3.72 | 3.49 | 4.15 | 3.89 |
| | S.D. | 1.08 | 0.96 | 0.77 | 1.12 | 0.99 | 1.13 | 1.15 | 0.83 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 1.15 | 0.81 | 1.08 |
| | N | 443 | 367 | 443 | 1491 | 792 | 1120 | 639 | 552 | 773 | 278 | 328 | 54 | 7,280 |
| ... concerned with helping resolve your problem | Mean | 3.52 | 3.92 | 3.95 | 3.34 | 3.92 | 3.60 | 3.58 | 3.91 | 3.70 | 3.89 | 3.55 | 3.89 | 3.66 |
| | S.D. | 1.03 | 0.98 | 0.88 | 1.20 | 0.99 | 1.17 | 1.12 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 1.18 | 1.02 | 1.10 |
| | N | 247 | 334 | 363 | 1131 | 425 | 623 | 405 | 410 | 493 | 141 | 211 | 44 | 4,827 |
| ... feel safe during the day | Mean | 3.45 | 3.95 | 3.91 | 3.67 | 3.81 | 3.64 | 3.66 | 3.95 | 3.50 | 3.65 | 3.48 | 3.76 | 3.69 |
| | S.D. | 1.20 | 1.04 | 0.89 | 1.19 | 1.11 | 1.17 | 1.24 | 1.06 | 1.14 | 1.13 | 1.20 | 1.16 | 1.15 |
| | N | 441 | 365 | 433 | 1570 | 825 | 1203 | 675 | 540 | 792 | 288 | 342 | 51 | 7,525 |
| ... feel safe during the night | Mean | 3.55 | 4.05 | 3.91 | 3.77 | 3.97 | 3.68 | 3.69 | 3.91 | 3.47 | 3.67 | 3.48 | 3.85 | 3.74 |
| | S.D. | 1.32 | 1.08 | 1.03 | 1.28 | 1.15 | 1.32 | 1.35 | 1.18 | 1.24 | 1.39 | 1.28 | 1.22 | 1.26 |
| | N | 427 | 327 | 373 | 1515 | 822 | 1121 | 664 | 504 | 750 | 263 | 340 | 47 | 7,153 |
| Conduct of employees is professional | Mean | 3.84 | 4.15 | 4.09 | 3.63 | 4.11 | 3.88 | 3.82 | 4.21 | 3.88 | 4.15 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 3.90 |
| | S.D. | 0.96 | 0.90 | 0.86 | 1.13 | 0.97 | 1.06 | 1.08 | 0.86 | 0.97 | 0.85 | 1.04 | 0.95 | 1.03 |
| | N | 361 | 375 | 424 | 1352 | 644 | 882 | 520 | 509 | 676 | 223 | 288 | 53 | 6,307 |
| Employees are sensitive to cultural diversity | Mean | 3.63 | 3.92 | 3.93 | 3.63 | 3.84 | 3.61 | 3.56 | 3.98 | 3.47 | 4.07 | 3.33 | 3.44 | 3.69 |
| | S.D. | 1.01 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 1.12 | 1.08 | 1.21 | 1.16 | 1.01 | 1.10 | 0.88 | 1.22 | 1.05 | 1.11 |
| | N | 170 | 261 | 247 | 967 | 382 | 495 | 357 | 238 | 364 | 134 | 156 | 32 | 3,803 |

Appendix C: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Campus - Spring 2001

