

Customer Satisfaction with Purchasing on Participating California State University Campuses Spring 2001

Summary

A customer satisfaction survey of Purchasing was conducted in spring 2001 and completed by over 3000 faculty and staff on 12 CSU campuses, plus the Chancellor's Office. Participating campuses were: Chico, Dominguez Hills, Hayward, Los Angeles, Monterey Bay, Northridge, Pomona, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, San Marcos, and Stanislaus. Overall, faculty and staff expressed moderate to high levels of satisfaction with Purchasing. The following measures received the highest satisfaction ratings: ethical conduct, staff courtesy, staff helpfulness, accuracy of purchase order compared to requisition, and quality of goods and services. The lowest rated Purchasing areas were: clear, easy-to-follow policies and procedures, procurement training, and follow-up on orders not received. The survey identified several areas of customer need that are possibly not being met. Comparisons revealed San Bernardino, San Diego, the Chancellor's office, Chico, San Luis Obispo, and Stanislaus as the most highly rated campuses. Further, staff respondents were consistently the most satisfied and faculty respondents the least satisfied with Purchasing.

Survey Methods

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

Instrument

The Purchasing survey instrument was developed jointly in fall 2000 by the CSU systemwide Customer Satisfaction Survey Committee and the CSU Purchasing Function Group. The survey contains 22 questions, of which 17 were designed to assess both the importance of and satisfaction with Purchasing methods, goods and services, policies, efficiency and staff communication and responsiveness.¹ Accompanying the main survey form was a 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 the Faculty & Staff Booklet, can be found in **Appendix A: Customer Satisfaction Survey of Purchasing**.

Data Collection

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

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

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

Campus	Method	Sample Size	Return Count	Response Rate
Chico	Campus mail	742	132	17.8%
Chancellor's Office	Campus mail	NAV	145	NAV
Dominguez Hills	Campus mail	NAV	105	NAV
Hayward	Campus mail	205	63	30.7%
Los Angeles	Campus mail	2,282	979	42.9%
Monterey Bay	Campus mail	NAV	76	NAV
Northridge	Campus mail	1,644	434	26.4%
Pomona	Campus mail	1,200	246	20.5%
San Bernardino	Campus mail	207	99	47.8%
San Diego	Campus mail	4,000	516	12.9%
San Luis Obispo	Campus mail	132	62	47.0%
San Marcos	Campus mail	NAV	94	NAV
Stanislaus	Campus mail	200	56	28.0%
Total		10,612	3,007	28.3%

All campuses distributed surveys to faculty and staff via intra-campus mail services. The total number of faculty and staff surveyed was 10,612. Of this number 3,007 surveys were completed for an overall response rate of 28.3 percent. Campus response rates ranged from a low of 12.9 percent to a high of 47.0 percent. The return count was low (i.e., below 100) at several campuses. 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 samples from campuses with low response rates or return counts may not be representative of the 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 (62%), white (61%), employed at the campus more than 10 years (45%) in the division of Academic Affairs (40%). Additional survey detail on the demographic characteristics of survey respondents (i.e., administrators, faculty, staff) is provided in **Appendix B: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents to the Customer Satisfaction Survey of Purchasing.**

Results

Survey results presented below focus on addressing five key issues:

- **Overall Satisfaction: Overall, how satisfied are faculty and staff with Purchasing?**

- **Strengths and Weaknesses: In what areas of Purchasing are faculty and staff most and least satisfied?**
- **Gap Analysis: To what extent is Purchasing meeting faculty and staff needs/expectations?**
- **Highly Rated Campuses: How does customer satisfaction with Purchasing compare across campuses?**
- **Customer Differences: Are there important differences between faculty and staff in their level of satisfaction with Purchasing?**

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 Purchasing by Campus**, **Appendix D: Customer Satisfaction with Purchasing by Customer Type**, and **Appendix E: Gap Analysis of Purchasing 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: Administrator/Manager, Faculty, and Staff. The results shown in Table 2 are discussed below in terms of the five guiding questions outlined above.

Overall Satisfaction

Faculty and staff generally express moderate to high levels of satisfaction with Purchasing across all measures as indicated by ratings shown in Table 2. Average satisfaction ratings range from 3.2 to 4.0, of which most (12 of 17 measures) fall within the range 3.4 to 3.8. The percentage of faculty and staff who reported they were satisfied with Purchasing ranges from 50 percent to 73 percent on most measures (14 of 17).

From 10 percent to nearly 24 percent of faculty and staff indicated they are dissatisfied with Purchasing. On 14 measures dissatisfaction falls below 20 percent and on three measures above 20 percent.

In general, overall customer satisfaction with Purchasing is not consistently high or exceptionally strong nor consistently low or very weak.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The highest rated measures (3.8 - 4.0) on the survey are:

- Ethical conduct,
- Staff courtesy,
- Staff helpfulness,
- Accuracy of purchase order compared to requisition, and
- Quality of goods and services.

The lowest rated areas (3.2 - 3.3) are:

- Clear, easy-to-follow policies and procedures,
- Procurement training, and
- Follow-up on orders not received.

Gap Analysis

Faculty and staff respondents rated each survey item on Importance and Satisfaction in order to assess differences or “gaps” between the two. Listed below are the areas where the largest gaps are found:

- Clear, easy-to-follow policies and procedures,
- Timeliness of placing order with supplier,
- Follow-up on orders not received,
- Promptness of response, and
- Ease of submitting requisition.

These findings suggest the above five areas as targets for further improvement in order to meet faculty and staff Purchasing needs. More detailed gap analysis results can be found in **Appendix E: Gap Analysis of Purchasing by Campus.**

Highly Rated Campuses

Table 2 lists the campuses that achieved the highest level of customer satisfaction with Purchasing. The campuses that are most consistently highly rated across all 17 satisfaction measures (i.e., potentially “best practice” campuses) are:

- San Bernardino
- San Diego
- The Chancellor’s Office
- Chico

- San Luis Obispo
- Stanislaus.

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

Customer Differences

Two very clear patterns are revealed in the data reported in Table 2 comparing customer satisfaction ratings among administrator/managers, faculty and staff. First, staff reported higher levels of satisfaction than administrators and faculty on almost all measures (15 of 17). The largest difference are found in the following areas:

- Credit cards and other low-dollar purchasing options
- Variety of methods to procure goods and services, and
- Ease of submitting requisition.

