

REPORT ON CUSTOMER SERVICE

Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists

Submitted: May 2014

<u>Board Member</u>	<u>Date of Term</u>	<u>Hometown</u>
Jeffrey M. Baker, Ph.D.	2010-2015	League City
Donna Lord Black, M.A.	2007-2017	Frisco
Tim F. Branaman, Ph.D.	2008-2019	Dallas
Jo Ann Campbell, M.S.	2008-2017	Abilene
Carlos R. Chacón	2008-2015	Houston
Angela A. Downes, J.D.	2008-2019	Dallas
John Huffman, J.D.	2012-2017	Southlake
Lou Ann Todd Mock, Ph.D.	2008-2019	Bellaire
Leslie D. Rosenstein, Ph.D.	2010-2015	Austin

**Darrel D. Spinks
Executive Director**

**333 Guadalupe, 2-450
Austin, Texas 78701
512-305-7700
darrel.spinks@tsbep.state.tx.us**

REPORT ON CUSTOMER SERVICE Fiscal Year 2012

Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists

Submitted: May 2014

A. Inventory of External Customers

Customers by strategy with the types of services provided:

Strategy: A.1.1. Licensing

Licensees:

Processing of fees; review and issuance of renewal permits, professional development audits, enforcement services; newsletter, online rulebook, website information; individual correspondence and Board opinions.

Applicants:

Processing of fees; distribution of application packets, application processing, issuance of licenses; enforcement; website information.

Patients/Clients of licensees:

Complaint packets, processing of complaints, informal conferences, notifications of status of complaint, and correspondence; website information.

Insurance companies:

Status of licenses; open records information; enforcement information.

Managed care entities:

Status of licenses; open records information; enforcement information

Students:

Application packets, online rulebooks, website.

Higher education training programs:

Information on agency programs, examination results, rules.

Licensees of other states who may wish to become licensed in Texas:

Processing of fees; distribution of application packets; dissemination of licensure and examination requirements.

Other states' psychology licensing boards:

Status of licenses; open records information; disciplinary and enforcement information.

Professional organizations:

Presentations, correspondence, information on licensees and agency programs.

National testing services:

Approval of candidates for national psychology exam; requests for scores

Legislators:

Provide various types of information, budget requests, constituents' requests for information, required fiscal and performance reporting.

Other state agencies:

Provide various types of information responsive to requests.

Federal agencies:

Cooperation on federal suits, information on licensees.

Examinees:

Processing of fees; approval of applicants for national examination, jurisprudence examination and oral examination

Examiners:

Training of persons who administer oral examinations.

Strategy B.1.1. Enforcement

Patients/Clients of licensees:

Complaint packets, processing of complaints, informal conferences, notifications of status of complaint, and correspondence; website information

Licensees:

Processing of complaints, enforcement, informal conferences, notifications of status of complaint, and correspondence; professional development audits; newsletter and online rulebook.

Applicants:

Processing of complaints, enforcement, eligibility orders, informal conferences, notifications of status of complaint, and correspondence; newsletter and online rulebook.

Insurance companies:

Status of licenses; disciplinary and enforcement information.

Managed care entities:

Status of licenses; disciplinary and enforcement information.

Other states' psychology licensing boards:

Status of licenses; open records information; disciplinary and enforcement information.

Professional organizations:

Presentations, correspondence, disciplinary and enforcement information; information on licenses and agency programs.

Legislators:

Provide various types of information responsive to requests; budget requests, constituents' requests for information, required fiscal and performance reporting; disciplinary and enforcement information.

Other state agencies:

Provide various types of information responsive to requests from: Attorney General's Office, Comptroller's Office, Office of the Governor, Auditor's Office, etc.

Federal agencies:

Cooperation on federal suits and prosecutions.

Attorneys:

Negotiation of agreed orders for their clients.

B. Information Gathering Methods

- The Psychology Board, like all other state agencies, is mandated by Section 2113 of the Government Code to develop customer service standards and to implement customer satisfaction assessment plans. Of the customers identified for each of its strategies, the Board then selected its most prominent groups of customers who receive services directly. The agency used the surveys that it had developed previously for this report again for fiscal year 2012 as the results from previous years were appropriate, effective and reliable.
- Customer groups surveyed include: current licensees, applicants, written examinees, oral examination candidates, oral examiners, complainants, respondents, and persons who make open record requests to the agency.

These groups involve the agency's two strategies: licensure and enforcement.