Table 2. Campus and Systemwide Percent Satisfaction Ratings

| Satisfaction With | Data Type | Chico | Dominguez Hills | Fresno | Los Angeles | Long Beach | Sacramento | San Bernardino | San Diego | San Luis Obispo | San Marcos | Sonoma | Stanislaus | All |
|--|-------------|-------|-----------------|--------|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|------------|--------|------------|------|
| Evening guide/escort services | Total N | 197 | 223 | 179 | 768 | 562 | 475 | 420 | 249 | 477 | 145 | 153 | 31 | 3879 |
| | VS/S (%) | 49.2 | 65.5 | 60.9 | 44.1 | 70.3 | 42.3 | 48.6 | 63.9 | 40.9 | 41.4 | 37.9 | 38.7 | 50.9 |
| | Neutral (%) | 38.1 | 26.5 | 30.7 | 38.8 | 21.0 | 42.5 | 39.5 | 25.7 | 46.8 | 29.0 | 41.8 | 32.3 | 35.5 |
| | D/VD (%) | 12.7 | 8.1 | 8.4 | 17.1 | 8.7 | 15.2 | 11.9 | 10.4 | 12.4 | 29.7 | 20.3 | 29.0 | 13.6 |
| Crime prevention presentations | Total N | 213 | 205 | 202 | 815 | 441 | 492 | 422 | 278 | 548 | 147 | 153 | 31 | 3947 |
| | VS/S (%) | 33.3 | 41.5 | 41.1 | 36.2 | 44.4 | 35.4 | 38.6 | 56.5 | 42.2 | 29.3 | 37.9 | 45.2 | 39.8 |
| | Neutral (%) | 52.1 | 41.0 | 46.0 | 44.9 | 45.4 | 44.5 | 42.7 | 34.9 | 47.4 | 50.3 | 49.0 | 45.2 | 44.9 |
| | D/VD (%) | 14.6 | 17.6 | 12.9 | 18.9 | 10.2 | 20.1 | 18.7 | 8.6 | 10.4 | 20.4 | 13.1 | 9.7 | 15.3 |
| Procedure for reporting crimes | Total N | 187 | 221 | 229 | 845 | 380 | 545 | 376 | 304 | 472 | 121 | 154 | 28 | 3862 |
| | VS/S (%) | 32.1 | 62.4 | 58.5 | 42.0 | 46.8 | 49.0 | 39.9 | 65.8 | 43.4 | 44.6 | 44.8 | 42.9 | 47.2 |
| | Neutral (%) | 45.5 | 29.4 | 32.8 | 41.5 | 43.9 | 35.4 | 42.6 | 27.6 | 48.9 | 45.5 | 42.9 | 42.9 | 40.0 |
| | D/VD (%) | 22.5 | 8.1 | 8.7 | 16.4 | 9.2 | 15.6 | 17.6 | 6.6 | 7.6 | 9.9 | 12.3 | 14.3 | 12.8 |
| Procedure for investigating crimes | Total N | 176 | 202 | 194 | 774 | 316 | 469 | 357 | 248 | 413 | 100 | 150 | 23 | 3422 |
| | VS/S (%) | 31.3 | 55.0 | 49.0 | 35.4 | 42.4 | 35.8 | 38.1 | 54.0 | 34.4 | 32.0 | 35.3 | 34.8 | 39.2 |
| | Neutral (%) | 48.9 | 30.7 | 36.6 | 43.9 | 45.6 | 39.9 | 48.5 | 37.9 | 51.8 | 60.0 | 44.0 | 43.5 | 44.0 |
| | D/VD (%) | 19.9 | 14.4 | 14.4 | 20.7 | 12.0 | 24.3 | 13.4 | 8.1 | 13.8 | 8.0 | 20.7 | 21.7 | 16.7 |
| Responding to your information requests | Total N | 254 | 284 | 294 | 1032 | 455 | 595 | 479 | 350 | 521 | 143 | 205 | 40 | 4652 |
| | VS/S (%) | 52.4 | 66.5 | 70.4 | 44.4 | 58.2 | 51.4 | 47.4 | 68.9 | 48.0 | 54.5 | 52.2 | 62.5 | 53.4 |
| | Neutral (%) | 32.7 | 26.4 | 22.4 | 35.9 | 33.2 | 33.1 | 38.6 | 23.1 | 43.2 | 39.9 | 33.2 | 27.5 | 33.7 |
| | D/VD (%) | 15.0 | 7.0 | 7.1 | 19.7 | 8.6 | 15.5 | 14.0 | 8.0 | 8.8 | 5.6 | 14.6 | 10.0 | 12.8 |
| Requesting a vehicle door be unlocked | Total N | 113 | 163 | 134 | 715 | 323 | 401 | 409 | 161 | 340 | 94 | 131 | 23 | 3007 |