The second pattern revealed in the findings is lower faculty satisfaction on 16 of 17 measures. Faculty satisfaction was particularly weak (3.0 – 3.1) in five areas:

- Credit cards and other low-dollar purchasing options,
- Procurement training,
- Clear, easy-to-follow policies and procedures,
- Timeliness of placing order with supplier, and
- Ease of submitting requisition.

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

Table 2. Summary of Customer Satisfaction Survey of Purchasing - Spring 2001

Item	CSU Ratings					Gap	Campus Ratings (Means)			Customer Ratings (Means)		
	N	Mean	Sat (%)	Dis (%)	Rank		High	Low	Top Half (descending)	Adm/Mgr	Faculty	Staff
Variety of methods to procure goods and services	1,788	3.49	56.8	16.3	12	0.80	3.99	3.20	SB, CO, SLO, STAN, CHI, SD, SM	3.46	3.21	3.60
Staff knowledge of goods and services	1,787	3.66	61.4	10.7	6	0.69	4.23	3.33	SB, CHI, CO, SD, DH, SLO, LA	3.67	3.39	3.73
Staff helpfulness	1,884	3.83	69.7	10.2	3	0.68	4.34	3.20	SB, CHI, CO, SLO, SD, DH, STAN	3.86	3.61	3.89
Staff courtesy	1,889	3.98	73.8	5.3	2	0.45	4.36	3.65	SB, SLO, CHI, DH, SD, CO, LA	4.02	3.78	4.00
Promptness of response	1,863	3.55	59.3	17.4	9	0.97	4.14	2.91	SB, CHI, CO, SD, SLO, LA, STAN	3.51	3.36	3.62
Ease of submitting requisition	1,803	3.50	56.2	18.4	11	0.92	4.00	3.12	SB, CHI, DH, SLO, CO, SD, LA	3.51	3.19	3.60
Timeliness of placing order with supplier	1,755	3.43	54.8	20.0	14	1.08	3.89	2.96	CO, SB, SLO, CHI, SD, LA, SM	3.48	3.15	3.51
Accuracy of purchase order compared to requisition	1,735	3.82	69.2	7.1	4	0.70	4.33	3.63	SB, SLO, CHI, CO, SD, DH, STAN	3.84	3.64	3.89
Quality of goods and services	1,842	3.81	70.4	5.0	5	0.67	4.20	3.58	SB, SLO, CO, STAN, CHI, DH, SD	3.80	3.65	3.89
Goods and services are delivered within expectations	1,873	3.60	61.5	12.9	8	0.86	4.03	3.11	SB, SLO, CO, SM, CHI, SD, STAN	3.60	3.42	3.65
Purchasing maintains an effective relationship with my suppliers	1,329	3.64	57.3	7.3	7	0.50	4.13	3.35	SB, SLO, STAN, SD, CO, DH, CHI	3.63	3.40	3.69
Availability of information on the status of my orders	1,675	3.44	53.0	17.7	13	0.92	4.08	2.76	SB, CHI, SD, CO, SLO, LA, SM	3.38	3.25	3.51
Follow-up on orders not received	1,528	3.32	46.6	20.2	15	1.07	3.90	2.75	SB, CHI, CO, STAN, SD, LA, SLO	3.28	3.26	3.36
Clear, easy-to-follow policies and procedures	1,741	3.25	45.0	23.7	17	1.16	3.66	2.88	SB, CHI, DH, LA, CO, SD, SLO	3.17	3.10	3.32
Procurement training	1,294	3.29	41.0	17.1	16	0.74	4.19	3.00	SB, STAN, CHI, SD, LA, CO, NOR	3.17	3.10	3.37
Credit cards and other low-dollar purchasing options	1,423	3.53	55.0	15.2	10	0.73	4.11	3.12	HAY, SB, SLO, CO, STAN, SM, SD	3.59	3.01	3.63
Ethical conduct	1,488	4.01	73.7	3.4	1	0.47	4.35	3.76	SB, SLO, DH, STAN, CO, SD, CHI	4.18	3.83	3.98

f
f
f
f
f
f
f
f
f
f

K

Customer Satisfaction Survey

Spring 2001

PURCHASING

q

q

q

q

q

q

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 ID NUMBER
HERE. THIS NUMBER IS PRINTED
IN RED ON THE TOP OF YOUR
BOOKLET.

Listed below are services provided by your campus Purchasing department. 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.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	2.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	3.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	4.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	5.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	6.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	7.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	8.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	9.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	10.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	11.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	12.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	13.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	14.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	15.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	16.	~	~	~	~	~
f	5	4	3	2	1	17.	~	~	~	~	~

-Continue on back-

18. In the last 12 months, how often have you personally contacted the Purchasing office for assistance?

- ~ Daily
- ~ Weekly
- ~ Monthly
- ~ Infrequently
- ~ Never

20. In the last 12 months, how many purchase requisitions have you submitted to Purchasing?

- ~ None
- ~ 1 - 10
- ~ 11 - 25
- ~ 26 - 50
- ~ More than 50

19. In the last 12 months, how many procurement card purchases have you personally transacted?

- ~ None
- ~ 1 - 10
- ~ 11 - 25
- ~ 26 - 50
- ~ More than 50

21. In the last 12 months, have you used:

	YES	NO
on-line purchasing	~	~
on-line financial services	~	~

n
n
n
n
n
n
n

n
n
n
n
n
n
n

22. What is your department's name? _____

Please make any written comments regarding your campus Purchasing department on pages 3 or 4 of your survey booklet and circle letter K.

Additional Campus Items

If your campus has included an additional set of questions, please use this section to record your responses. Six ovals are provided for each question, although some questions may not require that many choices. Simply ignore the extra ovals. If no additional questions are provided, leave this section blank.