- Eight different surveys were used for these eight groups. Two of the surveys existed and have been used on an on-going basis by the agency for several years. The other six surveys were developed specifically for this mandate.
- The style of the surveys is similar; however, some questions on each are modified to better address the customer group being surveyed. Copies of the eight surveys are provided.
- Each survey consists of approximately 6-10 statements, which the survey participant (participant) is asked to mark on a scale of 1 to 4 (strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree). Additionally each survey includes a space for the participant to make suggestions if he/she thinks the process could be improved.
- A total of 551 surveys were distributed and 271 were returned. To maximize response rates, the surveys were mailed with enclosed, self-addressed, stamped envelopes. The agency believes that the use of these return envelopes is partially responsible for the high return rate on the surveys. Additionally, the name of the participant was optional, therefore persons could respond anonymously. The survey response rate is provided in an accompanying chart. Overall the response rate was 49.18%.
- Random sampling was used in this manner:

Current licensees: licensees who renewed in January 2012

Applicants: persons approved for licensure in September-November 2012

Written examinees: applicants who took the written examinations in July-October 2012

Respondents: licensees whose cases were resolved at May 2012 and August 2012 Board meetings

Complainants: persons whose complaints against licensees were resolved at May 2012 and August 2012 Board meetings

Requestors for Open Records: persons who made open record requests from the agency in June-August 2012

Oral examiners: licensees who served as examiners at the July 2012 Oral Examination

Oral Examination candidates: applicants who took the Oral Examination in July 2012

C. Customer-Determined Satisfaction Synopsis

The Psychology Board determines satisfaction on the surveys by considering a score of either 3 or 4 as satisfactory. A score of either 1 or 2 is not satisfactory. Each survey returned is entered into a spreadsheet noting the rating of 1-4 that each question on the survey received. A total satisfaction rating for each question on all surveys is obtained and then these are totaled for a final satisfaction rating for the survey type.

The satisfaction ratings can be compared in many ways including determining which surveys received the worst or best ratings from a target population, the question per survey type that received the best and worst ratings, and satisfaction ratings per survey type from year to year.

For Fiscal Year 2012 surveys, the agency received a higher overall satisfaction rate than in any previous year: 91.73%. The satisfaction rate for Fiscal Year 2011 was 90.52%, Fiscal Year 2010 was 90.70% and Fiscal Year 2009 was 90.38%.

For this fiscal year's surveys, the Psychology Board received higher scores on seven of its eight different surveys than it did the previous year. The Board believes that this is clear indication that it is making progress in satisfying its customers.

The Psychology Board received favorable ratings (90.59% or more) from seven out of the eight consumer groups surveyed.

Attached is a synopsis of the total number of surveys which were distributed, the number of surveys returned, the percentage of the responses for each survey that were satisfactory and the final overall satisfaction rate. Also attached are copies of the eight surveys that were used: Licensee Survey, Complainant Survey, Respondent Survey, Applicant Survey, Jurisprudence Exam Survey, Open Records Requestor Survey, Oral Examiner Survey, and Oral Examination Candidate Survey.

D. Analysis of Survey Results

The Psychology Board believes that the overall results of the 2012 surveys were favorable to the Board and its operations. The lowest scores were received on the Complainant Survey, although it still reflects an overall satisfaction rating of 67.18%. Satisfaction rating for this survey over the past six years has ranged

from a high of 82.14% in 2011 to a low of 35.71% in 2000. It should be noted that only 11 of the 30 complainants surveyed chose to return their surveys. The fact that complainants chose not to respond could be interpreted as their being basically satisfied with the Board's resolution of their complaints. Also, since the majority of complaints filed with the Board cannot be substantiated and are therefore dismissed, this fact alone could account for why this survey reflects the lowest satisfaction rate.

In reviewing all the surveys and their responses, the one question that had the lowest satisfaction rating was on the Complainant Survey. This survey has a total of eight questions. The question with the low rating states: "The Board does an adequate job of processing complaints." The satisfaction rating was 50%. There is no apparent reason why the satisfaction rating should have dipped on this issue, but of note is that 1 participant declined to give any rating as to his/her agreement or disagreement with it.

The second lowest average rating for any one question on any survey was 54.55% on the Complainants' Survey. Two questions on this survey received 54.55% satisfaction ratings. These questions were: "The Board kept me informed about the time expected for resolution of the complaint," and "My complaint was resolved in a reasonable amount of time given the agency's limited resources and duty to review every complaint received thoroughly."