| | VS/S (%) | 35.4 | 50.3 | 44.8 | 49.9 | 47.4 | 46.6 | 50.6 | 49.1 | 27.4 | 29.8 | 39.7 | 47.8 | 44.9 |
| | Neutral (%) | 55.8 | 37.4 | 44.8 | 37.8 | 43.0 | 41.4 | 41.6 | 37.3 | 57.9 | 45.7 | 46.6 | 47.8 | 43.3 |
| | D/VD (%) | 8.8 | 12.3 | 10.4 | 12.3 | 9.6 | 12.0 | 7.8 | 13.7 | 14.7 | 24.5 | 13.7 | 4.3 | 11.9 |
| Requesting a campus door/gate be unlocked | Total N | 207 | 278 | 341 | 913 | 410 | 437 | 401 | 325 | 419 | 155 | 194 | 44 | 4124 |
| | VS/S (%) | 55.1 | 64.0 | 71.8 | 42.3 | 57.8 | 53.3 | 40.4 | 68.3 | 43.9 | 56.1 | 55.2 | 61.4 | 52.9 |
| | Neutral (%) | 26.1 | 21.6 | 14.4 | 34.9 | 34.6 | 37.1 | 45.4 | 18.5 | 48.2 | 28.4 | 33.5 | 22.7 | 32.7 |
| | D/VD (%) | 18.8 | 14.4 | 13.8 | 22.8 | 7.6 | 9.6 | 14.2 | 13.2 | 7.9 | 15.5 | 11.3 | 15.9 | 14.4 |
| Presence of uniformed personnel on foot patrol | Total N | 367 | 313 | 361 | 1269 | 749 | 929 | 598 | 442 | 678 | 272 | 299 | 44 | 6321 |
| | VS/S (%) | 43.6 | 47.6 | 38.0 | 38.1 | 42.6 | 44.0 | 35.1 | 52.9 | 29.1 | 40.8 | 43.5 | 38.6 | 40.4 |
| | Neutral (%) | 34.1 | 26.8 | 40.4 | 36.1 | 33.8 | 31.5 | 39.5 | 28.3 | 42.0 | 25.4 | 36.8 | 47.7 | 34.9 |
| | D/VD (%) | 22.3 | 25.6 | 21.6 | 25.8 | 23.6 | 24.4 | 25.4 | 18.8 | 28.9 | 33.8 | 19.7 | 13.6 | 24.7 |
| Overall University Police services | Total N | 397 | 359 | 408 | 1385 | 756 | 947 | 620 | 482 | 771 | 275 | 306 | 48 | 6754 |
| | VS/S (%) | 58.2 | 68.8 | 72.3 | 45.0 | 62.4 | 53.1 | 52.3 | 72.6 | 53.7 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 70.8 | 56.2 |
| | Neutral (%) | 34.8 | 24.8 | 24.0 | 36.7 | 30.2 | 34.7 | 36.5 | 21.8 | 37.7 | 36.0 | 37.9 | 18.8 | 33.1 |
| | D/VD (%) | 7.1 | 6.4 | 3.7 | 18.3 | 7.4 | 12.1 | 11.3 | 5.6 | 8.6 | 12.0 | 10.1 | 10.4 | 10.7 |
| Ease of contact with University Police | Total N | 397 | 372 | 424 | 1421 | 713 | 899 | 577 | 490 | 742 | 233 | 308 | 51 | 6627 |
| | VS/S (%) | 69.8 | 79.8 | 86.3 | 59.1 | 74.8 | 64.5 | 60.8 | 80.6 | 69.7 | 63.5 | 68.5 | 80.4 | 68.7 |
| | Neutral (%) | 21.4 | 14.0 | 10.8 | 27.4 | 18.9 | 24.6 | 27.9 | 13.9 | 24.8 | 21.5 | 24.7 | 11.8 | 22.2 |
| | D/VD (%) | 8.8 | 6.2 | 2.8 | 13.5 | 6.3 | 10.9 | 11.3 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 15.0 | 6.8 | 7.8 | 9.0 |
| Timeliness of service | Total N | 311 | 350 | 401 | 1285 | 560 | 756 | 508 | 452 | 600 | 190 | 269 | 48 | 5730 |
| | VS/S (%) | 55.6 | 67.7 | 73.3 | 44.8 | 65.9 | 56.2 | 55.9 | 73.0 | 62.5 | 58.9 | 59.9 | 75.0 | 58.8 |
| | Neutral (%) | 31.8 | 23.7 | 18.7 | 35.6 | 25.5 | 30.7 | 31.9 | 18.1 | 32.8 | 30.0 | 30.9 | 12.5 | 29.3 |
| | D/VD (%) | 12.5 | 8.6 | 8.0 | 19.5 | 8.6 | 13.1 | 12.2 | 8.8 | 4.7 | 11.1 | 9.3 | 12.5 | 11.9 |