23.
A
B
C
D
E
F

24.
A
B
C
D
E
F

25.
A
B
C
D
E
F

26.
A
B
C
D
E
F

27.
A
B
C
D
E
F

28.
A
B
C
D
E
F

29.
A
B
C
D
E
F

30.
A
B
C
D
E
F

31.
A
B
C
D
E
F

32.
A
B
C
D
E
F

n
n
n
n
n
n

For office use only

O	O	O	O	O
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

n
n
n
n
n
n
n

Appendix B: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents to the Customer Satisfaction Survey of Purchasing - Spring 2001

	Adm/Mgr		Faculty		Staff		All	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Status</u>								
Full-time	528	99.1	373	62.0	1,322	90.9	2,223	85.8
Part-time	5	0.9	229	38.0	133	9.1	367	14.2
All	533	100.0	602	100.0	1,455	100.0	2,590	100.0
<u>Years on Campus</u>								
Less than 1 year	48	9.0	58	9.5	143	9.8	249	9.6
1 - 2 years	66	12.4	70	11.5	212	14.5	348	13.4
3 - 4 years	45	8.4	75	12.3	188	12.9	308	11.8
5 - 6 years	62	11.6	69	11.3	140	9.6	271	10.4
7 - 8 years	42	7.9	31	5.1	91	6.2	164	6.3
9 - 10 years	26	4.9	33	5.4	43	2.9	102	3.9
More than 10 years	245	45.9	274	44.9	644	44.1	1,163	44.6
All	534	100.0	610	100.0	1,461	100.0	2,605	100.0
<u>Division</u>								
Academic	154	29.4	377	74.8	435	31.0	966	39.7
Administration	184	35.1	1	0.2	330	23.5	515	21.2
Student Services	86	16.4	7	1.4	286	20.4	379	15.6
Other	100	19.1	119	23.6	353	25.1	572	23.5
All	524	100.0	504	100.0	1,404	100.0	2,432	100.0
<u>Gender</u>								
Female	274	51.6	277	46.9	1,041	72.0	1,592	62.0
Male	257	48.4	314	53.1	405	28.0	976	38.0
All	531	100.0	591	100.0	1,446	100.0	2,568	100.0
<u>Age</u>								
Under 20			1	0.2	3	0.2	4	0.2
20 - 29	20	3.8	31	5.2	203	14.1	254	9.9
30 - 39	89	16.8	114	19.3	328	22.9	531	20.8
40 - 49	163	30.8	149	25.2	432	30.1	744	29.1
50 - 59	220	41.6	184	31.1	392	27.3	796	31.1
60 - 69	35	6.6	97	16.4	73	5.1	205	8.0
70 or over	2	0.4	16	2.7	4	0.3	22	0.9
All	529	100.0	592	100.0	1,435	100.0	2,556	100.0
<u>Race/Ethnicity</u>								
Amer.Ind./Alaskan Nat	3	0.6	1	0.2	15	1.1	19	0.8
Asian	28	5.4	51	9.0	118	8.4	197	7.9
Black/African Amer.	39	7.5	17	3.0	103	7.3	159	6.4
Filipino	2	0.4	7	1.2	41	2.9	50	2.0
Mex. Amer./Hispanic	72	13.8	44	7.7	301	21.4	417	16.7
Pacific Islander	3	0.6			9	0.6	12	0.5
White	353	67.6	423	74.5	756	53.7	1,532	61.3
Other	22	4.2	25	4.4	65	4.6	112	4.5
All	522	100.0	568	100.0	1,408	100.0	2,498	100.0

Appendix C: Customer Satisfaction with Purchasing by Campus - Spring 2001

Table 1. Campus and Systemwide Mean Satisfaction Ratings

Satisfaction with ...		CHI	CO	DH	HAY	LA	MB	NOR	POM	SB	SD	SLO	SM	STAN	All
Variety of methods to procure goods/services	Mean	3.57	3.75	3.45	3.47	3.44	3.48	3.20	3.47	3.99	3.55	3.73	3.49	3.66	3.49
	S.D.	1.07	0.82	1.13	1.20	1.04	0.87	1.01	0.92	0.89	1.02	0.92	1.03	0.94	1.02
	N	74	102	94	55	446	52	268	169	89	282	60	65	32	1788
Staff knowledge of goods/services	Mean	3.86	3.86	3.70	3.46	3.69	3.33	3.35	3.56	4.23	3.79	3.70	3.39	3.50	3.66
	S.D.	0.91	0.75	1.05	1.06	0.90	0.88	1.03	0.87	0.70	0.92	0.94	1.08	0.98	0.95
	N	78	103	98	52	461	52	264	167	90	269	57	64	32	1787
Staff helpfulness	Mean	4.20	3.98	3.87	3.20	3.84	3.56	3.57	3.81	4.34	3.94	3.98	3.62	3.85	3.83
	S.D.	0.89	0.94	1.15	1.23	0.99	1.08	1.06	0.94	0.77	0.98	0.91	0.95	0.87	1.01
	N	82	111	97	56	481	54	279	175	94	289	62	65	39	1884
Staff courtesy	Mean	4.20	4.05	4.18	3.65	3.96	3.91	3.70	3.88	4.36	4.10	4.29	3.76	3.95	3.98
	S.D.	0.90	0.87	0.92	0.97	0.89	0.86	0.98	0.98	0.82	0.90	0.80	0.95	1.00	0.93
	N	81	113	99	57	482	53	278	179	95	288	62	63	39	1889
Promptness of response	Mean	3.88	3.84	3.22	2.91	3.58	2.98	3.28	3.45	4.14	3.80	3.62	3.37	3.51	3.55
	S.D.	0.92	0.85	1.27	1.21	1.11	1.06	1.10	1.09	0.75	0.98	1.02	1.24	1.15	1.10
	N	83	107	97	57	482	50	282	172	92	281	61	62	37	1863
Ease of submitting requisition	Mean	3.74	3.65	3.70	3.38	3.50	3.12	3.22	3.34	4.00	3.60	3.69	3.32	3.46	3.50
	S.D.	1.09	0.95	1.08	1.15	1.05	1.10	1.13	1.03	0.90	1.07	1.21	1.27	1.12	1.09
	N	76	98	96	53	478	52	275	165	85	268	62	60	35	1803
Timliness of placing order with supplier	Mean	3.59	3.89	3.16	2.96	3.49	3.07	3.20	3.28	3.85	3.56	3.61	3.47	3.21	3.43
	S.D.	1.05	0.80	1.24	1.16	1.07	1.10	1.12	1.08	0.93	1.08	0.97	1.15	1.12	1.09
	N	76	91	95	54	460	46	264	164	86	267	59	59	34	1755
Accuracy of purchase order compared to requisition	Mean	3.92	3.89	3.88	3.80	3.77	3.70	3.63	3.71	4.33	3.89	4.23	3.75	3.82	3.82
	S.D.	0.98	0.74	0.98	0.83	0.88	0.96	0.93	0.99	0.79	0.88	0.76	0.89	0.83	0.91
	N	76	93	94	51	458	46	259	163	86	259	61	55	34	1735
Quality of goods and services	Mean	3.90	4.01	3.89	3.58	3.74	3.69	3.67	3.75	4.20	3.86	4.10	3.81	4.00	3.81
	S.D.	0.86	0.58	0.80	0.89	0.81	0.68	0.81	0.77	0.68	0.78	0.66	0.88	0.74	0.79
	N	83	104	98	52	484	49	276	166	94	285	59	62	30	1842
Goods/services delivered within expectations	Mean	3.70	3.87	3.42	3.11	3.59	3.44	3.41	3.50	4.03	3.70	3.90	3.74	3.65	3.60
	S.D.	0.88	0.74	1.08	1.17	0.96	0.93	0.99	1.01	0.84	0.93	0.83	0.94	1.25	0.97
	N	82	106	98	56	495	50	279	168	93	289	58	65	34	1873
Effective relationship with suppliers	Mean	3.66	3.73	3.69	3.52	3.63	3.36	3.35	3.54	4.13	3.76	3.81	3.65	3.77	3.64
	S.D.	0.80	0.74	1.04	0.78	0.85	0.87	0.93	0.75	0.81	0.91	0.97	0.90	0.76	0.88
	N	59	75	78	46	333	39	187	131	67	200	42	46	26	1329