The Board attempts to resolve all complaints in as timely a fashion as possible. And, in accordance with the Psychologists' Licensing Act and Board rules and procedures, complainants are notified of the projected time schedule for resolving their complaint and, if necessary, are sent updates to this projected time schedule every six months while the investigation is ongoing. Additionally, it should be noted that in fiscal year 2012 the average time for resolving a complaint was 196 days, which is less than its target performance measure of 242 days. The agency is performing above average in complaint resolution time.

All comments received are discussed with the agency staff. Comments identifying ways to improve services are weighed for feasibility and economic impact. In past years many of the comments have led to changes in procedures. All comments received on the surveys are presented to the Board for their review at a regularly scheduled Board meeting. The Board reviews the detailed statistics from the surveys returned.

In response to some of the comments received, the Board has taken the following actions. All application for licensure forms and support materials are now on the agency's website and can be downloaded free of charge. Regarding enforcement, the Board expanded its reasons for dismissal of complaints that are provided to complainants. Additionally, the Board has developed child clinical vignettes as an optional testing area for the Oral Examination. Maps for the Oral Examination have been updated, more directional posters have been added to the exam site,

and the Handbook for Oral Examinees and Board rules concerning the Oral Examination have been expanded and clarified. Most recently, instructions for oral examiners have been expanded. In progress is the plan to send the newsletter to licensees by e-mail. The Board is currently in the process of computerizing its Jurisprudence Exam, which will make taking the exam more convenient for applicants for licensure. Additionally, the Board is amending its Oral Examination procedures so that candidates can receive their exam results sooner, thereby decreasing the amount of time it takes for applicants to become licensed.

The Board is keenly aware that both complainants and respondents would like to have their complaints resolved in a more timely manner. The overall average time for complaint resolution in fiscal year 2012 was 196 days which was well below the performance target of 242 days. However, complicated substantive complaints, many of which result in disciplinary action, frequently take longer to resolve.

The Board continues to make changes in its enforcement and licensing rules and processes to improve the timeliness of complaint resolution and license issuance. The advent of online renewals has assisted licensees in timely renewal and the requirement for online profiles as a condition of license renewal assists the consumer in accessing information about individual psychologists.

Most recently the Board has decided to increase the administrative fee for complaints that are filed as the result of licensees failing to submit proof of professional development as a condition for annual renewal of their licenses. The Board anticipates that this will decrease the large number of professional development complaints that must be filed and therefore conserve agency resources.

E. Customer-related Performance Measures Definitions

1. OUTCOME MEASURES:

Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Expressing Overall Satisfaction with Services Rendered

Short Definition: The percentage of persons who responded to the customer surveys who expressed general satisfaction with the agency's services that they were provided.

Purpose/Importance: This measure is intended to show the percentage of agency customers that are generally satisfied with the services they received.

Source/Collection of Data: Information comes from different surveys which are mailed to representatives of each of the agency's customer groups on an annual basis. Responses are requested via self-addressed, stamped envelopes provided to the survey participants.

- a. Current licensees: licensees who renew in one month, varying the months for random sampling.
- b. New licensees: all those persons who received their licenses at one Board meeting.
- c. Written examinees: persons who took the written examinations at any one national examination administered by the Board.
- d. Persons who received Open Record request information: persons who received open record request information in any two consecutive months.
- e. Complainants: persons whose complaints were resolved at any one Board meeting.
- f. Respondents: licensees whose complaints were resolved at any one Board meeting.
- g. Oral Examiners: oral examiners for any one administration of the Oral Examination.
- h. Oral Examination Candidates: all persons who took the Oral Examination at any one administration of this examination.

Method of Calculation: The measure is calculated by placing the scores for each type of survey on one spreadsheet per type. Thus, there are eight spreadsheets. Each spreadsheet provides the percentages of satisfactory responses on each question for each survey returned, arriving at one total percentage of satisfaction per each survey type. These totals from each survey are then added together and the resulting number is divided by 8, which is the number of the different types of surveys.

Data Limitations: Not all customers can be surveyed. Only the major customer groups are surveyed: current licensees, newly licensed persons, written examinees, persons who received open record request information, complainants, respondents, oral examiners and candidates for the Oral Examination.

Calculation: Non-cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: Performance that is higher than target is preferable.

Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Identifying Ways to Improve Service Delivery

Short Definition: The percentage of customers surveyed by the agency that responded and identified ways for the agency to improve the delivery of services.