Appendix C: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Campus - Spring 2001

Table 2. Campus and Systemwide Percent Satisfaction Ratings

| Satisfaction With | Data Type | Chico | Dominguez Hills | Fresno | Los Angeles | Long Beach | Sacramento | San Bernardino | San Diego | San Luis Obispo | San Marcos | Sonoma | Stanislaus | All |
|---|--------------|-------|-----------------|--------|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|------------|--------|------------|------|
| Contributes to teaching and learning | Total N | 321 | 287 | 359 | 1154 | 623 | 819 | 508 | 453 | 598 | 222 | 248 | 42 | 5634 |
| | Much (%) | 41.1 | 64.1 | 65.2 | 49.3 | 62.1 | 50.2 | 50.4 | 64.5 | 47.5 | 48.6 | 36.7 | 50.0 | 52.7 |
| | Neutral (%) | 31.5 | 23.3 | 25.1 | 30.4 | 23.4 | 29.8 | 26.8 | 25.6 | 35.1 | 29.7 | 33.9 | 35.7 | 28.9 |
| | Not much (%) | 27.4 | 12.5 | 9.7 | 20.3 | 14.4 | 20.0 | 22.8 | 9.9 | 17.4 | 21.6 | 29.4 | 14.3 | 18.4 |
| Provides adequate communication ... | Total N | 368 | 327 | 382 | 1230 | 570 | 820 | 469 | 483 | 662 | 214 | 250 | 48 | 5823 |
| | Much (%) | 37.2 | 55.4 | 56.5 | 43.3 | 44.4 | 37.6 | 43.5 | 62.7 | 41.2 | 36.4 | 35.2 | 66.7 | 44.7 |
| | Neutral (%) | 30.7 | 28.4 | 28.0 | 32.3 | 34.7 | 31.5 | 30.5 | 26.1 | 39.6 | 32.7 | 37.6 | 18.8 | 32.1 |
| | Not much (%) | 32.1 | 16.2 | 15.4 | 24.5 | 20.9 | 31.0 | 26.0 | 11.2 | 19.2 | 30.8 | 27.2 | 14.6 | 23.1 |
| Serve an essential role... | Total N | 443 | 367 | 443 | 1491 | 792 | 1120 | 639 | 552 | 773 | 278 | 328 | 54 | 7280 |
| | Much (%) | 60.0 | 75.5 | 85.3 | 62.8 | 74.7 | 66.3 | 60.3 | 84.6 | 61.8 | 57.2 | 51.2 | 77.8 | 67.2 |
| | Neutral (%) | 26.0 | 18.0 | 12.6 | 25.1 | 17.9 | 21.3 | 26.0 | 12.1 | 25.4 | 29.5 | 30.5 | 20.4 | 22.2 |
| | Not much (%) | 14.0 | 6.5 | 2.0 | 12.1 | 7.3 | 12.3 | 13.8 | 3.3 | 12.8 | 13.3 | 18.3 | 1.9 | 10.6 |
| ... concerned with helping resolve your problem | Total N | 247 | 334 | 363 | 1131 | 425 | 623 | 405 | 410 | 493 | 141 | 211 | 44 | 4827 |
| | Much (%) | 57.5 | 72.5 | 74.4 | 46.9 | 70.1 | 58.4 | 56.5 | 70.0 | 61.1 | 70.9 | 56.4 | 75.0 | 60.4 |
| | Neutral (%) | 25.9 | 19.8 | 19.3 | 30.4 | 21.6 | 24.6 | 26.4 | 21.5 | 27.2 | 17.7 | 26.1 | 15.9 | 25.0 |
| | Not much (%) | 16.6 | 7.8 | 6.3 | 22.7 | 8.2 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 8.5 | 11.8 | 11.3 | 17.5 | 9.1 | 14.6 |
| ... feel safe during the day | Total N | 441 | 365 | 433 | 1570 | 825 | 1203 | 675 | 540 | 792 | 288 | 342 | 51 | 7525 |
| | Much (%) | 50.8 | 71.0 | 68.6 | 58.9 | 62.8 | 57.6 | 59.0 | 70.7 | 52.1 | 59.4 | 52.3 | 62.7 | 59.7 |
| | Neutral (%) | 30.6 | 20.5 | 26.3 | 26.2 | 25.8 | 27.1 | 24.3 | 20.4 | 32.3 | 25.3 | 30.1 | 27.5 | 26.5 |
| | Not much (%) | 18.6 | 8.5 | 5.1 | 14.9 | 11.4 | 15.3 | 16.7 | 8.9 | 15.5 | 15.3 | 17.5 | 9.8 | 13.8 |
| ... feel safe during the night | Total N | 427 | 327 | 373 | 1515 | 822 | 1121 | 664 | 504 | 750 | 263 | 340 | 47 | 7153 |
| | Much (%) | 57.8 | 74.0 | 68.9 | 62.6 | 71.7 | 61.0 | 60.2 | 67.5 | 51.2 | 63.9 | 55.6 | 68.1 | 62.6 |
| | Neutral (%) | 17.1 | 16.5 | 20.9 | 20.5 | 16.4 | 18.3 | 19.0 | 18.7 | 28.3 | 11.0 | 21.8 | 17.0 | 19.6 |
| | Not much (%) | 25.1 | 9.5 | 10.2 | 16.9 | 11.9 | 20.7 | 20.8 | 13.9 | 20.5 | 25.1 | 22.6 | 14.9 | 17.8 |
| Conduct of employees is professional | Total N | 361 | 375 | 424 | 1352 | 644 | 882 | 520 | 509 | 676 | 223 | 288 | 53 | 6307 |
| | Much (%) | 67.3 | 81.1 | 77.4 | 59.1 | 76.7 | 69.3 | 65.8 | 82.1 | 67.5 | 78.9 | 64.2 | 75.5 | 69.7 |
| | Neutral (%) | 24.4 | 13.6 | 17.7 | 25.6 | 16.6 | 20.5 | 22.5 | 13.4 | 24.9 | 17.5 | 25.0 | 18.9 | 21.0 |
| | Not much (%) | 8.3 | 5.3 | 5.0 | 15.3 | 6.7 | 10.2 | 11.7 | 4.5 | 7.7 | 3.6 | 10.8 | 5.7 | 9.3 |
| Employees are sensitive to cultural diversity | Total N | 170 | 261 | 247 | 967 | 382 | 495 | 357 | 238 | 364 | 134 | 156 | 32 | 3803 |
| | Much (%) | 58.2 | 72.4 | 68.4 | 57.5 | 67.5 | 57.0 | 56.3 | 71.0 | 49.7 | 77.6 | 45.5 | 43.8 | 60.3 |
| | Neutral (%) | 30.6 | 18.8 | 24.7 | 28.4 | 20.7 | 26.5 | 27.7 | 21.0 | 33.8 | 17.2 | 31.4 | 40.6 | 26.4 |
| | Not much (%) | 11.2 | 8.8 | 6.9 | 14.1 | 11.8 | 16.6 | 16.0 | 8.0 | 16.5 | 5.2 | 23.1 | 15.6 | 13.3 |

Appendix D: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Customer Type - Spring 2001