Appendix C: Customer Satisfaction with Purchasing by Campus - Spring 2001

Table 1. Campus and Systemwide Mean Satisfaction Ratings

Satisfaction with ...		CHI	CO	DH	HAY	LA	MB	NOR	POM	SB	SD	SLO	SM	STAN	All
Availability of information on status of orders	Mean	3.76	3.61	3.35	2.76	3.47	2.91	3.22	3.25	4.08	3.62	3.49	3.42	3.41	3.44
	S.D.	0.87	0.86	1.19	1.03	1.04	1.14	1.05	0.98	0.84	0.98	1.06	1.08	0.95	1.04
	N	75	92	95	54	427	45	245	155	87	252	59	57	32	1675
Follow-up on orders not received	Mean	3.78	3.59	3.14	2.75	3.34	2.90	3.14	3.26	3.90	3.37	3.29	3.16	3.38	3.32
	S.D.	0.69	0.92	1.23	1.17	1.03	0.91	1.04	1.02	1.02	1.04	1.06	1.06	0.98	1.05
	N	60	80	92	52	391	42	221	150	81	229	51	50	29	1528
Clear, easy-to-follow policies/procedures	Mean	3.41	3.35	3.41	3.02	3.40	2.88	2.94	3.12	3.66	3.28	3.25	3.06	3.09	3.25
	S.D.	0.87	0.97	1.13	1.18	1.01	1.13	1.07	1.03	0.95	1.07	0.99	1.32	1.12	1.07
	N	75	96	93	53	444	51	258	161	89	265	61	63	32	1741
Procurement training	Mean	3.34	3.24	3.12	3.00	3.28	3.12	3.18	3.07	4.19	3.33	3.14	3.17	3.73	3.29
	S.D.	0.69	1.00	1.07	1.07	0.92	0.87	1.05	0.93	0.77	1.02	1.01	1.05	0.69	0.99
	N	56	78	67	45	281	41	199	123	84	178	59	53	30	1294
Credit cards/other low-dollar purchasing options	Mean	3.25	3.88	3.12	4.11	3.35	3.57	3.18	3.57	4.06	3.59	4.03	3.78	3.86	3.53
	S.D.	1.26	0.97	1.18	0.95	1.04	1.14	1.19	0.98	0.92	1.17	0.86	1.10	0.71	1.11
	N	61	93	68	54	342	47	188	141	79	209	58	55	28	1423
Ethical conduct	Mean	4.16	4.18	4.23	3.88	3.88	4.07	3.76	3.81	4.35	4.17	4.31	4.08	4.21	4.01
	S.D.	0.80	0.77	0.86	0.87	0.86	0.70	0.84	1.00	0.86	0.85	0.80	0.83	0.73	0.87
	N	68	87	90	48	361	44	211	147	83	219	48	53	29	1488