Purpose/Importance: The measure is intended to show the percentage of customers who offered suggestions of ways that services could be improved by the agency.

Source/Collection of Data: Information comes from different surveys which are mailed to representatives of each of the agency's customer groups. Responses are requested via self-addressed, stamped envelopes provided to the participants.

- a. Current licensees: all those licensees who renew in any given month, varying months each year.
- b. New licensees: all those persons who received their licenses at one Board meeting.
- c. Written examinees: persons who took the written examinations at any one national examination administered by the Board.
- d. Persons who received Open Record request information: persons who received open record request information in any two consecutive months.
- e. Complainants: persons whose complaints were resolved at any one Board meeting.
- f. Respondents: licensees whose complaints were resolved at any one Board meeting.
- g. Oral examiners: oral examiners for any one administration of the oral examination.
- h. Candidates for the Oral Examination: all persons who took the Oral Examination at any one administration of this examination.

Method of Calculation: The measure is calculated by totaling the number of surveys to all customer groups with suggestions for improvements and then dividing by the total number of all returned surveys.

Data Limitations: Not all customers are surveyed. Only the major customer groups are surveyed: current licensees, newly licensed persons, written examinees, persons who received open record request information, complainants, respondents, oral examiners, oral examinees.

Calculation: Non-cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: Performance that is higher than target might show that there are more problems that need to be corrected. Performance that

is lower than target might show that the agency is doing a better job and therefore there are fewer suggestions for corrections. The agency has no control over the number of customers who respond to its surveys.

2. **OUTPUT MEASURES:**

Number of Customers Surveyed

Short Definition: The total number of persons to whom a survey was mailed.

Purpose/Importance: The measure is intended to show how extensive the survey was.

Source/Collection of Data: The information comes from counting the number of surveys that are mailed out.

Method of Calculation: The measure is calculated by counting the number of surveys that are mailed out.

Data Limitations: There are no data limitations. It is expected that the number surveyed will fluctuate from year to year, due to the source/collection of data methodology for random sampling.

Calculation Type: Cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: A higher performance would indicate that more persons were surveyed. A lower performance would indicate that fewer persons were surveyed.

The agency has no control over the number of customers that seek its services.

Number of Customers Served

Short Definition: Total number of customers served in target customer groups per fiscal year.

Purpose/Importance: This measure is intended to show the total number of customers served in target customer groups per fiscal year.

Source/Collection of Data: Information comes from totaling the following:

- a. Total number of current licensees.
- b. Total number of persons who received licensure in the fiscal year.
- c. Total number of persons who took the two written examinations in the fiscal year.
- d. Total number of persons who received open record requests information in the fiscal year.
- e. Total number of complainants who had their cases resolved during the fiscal year.
- f. Total number of respondents who had their cases resolved during the fiscal year.
- g. Total number of oral examiners per fiscal year.
- h. Total number of oral examinees per fiscal year.

Method of Calculation: This measure is calculated by totaling all of the customers in the fiscal year for all the target customer groups.

Data Limitations: Not all customers are surveyed. Only the major customer groups are surveyed: current licensees, newly licensed persons, written examinees, persons who received open record request information, complainants, respondents, oral examiners, oral examinees.

Calculation: Cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: Performance that is higher would indicate a greater number of customers. Performance that is lower would indicate a lower number of customers served. The agency has no control over the number of customers that seek its services.

3. **EFFICIENCY MEASURES:**

Cost per Customer Surveyed

Short Definition: The cost of sending a survey by mail with a self-addressed, stamped envelope to participant.

Purpose/Importance: The measure is intended to assess the cost of surveying one person.

Source/Collection of Data: The measure is collected by totaling the costs for paper, copying, envelopes, and stamps used for the surveys.

Method of Calculation: The measure is collected by totaling the costs for paper, copying, envelopes, and stamps used for the surveys and dividing by the total number of surveys mailed out.

Data Limitations: The measure does not capture the amount of staff hours that are required to prepare the surveys for mail out, receiving the surveys back, entering them in a database, and calculating the responses.

Calculation: Non-cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: Performance that is higher would indicate that the costs for the surveys have increased. Performance that is lower would indicate that the costs for the surveys have decreased.

4. EXPLANATORY MEASURES

Number of Customers Identified

Short Definition: The total number of persons from the target customer groups for which the agency has a name and address.

Purpose/Importance: This measure is intended to verify that the agency knows who its customers are.