Table 1. Mean Satisfaction Ratings by Customer Type

| Satisfaction with ... | | Students | Faculty | Staff | All |
|--|------|----------|---------|-------|-------|
| Evening guide/escort services | Mean | 3.36 | 3.79 | 3.62 | 3.49 |
| | S.D. | 1.02 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 1.00 |
| | N | 2,070 | 428 | 1,015 | 3,513 |
| Crime prevention presentations | Mean | 3.17 | 3.43 | 3.42 | 3.29 |
| | S.D. | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| | N | 1,939 | 378 | 1,244 | 3,561 |
| Procedure for reporting crimes | Mean | 3.19 | 3.58 | 3.61 | 3.40 |
| | S.D. | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.89 | 0.93 |
| | N | 1,673 | 445 | 1,325 | 3,443 |
| Procedure for investigating crimes | Mean | 3.10 | 3.42 | 3.40 | 3.25 |
| | S.D. | 0.93 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 0.98 |
| | N | 1,526 | 364 | 1,150 | 3,040 |
| Responding to your information requests | Mean | 3.25 | 3.75 | 3.70 | 3.51 |
| | S.D. | 0.96 | 0.94 | 0.95 | 0.98 |
| | N | 1,861 | 644 | 1,626 | 4,131 |
| Requesting a vehicle door be unlocked | Mean | 3.35 | 3.73 | 3.49 | 3.44 |
| | S.D. | 0.98 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.01 |
| | N | 1,476 | 330 | 891 | 2,697 |
| Requesting a group door/gate be unlocked | Mean | 3.25 | 3.87 | 3.60 | 3.51 |
| | S.D. | 0.91 | 1.05 | 1.08 | 1.04 |
| | N | 1,477 | 737 | 1,424 | 3,638 |
| Presence of uniformed personnel on foot patrol | Mean | 3.08 | 3.31 | 3.24 | 3.17 |
| | S.D. | 1.06 | 1.03 | 1.07 | 1.06 |
| | N | 2,942 | 801 | 1,963 | 5,706 |
| Overall university police services | Mean | 3.37 | 3.76 | 3.70 | 3.55 |
| | S.D. | 0.92 | 0.83 | 0.88 | 0.91 |
| | N | 2,954 | 905 | 2,205 | 6,064 |
| Ease of contact with University Police | Mean | 3.54 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 3.79 |
| | S.D. | 0.95 | 0.83 | 0.88 | 0.94 |
| | N | 2,743 | 945 | 2,252 | 5,940 |
| Timeliness of service | Mean | 3.37 | 3.80 | 3.75 | 3.60 |
| | S.D. | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| | N | 2,163 | 870 | 2,069 | 5,102 |
| Contributes to teaching and learning | Mean | 3.26 | 3.60 | 3.69 | 3.47 |
| | S.D. | 1.24 | 1.16 | 1.11 | 1.20 |
| | N | 2,339 | 851 | 1,859 | 5,049 |

Appendix D: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Customer Type - Spring 2001

Table 1. Mean Satisfaction Ratings by Customer Type

| Satisfaction with ... | | Students | Faculty | Staff | All |
|---|------|----------|---------|-------|-------|
| Provides adequate communication ... | Mean | 2.99 | 3.42 | 3.47 | 3.25 |
| | S.D. | 1.18 | 1.01 | 1.06 | 1.13 |
| | N | 2,322 | 843 | 2,057 | 5,222 |
| Serve an essential role... | Mean | 3.59 | 4.09 | 4.17 | 3.88 |
| | S.D. | 1.15 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 1.08 |
| | N | 3,158 | 1,027 | 2,364 | 6,549 |
| ... concerned with helping resolve your problem | Mean | 3.31 | 3.82 | 3.86 | 3.65 |
| | S.D. | 1.16 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.10 |
| | N | 1,592 | 794 | 1,880 | 4,266 |
| ... feel safe during the day | Mean | 3.53 | 3.70 | 3.88 | 3.68 |
| | S.D. | 1.22 | 1.10 | 1.06 | 1.16 |
| | N | 3,382 | 1,023 | 2,382 | 6,787 |
| ... feel safe during the night | Mean | 3.65 | 3.79 | 3.84 | 3.73 |
| | S.D. | 1.34 | 1.12 | 1.21 | 1.27 |
| | N | 3,402 | 990 | 2,065 | 6,457 |
| Conduct of employees is professional | Mean | 3.68 | 4.07 | 4.07 | 3.90 |
| | S.D. | 1.11 | 0.91 | 0.93 | 1.03 |
| | N | 2,428 | 916 | 2,280 | 5,624 |
| Employees are sensitive to cultural diversity | Mean | 3.50 | 3.85 | 3.82 | 3.68 |
| | S.D. | 1.19 | 1.03 | 1.04 | 1.12 |
| | N | 1,554 | 433 | 1,393 | 3,380 |

Appendix D: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Customer Type - Spring 2001