Appendix C: Customer Satisfaction with Purchasing by Campus - Spring 2001

Table 2. Campus and Systemwide Percent Satisfaction Ratings

		CHI	CO	DH	HAY	LA	MB	NOR	POM	SB	SD	SLO	SM	STAN	All
Variety of methods to procure goods/services	Total N	74	102	94	55	446	52	268	169	89	282	60	65	32	1788
	VS/S (%)	56.8	72.5	57.4	60.0	53.1	59.6	41.8	55.6	78.7	58.2	70.0	58.5	75.0	56.8
	Neutral (%)	27.0	16.7	20.2	18.2	30.9	25.0	36.6	30.8	12.4	26.6	18.3	21.5	9.4	26.9
	D/VD (%)	16.2	10.8	22.3	21.8	15.9	15.4	21.6	13.6	9.0	15.2	11.7	20.0	15.6	16.3
Staff knowledge of goods/services	Total N	78	103	98	52	461	52	264	167	90	269	57	64	32	1787
	VS/S (%)	67.9	75.7	65.3	57.7	60.1	46.2	48.1	58.1	90.0	66.9	66.7	48.4	56.3	61.4
	Neutral (%)	25.6	18.4	21.4	21.2	33.0	36.5	32.6	31.7	8.9	24.9	21.1	31.3	28.1	27.8
	D/VD (%)	6.4	5.8	13.3	21.2	6.9	17.3	19.3	10.2	1.1	8.2	12.3	20.3	15.6	10.7
Staff helpfulness	Total N	82	111	97	56	481	54	279	175	94	289	62	65	39	1884
	VS/S (%)	81.7	81.1	74.2	46.4	67.8	57.4	60.6	69.7	89.4	75.1	74.2	60.0	64.1	69.7
	Neutral (%)	13.4	9.9	11.3	23.2	24.1	27.8	22.9	22.9	8.5	17.0	17.7	24.6	30.8	20.0
	D/VD (%)	4.9	9.0	14.4	30.4	8.1	14.8	16.5	7.4	2.1	8.0	8.1	15.4	5.1	10.2
Staff courtesy	Total N	81	113	99	57	482	53	278	179	95	288	62	63	39	1889
	VS/S (%)	82.7	80.5	84.8	59.6	71.8	73.6	64.4	72.6	82.1	78.5	85.5	61.9	71.8	73.8
	Neutral (%)	13.6	14.2	10.1	33.3	24.5	18.9	26.3	20.7	15.8	17.7	11.3	30.2	20.5	20.9
	D/VD (%)	3.7	5.3	5.1	7.0	3.7	7.5	9.4	6.7	2.1	3.8	3.2	7.9	7.7	5.3
Promptness of response	Total N	83	107	97	57	482	50	282	172	92	281	61	62	37	1863
	VS/S (%)	71.1	72.0	49.5	38.6	58.7	36.0	46.8	55.2	84.8	69.4	62.3	59.7	59.5	59.3
	Neutral (%)	22.9	19.6	19.6	22.8	25.1	32.0	31.2	26.2	12.0	19.9	18.0	11.3	18.9	23.3
	D/VD (%)	6.0	8.4	30.9	38.6	16.2	32.0	22.0	18.6	3.3	10.7	19.7	29.0	21.6	17.4
Ease of submitting requisition	Total N	76	98	96	53	478	52	275	165	85	268	62	60	35	1803
	VS/S (%)	63.2	62.2	67.7	56.6	55.4	42.3	45.8	48.5	75.3	59.0	71.0	50.0	57.1	56.2
	Neutral (%)	23.7	25.5	17.7	18.9	29.1	26.9	26.9	29.7	18.8	25.4	9.7	21.7	25.7	25.4
	D/VD (%)	13.2	12.2	14.6	24.5	15.5	30.8	27.3	21.8	5.9	15.7	19.4	28.3	17.1	18.4
Timeliness of placing order with supplier	Total N	76	91	95	54	460	46	264	164	86	267	59	59	34	1755
	VS/S (%)	60.5	75.8	46.3	40.7	55.2	37.0	46.2	46.3	73.3	59.2	66.1	52.5	58.8	54.8
	Neutral (%)	23.7	17.6	17.9	27.8	27.6	32.6	28.4	31.7	16.3	25.1	16.9	23.7	8.8	25.2
	D/VD (%)	15.8	6.6	35.8	31.5	17.2	30.4	25.4	22.0	10.5	15.7	16.9	23.7	32.4	20.0
Accuracy of purchase order compared to requisitor	Total N	76	93	94	51	458	46	259	163	86	259	61	55	34	1735
	VS/S (%)	69.7	73.1	76.6	68.6	66.4	63.0	61.0	65.0	87.2	72.2	88.5	65.5	67.6	69.2
	Neutral (%)	23.7	23.7	12.8	27.5	27.3	26.1	28.6	25.2	9.3	21.2	9.8	27.3	26.5	23.7
	D/VD (%)	6.6	3.2	10.6	3.9	6.3	10.9	10.4	9.8	3.5	6.6	1.6	7.3	5.9	7.1
Quality of goods and services	Total N	83	104	98	52	484	49	276	166	94	285	59	62	30	1842
	VS/S (%)	74.7	83.7	72.4	57.7	66.1	65.3	62.3	67.5	91.5	72.6	86.4	67.7	80.0	70.4
	Neutral (%)	20.5	16.3	22.4	34.6	28.3	30.6	30.4	28.3	5.3	22.5	11.9	25.8	16.7	24.6
	D/VD (%)	4.8	.	5.1	7.7	5.6	4.1	7.2	4.2	3.2	4.9	1.7	6.5	3.3	5.0
Goods/services delivered within expectations	Total N	82	106	98	56	495	50	279	168	93	289	58	65	34	1873
	VS/S (%)	61.0	75.5	55.1	46.4	60.0	54.0	51.3	58.9	81.7	65.7	79.3	64.6	64.7	61.5

Appendix C: Customer Satisfaction with Purchasing by Campus - Spring 2001

Table 2. Campus and Systemwide Percent Satisfaction Ratings

		CHI	CO	DH	HAY	LA	MB	NOR	POM	SB	SD	SLO	SM	STAN	All
	Neutral (%)	32.9	20.8	24.5	28.6	27.9	26.0	30.8	25.6	10.8	25.3	13.8	23.1	11.8	25.6
	D/VD (%)	6.1	3.8	20.4	25.0	12.1	20.0	17.9	15.5	7.5	9.0	6.9	12.3	23.5	12.9
Effective relationship with suppliers	Total N	59	75	78	46	333	39	187	131	67	200	42	46	26	1329
	VS/S (%)	55.9	64.0	59.0	54.3	58.6	41.0	42.2	53.4	79.1	62.0	69.0	58.7	65.4	57.3
	Neutral (%)	39.0	32.0	30.8	39.1	35.1	51.3	44.9	40.5	17.9	32.0	21.4	30.4	30.8	35.4
	D/VD (%)	5.1	4.0	10.3	6.5	6.3	7.7	12.8	6.1	3.0	6.0	9.5	10.9	3.8	7.3
Availability of information on status of orders	Total N	75	92	95	54	427	45	245	155	87	252	59	57	32	1675
	VS/S (%)	64.0	56.5	54.7	24.1	54.3	31.1	43.7	44.5	81.6	58.7	57.6	52.6	56.3	53.0
	Neutral (%)	28.0	34.8	20.0	40.7	28.3	31.1	33.5	34.2	13.8	29.0	27.1	29.8	25.0	29.3
	D/VD (%)	8.0	8.7	25.3	35.2	17.3	37.8	22.9	21.3	4.6	12.3	15.3	17.5	18.8	17.7
Follow-up on orders not received	Total N	60	80	92	52	391	42	221	150	81	229	51	50	29	1528
	VS/S (%)	63.3	58.8	42.4	26.9	46.3	21.4	38.9	43.3	71.6	48.5	47.1	46.0	58.6	46.6
	Neutral (%)	36.7	26.3	27.2	34.6	35.3	47.6	36.2	38.0	16.0	32.8	33.3	30.0	24.1	33.2
	D/VD (%)	.	15.0	30.4	38.5	18.4	31.0	24.9	18.7	12.3	18.8	19.6	24.0	17.2	20.2
Clear, easy-to-follow policies/procedures	Total N	75	96	93	53	444	51	258	161	89	265	61	63	32	1741
	VS/S (%)	49.3	47.9	54.8	35.8	51.8	29.4	32.9	38.5	62.9	44.2	44.3	38.1	43.8	45.0
	Neutral (%)	36.0	31.3	22.6	35.8	30.9	33.3	33.3	34.8	23.6	32.8	31.1	28.6	25.0	31.4
	D/VD (%)	14.7	20.8	22.6	28.3	17.3	37.3	33.7	26.7	13.5	23.0	24.6	33.3	31.3	23.7
Procurement training	Total N	56	78	67	45	281	41	199	123	84	178	59	53	30	1294
	VS/S (%)	32.1	41.0	37.3	31.1	39.9	36.6	36.2	30.9	81.0	42.1	39.0	35.8	66.7	41.0
	Neutral (%)	62.5	34.6	40.3	42.2	47.7	39.0	44.7	47.2	17.9	40.4	33.9	39.6	30.0	41.9
	D/VD (%)	5.4	24.4	22.4	26.7	12.5	24.4	19.1	22.0	1.2	17.4	27.1	24.5	3.3	17.1
Credit cards/other low-dollar purchasing options	Total N	61	93	68	54	342	47	188	141	79	209	58	55	28	1423
	VS/S (%)	42.6	69.9	36.8	81.5	46.5	59.6	41.5	53.9	79.7	56.0	75.9	69.1	67.9	55.0
	Neutral (%)	31.1	23.7	36.8	11.1	36.5	23.4	34.0	36.2	12.7	29.2	19.0	18.2	32.1	29.8
	D/VD (%)	26.2	6.5	26.5	7.4	17.0	17.0	24.5	9.9	7.6	14.8	5.2	12.7	.	15.2
Ethical conduct	Total N	68	87	90	48	361	44	211	147	83	219	48	53	29	1488
	VS/S (%)	75.0	82.8	80.0	68.8	67.3	79.5	64.5	69.4	85.5	78.5	87.5	83.0	82.8	73.7
	Neutral (%)	25.0	14.9	17.8	25.0	29.6	20.5	31.3	22.4	10.8	19.2	8.3	13.2	17.2	22.8
	D/VD (%)	.	2.3	2.2	6.3	3.0	.	4.3	8.2	3.6	2.3	4.2	3.8	.	3.4