Source/Collection of Data: This information is collected at the end of the fiscal year, when the agency can calculate the following:

- a. The total number of current licensees.
- b. The total number of persons who obtained licensure.
- c. The total number of persons who took the written examinations.
- d. The total number of persons who made written open record requests to the agency.
- e. The total number of complainants who had their cases resolved.
- f. The total number of respondents who had their cases resolved.
- g. The total number of oral examiners.
- h. The total number of candidates for the Oral Examination.

Method of Calculation: The measure is calculated by adding up the totals from all of these groups.

Data Limitations: The agency has other customer groups that it does not survey including: the state legislature, higher education institutions, other state agencies, etc.

Calculation: Cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: A performance that is higher would indicate that the agency has more customers in these customer groups. A performance that is lower would indicate that the agency is serving fewer customers. The agency has no control over the number of customers that seek its services.

Number of Customer Groups Inventoried

Short Definition: The number of customer groups that the agency uses to calculate its customer service performance measures. These are the major customer groups for the agency.

Purpose/Importance: This measure is intended to identify the total number of major customer groups for the agency.

Source/Collection of Data: Information for this measure comes from totaling the number of major customer groups surveyed.

Method of Calculation: Adding major customer groups

Data Limitations: None

Calculation: Cumulative

New Measure: New

Desired Performance: A higher performance would indicate that more customer groups were surveyed. A lower performance would indicate that fewer customer groups were surveyed.

F. Customer Service Performance Measures for Fiscal Year 2012

1.	Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Expressing Overall Satisfaction with Services Rendered	91.73%
2.	Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Identifying Ways to Improve Service Delivery	47.6%
3.	Number of Customers Surveyed	551
4.	Number of Customers Served	9,962
5.	Cost Per Customer Surveyed	\$0.63
6.	Number of Customers Identified	9,962
7.	Number of Customer Groups Inventoried	8

G. Estimated Fiscal Year 2014 Customer Service Performance Measures

1. Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Expressing Overall Satisfaction with Services rendered	91%
2. Percentage of Surveyed Customer Respondents Identifying Ways to Improve Service Delivery	45%
3. Number of Customers Surveyed	550
4. Number of Customers Served	10,000
5. Cost per Customer Served	\$0.62
6. Number of Customers Identified	10,000
7. Number of Customer Groups Inventoried	8

**Synopsis of Customer Service Assessment Surveys
Fiscal Year 2012
Texas State Board of Examiners of Psychologists**

Oral Examinee Survey

Surveys Distributed:	108
Surveys Returned:	108
No. of Questions on Survey:	6
Satisfaction Rate*:	96.74%
(FY2000: 79/79; 81.90%)	
(FY 2001: 67/67; 85.33%)	
(FY 2002:60/58; 82.08%)	
(FY2003:79/79; 84.93%)	
(FY2004:60/59; 86.69%)	
(FY 2005:41/38; 82.02%)	
(FY 2006: 75/65; 95.62%)	
(FY 2007: 81/81; 93.98%)	
(FY 2008: 99/98; 93.69%)	
(FY 2009: 85/81; 96.09%)	
(FY 2010: 86/86; 95.74%)	
(FY 2011: 106/106; 95.91%)	

Oral Examiner Survey

Surveys Distributed:	58
Surveys Returned:	58
No. of Questions on Survey:	6
Satisfaction Rate:	99.65%
(FY2000: 59/54; 94.43%)	
(FY 2001: 48/44; 96.48%)	
(FY 2002: 61/59; 94.45%)	
(FY 2003; 61/59; 95.63%)	
(FY 2004: 46/42; 96.78%)	
(FY 2005: 43/42; 97.48%)	
(FY 2006: 52/46; 99.62%)	

(FY 2007: 58/28; 100%)
(FY 2008: 52/52; 100%)
(FY 2009: 60/60; 98.85%)
(FY 2010: 53/53; 98.42%)
(FY 2011: 55/51; 90.29%)

Written Examinees

Surveys Distributed: 50
Surveys Returned: 6
No. of Questions on Survey: 5
Satisfaction Rate: 96.67%
(FY2000: 103/56; 85.36%)
(FY 2001: 103/49; 91.24%)
(FY 2002: 50/11; 85.45%)
(FY 2003: 50/32; 93.19%)
(FY 2004: 50/34; 93.49%)
(FY 2005: 50/30; 97.33%)
(FY 2006: 50/27; 97.78%)
(FY 2007: 50/23; 97.39%)
(FY 2008: 50/23; 98.26%)
(FY 2009: 50/28; 94.95%)
(FY 2010: 50/22; 97.23%)
(FY 2011: 50/6; 85.36%)