Table 2. Percent Satisfaction Ratings by Customer Type

| | | Students | Faculty | Staff | All |
|--|-------------|----------|---------|-------|-------|
| Evening guide/escort services | Total N | 2,070 | 428 | 1,015 | 3,513 |
| | VS/S (%) | 44.2 | 64.7 | 57.0 | 50.4 |
| | Neutral (%) | 38.8 | 28.7 | 32.8 | 35.9 |
| | D/VD (%) | 17.0 | 6.5 | 10.1 | 13.7 |
| Crime prevention presentations | Total N | 1,939 | 378 | 1,244 | 3,561 |
| | VS/S (%) | 32.9 | 43.7 | 48.3 | 39.4 |
| | Neutral (%) | 49.6 | 46.3 | 37.5 | 45.0 |
| | D/VD (%) | 17.5 | 10.1 | 14.2 | 15.6 |
| Procedure for reporting crimes | Total N | 1,673 | 445 | 1,325 | 3,443 |
| | VS/S (%) | 33.7 | 58.4 | 59.2 | 46.7 |
| | Neutral (%) | 49.6 | 30.3 | 31.6 | 40.2 |
| | D/VD (%) | 16.7 | 11.2 | 9.1 | 13.1 |
| Procedure for investigating crimes | Total N | 1,526 | 364 | 1,150 | 3,040 |
| | VS/S (%) | 29.2 | 49.5 | 48.0 | 38.7 |
| | Neutral (%) | 52.6 | 35.7 | 36.1 | 44.3 |
| | D/VD (%) | 18.2 | 14.8 | 15.9 | 16.9 |
| Responding to your information requests | Total N | 1,861 | 644 | 1,626 | 4,131 |
| | VS/S (%) | 38.0 | 66.8 | 64.4 | 52.9 |
| | Neutral (%) | 45.4 | 24.2 | 25.6 | 34.3 |
| | D/VD (%) | 16.7 | 9.0 | 10.0 | 12.8 |
| Requesting a vehicle door be unlocked | Total N | 1,476 | 330 | 891 | 2,697 |
| | VS/S (%) | 38.3 | 59.4 | 49.2 | 44.5 |
| | Neutral (%) | 50.1 | 33.6 | 37.0 | 43.8 |
| | D/VD (%) | 11.6 | 7.0 | 13.8 | 11.8 |
| Requesting a campus door/gate be unlocked | Total N | 1,477 | 737 | 1,424 | 3,638 |
| | VS/S (%) | 33.6 | 73.4 | 60.8 | 52.3 |
| | Neutral (%) | 53.0 | 13.8 | 24.3 | 33.8 |
| | D/VD (%) | 13.4 | 12.8 | 14.9 | 13.9 |
| Presence of uniformed personnel on foot patrol | Total N | 2,942 | 801 | 1,963 | 5,706 |
| | VS/S (%) | 35.6 | 46.6 | 44.0 | 40.0 |
| | Neutral (%) | 37.2 | 32.3 | 32.8 | 35.0 |
| | D/VD (%) | 27.3 | 21.1 | 23.2 | 25.0 |
| Overall University Police services | Total N | 2,954 | 905 | 2,205 | 6,064 |
| | VS/S (%) | 45.1 | 68.3 | 65.4 | 55.9 |
| | Neutral (%) | 41.4 | 25.4 | 26.3 | 33.5 |
| | D/VD (%) | 13.4 | 6.3 | 8.4 | 10.5 |
| Ease of contact with University Police | Total N | 2,743 | 945 | 2,252 | 5,940 |
| | VS/S (%) | 55.0 | 79.7 | 79.7 | 68.3 |
| | Neutral (%) | 32.3 | 14.6 | 14.1 | 22.6 |
| | D/VD (%) | 12.7 | 5.7 | 6.2 | 9.1 |

Appendix D: Customer Satisfaction with University Police Services by Customer Type - Spring 2001

Table 2. Percent Satisfaction Ratings by Customer Type

| | | Students | Faculty | Staff | All |
|---|--------------|----------|---------|-------|-------|
| Timeliness of service | Total N | 2,163 | 870 | 2,069 | 5,102 |
| | VS/S (%) | 44.7 | 70.8 | 67.5 | 58.4 |
| | Neutral (%) | 41.0 | 19.7 | 22.5 | 29.9 |
| | D/VD (%) | 14.3 | 9.5 | 10.0 | 11.8 |
| Contributes to teaching and learning | Total N | 2,339 | 851 | 1,859 | 5,049 |
| | Much (%) | 44.1 | 58.2 | 60.4 | 52.5 |
| | Neutral (%) | 31.4 | 26.0 | 26.8 | 28.8 |
| | Not much (%) | 24.5 | 15.9 | 12.7 | 18.7 |
| Provides adequate communication ... | Total N | 2,322 | 843 | 2,057 | 5,222 |
| | Much (%) | 34.5 | 49.9 | 52.3 | 44.0 |
| | Neutral (%) | 33.5 | 32.6 | 30.7 | 32.2 |
| | Not much (%) | 32.0 | 17.4 | 17.0 | 23.7 |
| Serve an essential role... | Total N | 3,158 | 1,027 | 2,364 | 6,549 |
| | Much (%) | 55.0 | 78.2 | 78.0 | 66.9 |
| | Neutral (%) | 28.4 | 15.9 | 16.7 | 22.2 |
| | Not much (%) | 16.6 | 5.9 | 5.3 | 10.9 |
| ... concerned with helping resolve your problem | Total N | 1,592 | 794 | 1,880 | 4,266 |
| | Much (%) | 45.4 | 69.6 | 68.8 | 60.2 |
| | Neutral (%) | 31.8 | 18.9 | 21.7 | 24.9 |
| | Not much (%) | 22.9 | 11.5 | 9.5 | 14.9 |
| ... feel safe during the day | Total N | 3,382 | 1,023 | 2,382 | 6,787 |
| | Much (%) | 52.8 | 60.8 | 67.7 | 59.2 |
| | Neutral (%) | 29.2 | 27.1 | 22.9 | 26.7 |
| | Not much (%) | 18.0 | 12.1 | 9.4 | 14.1 |
| ... feel safe during the night | Total N | 3,402 | 990 | 2,065 | 6,457 |
| | Much (%) | 59.8 | 65.5 | 65.5 | 62.5 |
| | Neutral (%) | 18.7 | 21.2 | 19.6 | 19.3 |
| | Not much (%) | 21.5 | 13.3 | 15.0 | 18.2 |
| Conduct of employees is professional | Total N | 2,428 | 916 | 2,280 | 5,624 |
| | Much (%) | 59.6 | 77.2 | 76.8 | 69.4 |
| | Neutral (%) | 27.1 | 17.2 | 16.6 | 21.2 |
| | Not much (%) | 13.4 | 5.6 | 6.6 | 9.4 |
| Employees are sensitive to cultural diversity | Total N | 1,554 | 433 | 1,393 | 3,380 |
| | Much (%) | 53.3 | 65.8 | 65.5 | 59.9 |
| | Neutral (%) | 29.4 | 24.2 | 23.9 | 26.5 |
| | Not much (%) | 17.3 | 9.9 | 10.6 | 13.6 |

