

STUDENT OPINION [SURVEY]

2006 - 2010

Procedure

1. The area of Research and Evaluation designs the instrument to be used, based on the needs stated by marketing directors of each campus. This instrument is reviewed each period before being applied. In the first semester of 2002, the survey began to be carried out formally.
2. Marketing Directors of each campus are responsible for the application of the survey to the students on the scheduled dates, and in accordance with pre-established samples, obtained through the formula for finite populations and by selection.
3. Once the information is obtained, it is processed by the area of Research and Evaluation, which is responsible for the report and its conclusions.
4. Information is sent in written to the Campus Director and to the corresponding departmental directors.
5. The information contains the following elements:
 - a. Index, with the sample and the instrument
 - b. Tables of campus results with the breakdown by department
 - c. Conclusions and annex with textual opinions
 - d. Comparative table of periods with highlights
 - e. Comparative general table with all periods and presentation
6. Annual revision. Once results are from the following period are obtained, data will be compared and thus advancement will be measured. Results from this measurement will be presented in the highlights report, which is analyzed through the Satisfaction Improvement Workshops.
7. Assigning responsibilities. In this point, the Campus Directors assess the different issues exposed, determine aspects to be solved, that are to be included in the working plans and in the productivity matrixes.
8. Diffusion of Improvement. In this point, the recommendation is that once commitment for improvement by the campus is established, and advancement for the semester is produced results are revealed, so that students are kept informed and evidence is obtained about the towards customer service

CRITERIA FOR REACHING CONCLUSIONS

1. For the purposes of measurement, data that represent improvement opportunities is considered. That is, the negative scale (Very poor, poor and regular).
2. The “regular” score is taken as a negative parameter, since it implies that room for improvement still exist.
3. To determine the Improvement Factor (IF) scores are added in the following categories: “very poor”, “poor” and “regular”
4. Conclusions are ranked from higher to lower percentage of IF,

In a visual format, the relationship between the Improvement Factor, and the score of the variable, is presented next:

TABLEA # 1

Improvement Factor (IF)	Score in percentage	Interpretation
0	100	Excellent
5	95	Excellent
10	90	Good
15	85	Good
20	80	Good
25	75	Regular
30	70	Regular
35	65	Poor
40	60	Poor
45	55	Ver y poor

Factors evaluated:

- Attention in the service departments
- Functionality of the facilities
- Extra-curricular a activities
- Feeling of proud for belonging to CETYS
- Student environment
- Satisfaction from all services received from CETYS

Next, results are presented from the perception from students in all three campus. Due to the particular nature of the study, it is better to treat each campus as an individual unit, given that each campus operates in a different context.

FACTOR: Attention from service departments

Services at Ensenada Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
General Score	Good IF 12	Good IF 15	Good IF 24	Regular IF 28	Good IF 15	Good IF 20
Worst scored services	Cafeteria IF 40 Computer Lab IF 26	Cashier services IF 34 Cafeteria IF 25	Wireless service IF 60 Blackboard IF 49 Copy center & store IF 40	Wireless service IF 64 Internet access to grades IF46 Cafeteria IF 44	Wireless service IF 56 Copy center & store IF 25	Wireless service IF 43 Copy center & store IF 34 Cafeteria IF 30

Services at Mexicali Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
General Score	Good IF 17	Good IF 20	Good IF 21	Good IF 18	Good IF 14	Good IF 16
Worst scored services	Copy center & store IF 46 Nurse's office IF 26	Wireless service IF 46 Copy center & store IF 33 Internet registration IF 28	Wireless service IF 57 Blackboard IF 38 Copy center & store IF 31	Wireless service IF 49 Copy center & store IF 28 Blackboard IF 27	Wireless service IF47	Wireless service IF 69 Blackboard IF 35 Internet access to grades IF 27

Services at Tijuana Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
General Score	Good IF 13	Good IF 11	Good IF 12	Good IF 19	Good IF 17	Good IF 21
Worst scored services	Computer Lab. IF 28	Cafeteria IF 62 Wireless service IF 37 Copy center / store IF 29	Wireless service IF 52 Cafeteria IF 36 Internet access to grades IF 27	Wireless service IF 55 Cafeteria IF 48 Internet access to grades IF 46	Wireless service IF45 Cafeteria IF 40 Internet access to grades IF 29	Wireless service IF 79 Cafeteria IF 51 Blackboard IF 46

FACTOR: Perception on the functionality of the facilities.