Appendix D: Customer Satisfaction with Purchasing by Customer Type Spring 2001

Table 1. Mean Satisfaction Ratings by Customer Type

Satisfaction with ...		Admin./Mgr.	Faculty	Staff	All
Variety of methods to procure goods and services	Mean	3.46	3.21	3.60	3.51
	S.D.	1.07	1.05	0.95	1.01
	N	424	231	930	1585
Staff knowledge of goods and services	Mean	3.67	3.39	3.73	3.66
	S.D.	0.95	1.09	0.91	0.95
	N	410	231	941	1582
Staff helpfulness	Mean	3.86	3.61	3.89	3.84
	S.D.	1.07	1.11	0.97	1.02
	N	428	249	990	1667
Staff courtesy	Mean	4.02	3.78	4.00	3.98
	S.D.	0.95	1.00	0.90	0.93
	N	434	242	996	1672
Promptness of response	Mean	3.51	3.36	3.62	3.55
	S.D.	1.13	1.22	1.04	1.10
	N	428	248	970	1646
Ease of submitting requisition	Mean	3.51	3.19	3.60	3.51
	S.D.	1.05	1.20	1.06	1.09
	N	406	245	939	1590
Timeliness of placing order with supplier	Mean	3.48	3.15	3.51	3.45
	S.D.	1.09	1.27	1.03	1.09
	N	396	228	929	1553
Accuracy of purchase order compared to requisition	Mean	3.84	3.64	3.89	3.84
	S.D.	0.96	0.94	0.86	0.90
	N	398	224	907	1529
Quality of goods and services	Mean	3.80	3.65	3.89	3.83
	S.D.	0.79	0.88	0.75	0.78
	N	423	250	951	1624
Goods and services are delivered within expectations	Mean	3.60	3.42	3.65	3.60
	S.D.	0.92	1.11	0.98	0.99
	N	430	251	973	1654
Purchasing maintains an effective relationship with my suppliers	Mean	3.63	3.40	3.69	3.64
	S.D.	0.90	1.01	0.84	0.88
	N	320	143	712	1175
Availability of information on the status of my orders	Mean	3.38	3.25	3.51	3.44
	S.D.	1.04	1.11	1.03	1.05
	N	393	198	889	1480
Follow-up on orders not received	Mean	3.28	3.26	3.36	3.33
	S.D.	1.02	1.13	1.05	1.05
	N	353	171	837	1361
Clear, easy-to-follow policies and procedures	Mean	3.17	3.10	3.32	3.25
	S.D.	1.06	1.12	1.05	1.07

Appendix D: Customer Satisfaction with Purchasing by Customer Type Spring 2001

Table 1. Mean Satisfaction Ratings by Customer Type

Satisfaction with ...		Admin./Mgr.	Faculty	Staff	All
	N	406	226	909	1541
Procurement training	Mean	3.17	3.10	3.37	3.29
	S.D.	0.99	0.93	0.99	0.99
	N	304	121	730	1155
Credit cards and other low-dollar purchasing options	Mean	3.59	3.01	3.63	3.54
	S.D.	1.13	1.18	1.05	1.11
	N	366	155	742	1263
Ethical conduct	Mean	4.18	3.83	3.98	4.02
	S.D.	0.88	0.89	0.85	0.87
	N	364	152	805	1321

Appendix D: Customer Satisfaction with Purchasing by Customer Type Spring 2001

Table 2. Percent Satisfaction Ratings by Customer Type

		Adm/Mgr	Faculty	Staff	All
Variety of methods to procure goods/services	Total N	424	231	930	1585
	VS/S (%)	58.5	43.7	60.8	57.7
	Neutral (%)	21.2	32.0	26.6	25.9
	D/VD (%)	20.3	24.2	12.7	16.4
Staff knowledge of goods and services	Total N	410	231	941	1582
	VS/S (%)	63.7	50.6	64.5	62.3
	Neutral (%)	25.4	28.1	27.0	26.7
	D/VD (%)	11.0	21.2	8.5	11.0
Staff helpfulness	Total N	428	249	990	1667
	VS/S (%)	73.1	59.8	71.6	70.2
	Neutral (%)	14.7	24.5	20.0	19.3
	D/VD (%)	12.1	15.7	8.4	10.4
Staff courtesy	Total N	434	242	996	1672
	VS/S (%)	77.2	65.3	74.8	74.0
	Neutral (%)	17.1	26.4	20.4	20.4
	D/VD (%)	5.8	8.3	4.8	5.6
Promptness of response	Total N	428	248	970	1646
	VS/S (%)	59.3	52.4	61.6	59.7
	Neutral (%)	20.8	24.2	23.0	22.6
	D/VD (%)	19.9	23.4	15.4	17.7
Ease of submitting requisition	Total N	406	245	939	1590
	VS/S (%)	56.4	44.5	60.3	56.9
	Neutral (%)	25.9	27.3	23.9	24.9
	D/VD (%)	17.7	28.2	15.9	18.2
Timeliness of placing order with supplier	Total N	396	228	929	1553
	VS/S (%)	58.1	43.4	57.9	55.8
	Neutral (%)	23.0	26.3	24.5	24.4
	D/VD (%)	18.9	30.3	17.5	19.8
Accuracy of purchase order compared to requisition	Total N	398	224	907	1529
	VS/S (%)	71.4	61.6	71.7	70.1
	Neutral (%)	19.8	29.0	22.9	23.0
	D/VD (%)	8.8	9.4	5.4	6.9
Quality of goods and services	Total N	423	250	951	1624
	VS/S (%)	69.0	62.8	73.4	70.6
	Neutral (%)	26.0	26.4	23.6	24.6
	D/VD (%)	5.0	10.8	3.0	4.7
Goods and services delivered within expectations	Total N	430	251	973	1654
	VS/S (%)	64.0	53.0	62.5	61.4
	Neutral (%)	24.0	27.1	25.4	25.3
	D/VD (%)	12.1	19.9	12.1	13.3
Maintain an effective relationship with suppliers	Total N	320	143	712	1175
	VS/S (%)	59.1	45.5	59.1	57.4
	Neutral (%)	33.1	42.0	34.8	35.2