Appendix E: Gap Analysis of University Police Services - Spring 2001

Table 1. Gap Analysis by Campus

| Satisfaction With | Data Type | Chico | Dominguez Hills | Fresno | Los Angeles | Long Beach | Sacramento | San Bernardino | San Diego | San Luis Obispo | San Marcos | Sonoma | Stanislaus | All |
|--|--------------|-------|-----------------|--------|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|-----------|-----------------|------------|--------|------------|------|
| Evening guide/escort services | Total N | 187 | 212 | 171 | 715 | 554 | 463 | 406 | 240 | 462 | 143 | 149 | 30 | 3732 |
| | Importance | 4.25 | 4.23 | 4.35 | 4.37 | 4.39 | 4.23 | 4.19 | 4.64 | 3.93 | 4.42 | 4.17 | 4.13 | 4.28 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.47 | 3.74 | 3.77 | 3.37 | 3.9 | 3.33 | 3.44 | 3.72 | 3.36 | 3.15 | 3.22 | 3.13 | 3.5 |
| | Gap | 0.79 | 0.49 | 0.58 | 1 | 0.5 | 0.89 | 0.75 | 0.92 | 0.57 | 1.27 | 0.95 | 1 | 0.78 |
| Crime prevention presentations | Total N | 202 | 196 | 190 | 752 | 433 | 479 | 409 | 266 | 530 | 144 | 144 | 30 | 3775 |
| | Importance | 3.69 | 4.15 | 3.86 | 4.2 | 3.96 | 3.82 | 4.02 | 4.22 | 3.58 | 3.9 | 3.75 | 3.43 | 3.94 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.16 | 3.26 | 3.34 | 3.2 | 3.44 | 3.19 | 3.22 | 3.66 | 3.4 | 3.1 | 3.28 | 3.37 | 3.3 |
| | Gap | 0.53 | 0.89 | 0.53 | 1 | 0.52 | 0.63 | 0.8 | 0.56 | 0.18 | 0.8 | 0.47 | 0.07 | 0.64 |
| Procedure for reporting crimes | Total N | 179 | 209 | 213 | 774 | 369 | 523 | 360 | 288 | 452 | 117 | 142 | 25 | 3651 |
| | Importance | 4.14 | 4.38 | 4.13 | 4.26 | 4.15 | 4.23 | 4.16 | 4.4 | 3.96 | 4.13 | 4.02 | 3.8 | 4.19 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.08 | 3.69 | 3.57 | 3.29 | 3.45 | 3.38 | 3.27 | 3.73 | 3.43 | 3.47 | 3.36 | 3.32 | 3.41 |
| | Gap | 1.06 | 0.69 | 0.56 | 0.97 | 0.7 | 0.86 | 0.89 | 0.67 | 0.53 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.48 | 0.78 |
| Procedure for investigating crimes | Total N | 167 | 190 | 186 | 708 | 304 | 449 | 340 | 231 | 396 | 95 | 141 | 21 | 3228 |
| | Importance | 4.32 | 4.39 | 4.22 | 4.28 | 4.21 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.42 | 4.04 | 4.02 | 4.13 | 3.57 | 4.22 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.13 | 3.53 | 3.42 | 3.14 | 3.35 | 3.07 | 3.29 | 3.58 | 3.24 | 3.29 | 3.17 | 3.05 | 3.25 |
| | Gap | 1.19 | 0.86 | 0.8 | 1.15 | 0.86 | 1.16 | 0.89 | 0.83 | 0.8 | 0.73 | 0.96 | 0.52 | 0.97 |
| Responding to your information requests | Total N | 243 | 268 | 279 | 946 | 439 | 578 | 462 | 330 | 495 | 141 | 194 | 37 | 4412 |
| | Importance | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.13 | 4.33 | 4.38 | 4.23 | 4.24 | 4.37 | 3.95 | 4.2 | 4.16 | 4.03 | 4.24 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.48 | 3.78 | 3.79 | 3.29 | 3.66 | 3.44 | 3.39 | 3.87 | 3.5 | 3.62 | 3.5 | 3.65 | 3.52 |
| | Gap | 0.73 | 0.57 | 0.34 | 1.05 | 0.72 | 0.79 | 0.85 | 0.5 | 0.45 | 0.58 | 0.66 | 0.38 | 0.72 |
| Requesting a vehicle door be unlocked | Total N | 106 | 153 | 129 | 654 | 319 | 389 | 394 | 148 | 326 | 90 | 126 | 21 | 2855 |
| | Importance | 3.36 | 3.8 | 3.5 | 4.14 | 3.98 | 3.76 | 4.18 | 3.82 | 3.53 | 3.91 | 3.8 | 3.57 | 3.89 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.24 | 3.49 | 3.43 | 3.52 | 3.51 | 3.49 | 3.64 | 3.51 | 3.15 | 3.07 | 3.32 | 3.62 | 3.45 |
| | Gap | 0.12 | 0.31 | 0.08 | 0.62 | 0.47 | 0.27 | 0.54 | 0.32 | 0.38 | 0.84 | 0.48 | -0.05 | 0.44 |
| Requesting a campus door/gate be unlocked | Total N | 195 | 262 | 326 | 843 | 398 | 424 | 389 | 308 | 400 | 150 | 190 | 40 | 3925 |
| | Importance | 3.92 | 4.21 | 4.29 | 4.1 | 4.08 | 3.78 | 3.97 | 4.26 | 3.63 | 4.13 | 3.95 | 3.98 | 4.02 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.47 | 3.64 | 3.8 | 3.21 | 3.73 | 3.58 | 3.34 | 3.8 | 3.46 | 3.49 | 3.62 | 3.6 | 3.51 |
| | Gap | 0.45 | 0.57 | 0.49 | 0.89 | 0.35 | 0.19 | 0.62 | 0.46 | 0.17 | 0.63 | 0.33 | 0.38 | 0.51 |
| Presence of uniformed personnel on foot patrol | Total N | 352 | 296 | 345 | 1182 | 730 | 901 | 582 | 425 | 653 | 267 | 287 | 41 | 6061 |
| | Importance | 3.99 | 4.3 | 4.11 | 4.29 | 4.26 | 4.31 | 4.18 | 4.42 | 3.87 | 4.27 | 3.88 | 3.76 | 4.19 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.22 | 3.25 | 3.19 | 3.11 | 3.24 | 3.22 | 3.09 | 3.43 | 2.97 | 3.1 | 3.26 | 3.22 | 3.17 |
| | Gap | 0.77 | 1.04 | 0.92 | 1.18 | 1.02 | 1.09 | 1.08 | 0.99 | 0.9 | 1.16 | 0.62 | 0.54 | 1.02 |
| Overall University Police services | Total N | 374 | 333 | 378 | 1269 | 728 | 903 | 589 | 454 | 730 | 265 | 282 | 43 | 6348 |
| | Importance | 4.43 | 4.51 | 4.52 | 4.44 | 4.5 | 4.43 | 4.39 | 4.63 | 4.18 | 4.45 | 4.19 | 4.26 | 4.42 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.58 | 3.8 | 3.81 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 3.48 | 3.51 | 3.88 | 3.52 | 3.55 | 3.45 | 3.63 | 3.55 |
| | Gap | 0.85 | 0.71 | 0.7 | 1.13 | 0.79 | 0.95 | 0.88 | 0.75 | 0.65 | 0.9 | 0.74 | 0.63 | 0.87 |

