


Faculty Satisfaction with Important Services¹ MISO Survey - February, 2008




*Network, email, and overall services are included but were not measured in the importance question.

¹ Important services are services averaging at least “Important” (3.0) on an importance scale of “Not Important” (1.0), “Somewhat Important” (2.0), “Important” (3.0), and “Very Important” (4.0). Services listed in order of Importance.

*Network, email, and overall services are included but were not measured in the importance question.

¹ Important services are services averaging at least “Important” (3.0) on an importance scale of “Not Important” (1.0), “Somewhat Important” (2.0), “Important” (3.0), and “Very Important” (4.0). Services listed in order of Importance.


Student Satisfaction with Important Services¹ MISO Survey - February, 2008



*Network, email, and overall services are included but were not measured in the importance question.

¹ Important services are services averaging at least "Important" (3.0) on an importance scale of "Not Important" (1.0), "Somewhat Important" (2.0), "Important" (3.0), and "Very Important" (4.0). Services listed in order of Importance.


Staff Satisfaction with Important Services¹ MISO Survey - February, 2008



*Network, email, and overall services are included but were not measured in the importance question.

¹ Important services are services averaging at least "Important" (3.0) on an importance scale of "Not Important" (1.0), "Somewhat Important" (2.0), "Important" (3.0), and "Very Important" (4.0). Services listed in order of Importance.

Faculty Satisfaction with Important Services¹ Compared to 2005 and Peer Institutions² MISO Survey - February, 2008




*Network, email, and overall services are included but were not measured in the importance question.

¹ Important services are services averaging at least "Important" (3.0) on an importance scale of "Not Important" (1.0), "Somewhat Important" (2.0), "Important" (3.0), and "Very Important" (4.0). Services listed in order of Importance.

² Bates, Barnard, Haverford, Middlebury, Mt. Holyoke, Pomona, and Wellesley

Student Satisfaction of Important Services¹ Compared to 2005 and Peer Institutions² MISO Survey - February, 2008




*Network, email, and overall services are included but were not measured in the importance question.

¹ Important services are services averaging at least “Important” (3.0) on an importance scale of “Not Important” (1.0), “Somewhat Important” (2.0), “Important” (3.0), and “Very Important” (4.0). Services listed in order of Importance.

² Bates, Barnard, Haverford, Middlebury, Mt. Holyoke, Pomona, and Wellesley

Staff Satisfaction of Important Services¹ Compared to 2005 and Peer Institutions² MISO Survey - February, 2008



*Network, email, and overall services are included but were not measured in the importance question.

¹ Important services are services averaging at least "Important" (3.0) on an importance scale of "Not Important" (1.0), "Somewhat Important" (2.0), "Important" (3.0), and "Very Important" (4.0). Services listed in order of Importance.

² Bates, Barnard, Haverford, Middlebury, Mt. Holyoke, Pomona, and Wellesley