Appendix D: Customer Satisfaction with Purchasing by Customer Type Spring 2001

Table 2. Percent Satisfaction Ratings by Customer Type

		Adm/Mgr	Faculty	Staff	All
	D/VD (%)	7.8	12.6	6.0	7.3
Availability of information on status of orders	Total N	393	198	889	1480
	VS/S (%)	51.9	44.4	56.5	53.6
	Neutral (%)	28.5	32.8	27.3	28.4
	D/VD (%)	19.6	22.7	16.2	18.0
Follow-up on orders not received	Total N	353	171	837	1361
	VS/S (%)	47.0	44.4	47.7	47.1
	Neutral (%)	31.2	33.3	33.6	32.9
	D/VD (%)	21.8	22.2	18.8	20.0
Clear, easy-to-follow policies and procedures	Total N	406	226	909	1541
	VS/S (%)	43.3	38.5	48.3	45.6
	Neutral (%)	29.1	31.4	31.0	30.6
	D/VD (%)	27.6	30.1	20.7	23.9
Procurement training	Total N	304	121	730	1155
	VS/S (%)	37.8	28.1	45.2	41.5
	Neutral (%)	40.5	52.1	39.6	41.1
	D/VD (%)	21.7	19.8	15.2	17.4
Credit cards and other low-dollar purchasing options	Total N	366	155	742	1263
	VS/S (%)	59.0	37.4	57.5	55.5
	Neutral (%)	24.0	32.3	31.1	29.2
	D/VD (%)	16.9	30.3	11.3	15.3
Ethical conduct	Total N	364	152	805	1321
	VS/S (%)	82.1	64.5	73.0	74.6
	Neutral (%)	13.5	31.6	23.9	21.9
	D/VD (%)	4.4	3.9	3.1	3.6

Appendix E: Gap analysis of Purchasing by Campus Spring 2001

		CHI	CO	DH	HAY	LA	MB	NOR	POM	SB	SD	SLO	SMI	STAN	All
Variety of methods to procure goods and services	Total N	72	91	86	54	415	47	249	161	83	267	57	63	31	1676
	Importance	4.29	4.02	4.35	4.39	4.33	4.32	4.19	4.32	4.31	4.30	4.47	4.40	4.16	4.29
	Satisfaction	3.57	3.74	3.49	3.44	3.43	3.49	3.19	3.47	3.95	3.57	3.72	3.51	3.71	3.49
	Gap	0.72	0.29	0.86	0.94	0.91	0.83	1.00	0.85	0.36	0.74	0.75	0.89	0.45	0.80
Staff knowledge of goods and services	Total N	76	88	90	50	426	45	243	160	84	252	53	61	31	1659
	Importance	4.30	4.19	4.49	4.46	4.28	4.09	4.30	4.29	4.49	4.40	4.68	4.36	4.52	4.34
	Satisfaction	3.87	3.86	3.73	3.42	3.68	3.31	3.34	3.56	4.20	3.78	3.72	3.43	3.52	3.65
	Gap	0.43	0.33	0.76	1.04	0.59	0.78	0.97	0.73	0.29	0.62	0.96	0.93	1.00	0.69
Staff helpfulness	Total N	76	95	89	55	450	48	256	168	88	267	55	61	37	1745
	Importance	4.70	4.44	4.73	4.65	4.39	4.46	4.47	4.49	4.73	4.54	4.78	4.46	4.54	4.51
	Satisfaction	4.21	4.01	3.90	3.16	3.85	3.52	3.56	3.79	4.33	3.94	3.98	3.64	3.89	3.83
	Gap	0.49	0.43	0.83	1.49	0.54	0.94	0.91	0.70	0.40	0.60	0.80	0.82	0.65	0.68
Staff courtesy	Total N	78	97	91	56	451	47	254	171	89	266	56	59	37	1752
	Importance	4.58	4.42	4.62	4.41	4.32	4.32	4.32	4.39	4.70	4.55	4.68	4.37	4.32	4.43
	Satisfaction	4.21	4.07	4.21	3.63	3.96	3.89	3.70	3.87	4.35	4.10	4.30	3.80	3.97	3.98
	Gap	0.37	0.35	0.41	0.79	0.35	0.43	0.63	0.53	0.35	0.45	0.38	0.58	0.35	0.45
Promptness of response	Total N	79	91	89	57	451	44	257	165	87	264	55	59	35	1733
	Importance	4.46	4.43	4.71	4.70	4.45	4.68	4.49	4.44	4.68	4.59	4.75	4.46	4.66	4.53
	Satisfaction	3.90	3.88	3.29	2.91	3.58	3.00	3.26	3.47	4.14	3.79	3.65	3.41	3.57	3.56
	Gap	0.56	0.55	1.42	1.79	0.87	1.68	1.22	0.97	0.54	0.80	1.09	1.05	1.09	0.97
Ease of submitting requisition	Total N	73	84	88	51	442	45	251	159	79	251	56	57	33	1669
	Importance	4.45	4.38	4.39	4.49	4.38	4.38	4.42	4.35	4.49	4.51	4.73	4.42	4.45	4.43
	Satisfaction	3.74	3.67	3.73	3.35	3.51	3.18	3.24	3.31	4.00	3.61	3.73	3.32	3.45	3.50
	Gap	0.71	0.71	0.66	1.14	0.87	1.20	1.18	1.03	0.49	0.90	1.00	1.11	1.00	0.92
Timliness of placing order with supplier	Total N	73	76	87	52	426	41	243	155	81	251	53	56	32	1626
	Importance	4.48	4.36	4.71	4.69	4.43	4.51	4.51	4.50	4.58	4.58	4.81	4.43	4.59	4.52
	Satisfaction	3.58	3.91	3.18	2.92	3.50	3.15	3.21	3.30	3.81	3.56	3.60	3.50	3.25	3.44
	Gap	0.90	0.45	1.53	1.77	0.93	1.37	1.30	1.19	0.77	1.02	1.21	0.93	1.34	1.08
Accuracy of purchase order compared to requisition	Total N	71	77	87	49	426	41	235	158	80	244	55	52	32	1607
	Importance	4.65	4.45	4.74	4.57	4.40	4.54	4.57	4.46	4.59	4.66	4.84	4.44	4.66	4.54
	Satisfaction	3.97	3.92	3.93	3.76	3.80	3.83	3.63	3.72	4.30	3.89	4.25	3.77	3.88	3.84
	Gap	0.68	0.53	0.80	0.82	0.61	0.71	0.94	0.75	0.29	0.77	0.58	0.67	0.78	0.70
Quality of goods and services	Total N	79	89	89	51	447	43	249	160	87	268	53	59	28	1702
	Importance	4.56	4.42	4.57	4.57	4.41	4.28	4.49	4.40	4.60	4.56	4.81	4.53	4.61	4.49
	Satisfaction	3.91	4.01	3.90	3.57	3.75	3.70	3.66	3.76	4.20	3.87	4.11	3.83	4.07	3.82
	Gap	0.65	0.40	0.67	1.00	0.66	0.58	0.83	0.64	0.40	0.69	0.70	0.69	0.54	0.67
Goods and services are delivered	Total N	80	91	89	55	457	43	253	158	86	265	52	62	32	1723
	Importance	4.50	4.44	4.52	4.55	4.41	4.37	4.47	4.44	4.62	4.55	4.77	4.40	4.47	4.48
	Satisfaction	3.69	3.89	3.44	3.09	3.61	3.53	3.42	3.53	4.01	3.71	3.94	3.77	3.78	3.62