Facilities at Ensenada Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
General Score	Good IF 24	Poor IF 36	Poor IF 31	Good IF 23	Good IF 19	Regular IF 27
Worst scored infrastructure	Cafeteria IF 34 Parking lot IF 31 Videoconferencing room IF 27	Cafeteria IF 71 Parking lot IF 69 Sports areas IF 48	Parking lot IF 51 Cafeteria IF 41 Sports areas IF 40	Cafeteria IF 37 Parking lot IF 34	Parking lot IF 42 Sports areas IF 33 Computer lab. IF 32	Parking lot IF 44 Cafeteria IF 37 Sports areas IF 29

Facilities at Mexicali Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
General Score	Good IF 23	Regular IF 25	Good IF 24	Good IF 21	Good IF 21	Good IF 17
Worst scored infrastructure	Restrooms IF 60 Audiovisual rooms IF 60 Classrooms IF 34	Parking lot IF 44 Restrooms IDF 41 Classrooms IF 33	Parking lot IF 51 Restrooms IF 35 Classrooms IF 34	Parking lot IF 47 Classrooms IF 29 Restrooms IF 26	Parking lot IF 41 Classrooms IF 33 Restrooms IF 29	Parking lot IF 28

Facilities at Tijuana Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
General Score	Poor			Good IF 24	Good IF 21	Good IF 23
Worst scored infrastructure	Classrooms Restrooms Audiovisual rooms			Cafeteria IF 50 Parking lot IF 49 Classrooms IF 27	Cafeteria IF 51 Parking lot IF 34 Computer labs IF 29	Cafeteria IF 58 Parking lot IF 36 Computer lab IF 28

FACTOR: Extra-curricular activities**Extra-curricular Activities at Ensenada Campus (Undergraduate)**

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
General Score	Good IF 10	Good IF 12	Good IF 20	Good IF 14	Good IF 14	Regular IF 26
Worst scored activities	None	None	None	Improve campaign for Queen elections IF 27	Did not present negative variables	Student society IF 32 Conferences IF 31 Study trips IF 27

Extra-curricular Activities at Mexicali Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
General Score	Good IF 20	Good IF 16	Good IF 18	Good IF 10	Good IF 9	Good IF 16
Worst scored activities	Student society IF 37 Sports representative teams IF 34	Did not present [negative] variables	Campaign for Queen elections IF 25	Did not present [negative] variables	Did not present [negative] variables	Campaigns for Queen election IF 30

Extra-curricular Activities at Tijuana Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
General Score	Good IF 11	Good IF 15	Good IF 15	Good IF 12	Good IF 13	Good IF 15
Worst scored activities		Student society IF 48 Campaign for Queen elections IF 31	Campaign for Queen elections IF 38 Student society IF 28	Did not present [negative] variables	Did not present [negative] variables	Student society IF 26

FACTOR : ¿What level of proud do you have of CETYS?

Student Proud: Ensenada Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
I am not proud:	17%	14%	27%	16%	9%	12%
Rationale	Expected more Do not like the school Do not deliver as promised	National level diffusion [lack of] Nothing of relevance to feel proud of Personal achievement	Expected more Personal achievement [meaning that the student feels proud of himself rather than of Cetys]	Expected more Do not deliver as promised Personal achievement	Lack of diffusion Expected more Do not like the school	Do not deliver as promised Expected more Do not like the school
I am proud:	83%	85%	73%	82%	91%	71%
Rationale	Prestige, acknowledgement Academic quality Like it	Prestige Academic quality Attention [personal service]	Prestige Academic quality More opportunities	Academic quality Prestige Better opportunities	Academic quality Prestige Better opportunities	Academic quality Prestige, acknowledgement Opportunities
Did not answer	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	17%