Appendix E: Gap Analysis of University Police Services - Spring 2001

Table 2. Gap Analysis by Customer Type

| | | Students | Faculty | Staff | All |
|--|--------------|----------|---------|-------|-------|
| Evening guide/escort services | Total N | 2,001 | 407 | 977 | 3,385 |
| | Importance | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.33 | 4.27 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.37 | 3.78 | 3.63 | 3.49 |
| | Gap | 0.87 | 0.49 | 0.70 | 0.77 |
| Crime prevention presentations | Total N | 1,868 | 360 | 1,186 | 3,414 |
| | Importance | 3.89 | 3.63 | 4.09 | 3.93 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.18 | 3.41 | 3.43 | 3.29 |
| | Gap | 0.71 | 0.23 | 0.66 | 0.64 |
| Procedure for reporting crimes | Total N | 1,588 | 413 | 1,264 | 3,265 |
| | Importance | 4.10 | 4.16 | 4.28 | 4.18 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.20 | 3.56 | 3.61 | 3.40 |
| | Gap | 0.90 | 0.60 | 0.67 | 0.77 |
| Procedure for investigating crimes | Total N | 1,441 | 342 | 1,096 | 2,879 |
| | Importance | 4.12 | 4.17 | 4.34 | 4.21 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.10 | 3.39 | 3.40 | 3.25 |
| | Gap | 1.03 | 0.78 | 0.94 | 0.96 |
| Responding to your information requests | Total N | 1,773 | 609 | 1,556 | 3,938 |
| | Importance | 4.24 | 4.18 | 4.28 | 4.25 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.25 | 3.75 | 3.71 | 3.51 |
| | Gap | 0.98 | 0.44 | 0.58 | 0.74 |
| Requesting a vehicle door be unlocked | Total N | 1,403 | 314 | 855 | 2,572 |
| | Importance | 4.01 | 3.79 | 3.72 | 3.88 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.36 | 3.73 | 3.48 | 3.44 |
| | Gap | 0.65 | 0.07 | 0.24 | 0.44 |
| Requesting a campus door/gate be unlocked | Total N | 1,411 | 701 | 1,365 | 3,477 |
| | Importance | 3.79 | 4.35 | 4.04 | 4.00 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.25 | 3.86 | 3.60 | 3.51 |
| | Gap | 0.54 | 0.49 | 0.45 | 0.49 |
| Presence of uniformed personnel on foot patrol | Total N | 2,836 | 769 | 1,881 | 5,486 |
| | Importance | 4.15 | 4.19 | 4.27 | 4.20 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.08 | 3.29 | 3.24 | 3.16 |
| | Gap | 1.07 | 0.89 | 1.03 | 1.03 |
| Overall University Police services | Total N | 2,816 | 843 | 2,060 | 5,719 |
| | Importance | 4.34 | 4.40 | 4.53 | 4.41 |
| | Satisfaction | 3.38 | 3.76 | 3.70 | 3.55 |
| | Gap | 0.96 | 0.65 | 0.82 | 0.86 |