Appendix E: Gap analysis of Purchasing by Campus Spring 2001

		CHI	CO	DH	HAY	LA	MB	NOR	POM	SB	SD	SLO	SMI	STAN	All
within expectations	Gap	0.81	0.55	1.08	1.45	0.80	0.84	1.06	0.91	0.60	0.85	0.83	0.63	0.69	0.86
	Total N	57	62	72	45	307	35	172	124	61	186	38	43	25	1227
	Importance	4.05	3.74	4.25	4.13	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.10	4.41	4.20	4.53	4.28	4.08	4.14
Purchasing maintains an effective relationship with my suppliers	Satisfaction	3.68	3.73	3.76	3.51	3.64	3.34	3.31	3.56	4.13	3.78	3.79	3.70	3.76	3.64
	Gap	0.37	0.02	0.49	0.62	0.50	0.69	0.77	0.53	0.28	0.42	0.74	0.58	0.32	0.50
	Total N	71	77	88	53	397	40	223	148	80	233	52	54	30	1546
	Importance	4.37	4.18	4.55	4.51	4.34	4.30	4.32	4.32	4.40	4.38	4.56	4.43	4.47	4.37
Availability of information on the status of my orders	Satisfaction	3.79	3.60	3.40	2.74	3.47	2.98	3.22	3.27	4.05	3.62	3.56	3.44	3.47	3.45
	Gap	0.58	0.58	1.15	1.77	0.87	1.33	1.10	1.05	0.35	0.76	1.00	0.98	1.00	0.92
	Total N	58	68	85	51	361	37	205	143	75	215	46	47	27	1418
	Importance	4.28	4.18	4.60	4.49	4.32	4.27	4.42	4.39	4.51	4.43	4.65	4.32	4.52	4.40
Follow-up on orders not received	Satisfaction	3.81	3.54	3.18	2.75	3.34	2.97	3.13	3.29	3.87	3.37	3.35	3.19	3.48	3.32
	Gap	0.47	0.63	1.42	1.75	0.98	1.30	1.30	1.10	0.64	1.07	1.30	1.13	1.04	1.07
	Total N	72	83	86	52	408	43	235	155	83	248	56	59	31	1611
	Importance	4.43	4.25	4.40	4.54	4.30	4.42	4.45	4.43	4.51	4.40	4.70	4.49	4.52	4.40
Clear, easy-to-follow policies and procedures	Satisfaction	3.42	3.34	3.45	3.02	3.38	2.91	2.93	3.11	3.63	3.30	3.27	3.08	3.13	3.25
	Gap	1.01	0.92	0.94	1.52	0.92	1.51	1.52	1.32	0.88	1.10	1.43	1.41	1.39	1.16
	Total N	54	63	63	44	257	37	182	118	79	166	53	50	29	1195
	Importance	3.74	3.98	4.19	4.30	3.86	4.08	4.02	4.03	4.38	4.04	4.42	4.02	3.86	4.03
Procurement training	Satisfaction	3.37	3.19	3.24	3.00	3.24	3.19	3.18	3.05	4.19	3.34	3.21	3.18	3.72	3.29
	Gap	0.37	0.79	0.95	1.30	0.61	0.89	0.84	0.98	0.19	0.70	1.21	0.84	0.14	0.74
	Total N	59	83	61	53	322	41	174	136	74	194	52	52	27	1328
	Importance	4.03	4.28	3.90	4.49	4.15	4.37	4.24	4.25	4.55	4.44	4.44	4.46	4.30	4.27
Credit cards and other low-dollar purchasing options	Satisfaction	3.22	3.88	3.15	4.11	3.36	3.63	3.18	3.57	4.04	3.65	4.00	3.79	3.85	3.55
	Gap	0.81	0.40	0.75	0.38	0.79	0.73	1.06	0.68	0.51	0.79	0.44	0.67	0.44	0.73
	Total N	65	77	81	47	333	37	194	140	77	206	43	50	27	1377
	Importance	4.51	4.49	4.63	4.49	4.35	4.35	4.41	4.51	4.65	4.60	4.79	4.52	4.44	4.49
Ethical conduct	Satisfaction	4.18	4.17	4.26	3.85	3.89	4.08	3.75	3.81	4.34	4.20	4.33	4.12	4.22	4.02
	Gap	0.32	0.32	0.37	0.64	0.47	0.27	0.66	0.71	0.31	0.40	0.47	0.40	0.22	0.47