Student Proud: Mexicali Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
I am not proud:	12%	15%	19%	13%	12%	7%
Rationale	Expected more Do not deliver as promised It is a matter of personal achievement	National level diffusion [lack of] Expected more Do not like the school	Expected more Personal achievement Nothing so special about it None	Expected more Lack of diffusion Personal achievement	Expected more Personal achievement Nothing so special about it None	Expected more Personal achievement [Should have] More diffusion at the national level
I am proud:	86%	85%	80%	88%	88%	90%
Rationale	High academic quality Better level and attention [service] More opportunities	Academic quality Because I like it Attention [personal service]	Prestige, acknowledgement Academic quality Better level of attention	Academic quality Prestige, acknowledgement Because I like it	Academic quality Prestige, acknowledgement Better level of attention	Academic quality Prestige, acknowledgement Better level of attention
Did not answer	2%	0%	1%	2%	0%	3%

Student Proud: Tijuana Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
I am not proud:	19%	10%	24%	16%	14%	12%
Rationale	Expected more Lack of national level diffusion Do not deliver as promised	Lack of diffusion Nothing so special about it Do not deliver as promised	Expected more Personal achievement Do not like it	Expected more Nothing so special about it Personal achievement	Expected more Do not deliver as promised Nothing so special about it	Expected more Do not deliver as promised Personal achievement
I am proud:	80%	90%	76%	81%	86%	87%
Rationale	Prestige High academic quality Better opportunities	Prestige Acknowledgement Academic quality	Prestige Acknowledgement Academic quality	Prestige, acknowledgement Academic quality Opportunities	Prestige, acknowledgement Academic quality Opportunities	Academic quality Prestige, acknowledgement Opportunities
Did not answer	1%	0%	0%	3%	0%	1%

FACTOR: If you could express, what is the level of satisfaction that you have at CETYS?

Level of Satisfaction: Ensenada Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
Score	8.18	8.29	7.74	8.29	8.56	8.21
High satisfaction	72%	69%	50%	53%	86%	76%
Rationale	Content with what is received Attention and service Faculty and classes	Faculty and classes Content with what is received	Content with what is received	Content with what is received I has been improving	Attention Content with what is received Faculty and classes	Content with what is received Attention
Dissatisfaction	28%	30%	49%	29%	12%	21%
Rationale	Cafeteria Faculty and classes Poor attention	Pays too much compared with what is received Services Classrooms	Poor facilities	Copy service Raffle tickets [contextualizing: likely due to enforced allocation for some students]	Computers Attention	Copy/store Faculty Services
Did not answer	0%	1%	1%	18%	2%	3%

Level of Satisfaction: Mexicali Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
Score	8.5	8.12	7.924	8.12	8.18	8.47
High satisfaction	74%	66%	66%	73%	75%	79%
Rationale	Content with what is received Faculty and classes Because of the Attention	Content with what is received Faculty and classes Attention and service	Faculty and classes Content with what is received	Content with what is received Attention and service	Content with what is received Faculty and classes Attention and service	Content with what is received Attention and service
Dissatisfaction	26%	33%	34%	27%	24%	19%
Rationale	Projectors and laptops Lack of communication and organization Facilities and equipment	Improve classrooms Services Improve attention	Better services Improve attention Improve classes and faculty	Expected more Pays too much compared with what is received	Improve attention Internet is slow	Slow Internet service Lack of support for sports
Did not answer	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%

Level of Satisfaction: Tijuana Campus (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
Score	8.04	8.31	8.3	8.15	8.28	8.34
High satisfaction	69%	75%	66%	67%	81%	66%
Rationale	Content with what is received Faculty and classes Because of the Attention and service	Faculty and classes Facilities Attention and service	Content with what is received Faculty and classes Facilities	Content with what is received	Attention and service Content with what is received	Content with what is received Attention and service
Dissatisfaction	31%	24%	34%	32%	19%	33%
Rationale	Faculty and classes Improve services Pays too much compared with what is received	Poor services Attention and service Pays too much compared with what is received	Poor services	Expected more Better services Lack of communication and organization	Poor attention Better services Expected courses are not being offered	Poor attention Slow Internet Faculty and classes
Did not answer	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%

FACTOR: Give us your opinion on student environment?