Open Records Requests

Surveys Distributed: 40
Surveys Returned: 9
No. of Questions on Survey: 5
Satisfaction Rate: 100%
(FY2000: 60/34; 83.73%)
(FY 2001: 80/44; 88.83%)
(FY 2002: 40/2; 100%)
(FY 2003: 40/21; 92.24%)
(FY 2004: 40/15; 96%)
(FY 2005: 40/24; 90.26%)
(FY 2006: 40/16; 96.17%)
(FY 2007: 40/12; 98.33%)
(FY 2008: 40/17; 86.25%)
(FY 2009: 40/32; 84.54%)
(FY 2010: 40/20; 93.61%)
(FY 2011: 40/27; 97.66%)

Applicants

Surveys Distributed: 75
Surveys Returned: 20
No. of Questions on Survey: 9

Satisfaction Rate: 91.12%

(FY 2000: 72/46; 70.47%)
(FY 2001: 162/82; 74.47%)
(FY 2002: 75/46; 82.14%)
(FY 2003: 75/44; 80.28%)
(FY 2004: 75/36; 79.41%)
(FY 2005: 75/35; 81.42%)
(FY 2006: 75/27; 84.97%)
(FY 2007: 75/26; 86.04%)
(FY 2008: 75/31; 82.66%)
(FY 2009: 75/35; 89.89%)
(FY 2010: 75/32; 93.61%)
(FY 2011: 75/28; 81.26%)

Current Licensees

Surveys Distributed: 150
Surveys Returned: 40
No. of Questions on Survey: 12
Satisfaction Rate: 90.59%

(FY 2000: 428/241; 78.33%)
(FY 2001: 300/249; 78.74%)
(FY 2002: 150/59; 78.88%)
(FY 2003: 150/80; 83.46%)
(FY 2004: 150/87; 86.03%)
(FY 2005: 150/78; 78.63%)
(FY 2006: 150/72; 80.09%)
(FY 2007: 150/57; 85.12%)
(FY 2008: 150/77; 86.54%)
(FY 2009: 150/68; 87.88%)
(FY 2010: 150/68; 89.47%)
(FY 2011: 150/68; 87.10%)

Complainants

Surveys Distributed: 30
Surveys Returned: 11
No. of Questions on Survey: 8
Satisfaction Rate: 67.18%

(FY 2000: 15/2; 35.71%)
(FY 2001: 34/8; 50.00%)
(FY 2002: 30/10; 62.86%)
(FY 2003: 30/18; 68.44%)
(FY 2004: 30/11; 65.32%)
(FY 2005: 30/11; 75.19%)
(FY 2006: 30/10; 62.86%)
(FY 2007: 30/12; 63.07%)
(FY 2008: 43/12; 60.39%)

(FY 2009: 30/14; 74.95%)
(FY 2010: 11/8; 74.95%)
(FY 2011: 9/9; 82.14%)

Respondents:

Surveys Distributed: 40
Surveys Returned: 19
No. of Questions on Survey: 8
Satisfaction Rate: 91.93%
(FY 2000: 24/8; 60.04%)
(FY 2001: 89/29; 80.70%)
(FY 2002: 40/19; 79.30%)
(FY 2003: 40/11; 88.31%)
(FY 2004: 40/15; 85.27%)
(FY 2005: 40/15; 88.03%)
(FY 2006: 40/15; 85.87%)
(FY 2007: 40/18; 79.14%)
(FY 2008: 50/25; 81.27%)
(FY 2009: 40/18; 94.96%)
(FY 2010: 40/16; 86.30%)
(FY 2011: 18/18; 85.16%)

TOTAL: 91.73%
(FY2000: 73.74%)
(FY 2001: 80.75%)
(FY 2002: 83.15%)
(FY 2003: 85.81%)
(FY 2004: 86.12%)
(FY 2005: 86.295%)
(FY 2006: 87.87%)
(FY 2007: 87.88%)
(FY 2008: 86.01%)
(FY 2009: 90.38%)
(FY 2010: 90.70%)
(FY 2011: 90.52%)

* Scores of 3 (Agree) or 4 (Strongly Agree) on a 4 point scale with 4 being the highest rate of satisfaction.