Student Environment: Ensenada (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
Could be improved in:	Poor/Regular 53%	Poor/Regular 50%	Poor/Regular 54%	Poor/Regular 45%	Poor/Regular 28%	Poor/Regular 40%
Issues	Apathy, little participation, lack of unity, too many silos, boring	Lack of unity Apathy Boring	Lack of unity Apathy Lack of events	Lack of unity Apathy Boring	Lack of unity Apathy Poor participation	Deficient events (communication, organization, support) Lack of unity, too many silos
It is good because	Good/Excellent 46%	Good/Excellent 50%	Good/Excellent 46%	Good/Excellent 53%	Good/Excellent 72%	Good/Excellent 53%
Good environment Issues	I like it, I feel at ease, make connections, it is adequate, educational, healthy	They like it It feels at ease Making connections	They like it Feels at ease Formative and healthy	They like it Making connections Formative and healthy	They like it Making connections Formative and healthy	It is adequate, formative and healthy Making connections There is social interaction
Environment Student Matters	Poor IF 39	Very poor IF 50	Poor IF 39	Poor IF 40	Good IF 23	Good IF 19

Student Environment: Mexicali (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
Could be improved in:	Poor/Regular 24%	Poor/Regular 40%	Poor/Regular 46%	Poor/Regular 46%	Poor/Regular 34%	Poor/Regular 25%
Issues	Apathy Lack of unity Lack of participation	Lack of unity Apathy Do not like	Lack of unity Apathy Do not like	Lack of unity Apathy Do not like	Lack of unity Apathy Poor participation	Lack of events Little social interaction Lack of unity, too many silos
It is good because	Good/Excellent 74%	Good/Excellent 60%	Good/Excellent 53%	Good/Excellent 53%	Good/Excellent 63%	Good/Excellent 72%
Good environment Issues	I like it, I feel at ease, make connections, it is adequate, educational, healthy	They like it It feels at ease Making connections Formative and healthy	They like it Feels at ease Formative and healthy Making connections	I like it Feels at ease Formative and healthy Making connections	I like it Feels at ease Formative and healthy Making connections	It is formative and healthy Making connections There is good social interaction
Environment Student Matters	Good IF 14	Regular IF 27	Regular IF 31	Regular IF 31	Regular IF 28	Good IF 21

Student Environment: Tijuana (Undergraduate)

Semester	2005-2	2006-2	2007-2	2008-2	2009-2	2010-2
Could be improved in:	Poor/Regular 54%	Poor/Regular 44%	Poor/Regular 29%	Poor/Regular 39%	Poor/Regular 39%	Poor/Regular 32%
Issues	Apathy Lack of participation Lack of unity	Lack of unity Apathy Do not like	Lack of unity Apathy Lack of participation	Lack of unity Apathy Lack of events	Lack of unity Apathy Poor participation	Apathy No student environment Lack of events
It is good because	Good/Excellent 44%	Good/Excellent 56%	Good/Excellent 71%	Good/Excellent 58%	Good/Excellent 60%	Good/Excellent 68%
Good environment Issues	Like it Formative and healthy Making connections	They like it It feels at ease Formative and healthy Making connections	Formative and healthy They like it Feels at ease Making connections	Formative and healthy Making connections	I like it Feels at ease Formative and healthy Making connections	Making connections It is formative and healthy
Environment Student Matters	Regular IF 38	Regular IF 28	Good IF 12	Regular IF 30	Excellent IF 6	Regular IF 26