

For the period: April 2014 to June 2014

Number of evaluations received for meetings:

■ 21

Rating Scale

- 1 = Poor
- 2 = Ok
- 3 = Average
- 4 = Good
- 5 = Excellent

How to use this evaluation:

- Numbers are quoted in the order: **Mean (Std dev) Count (Min-Max)**
- Standard deviation gives a feel for level of agreement/ disagreement in ratings.

Number of evaluations received for jobs:

■ 5

Feedback of Meetings

Were the IP associates polite and helpful?

4.7(0.7)21(2-5)

were the IP associates sensitive to needs and expectations of the clients?

4.4(0.7)21(2-5)

Were you comfortable speaking freely with the IP associates?

4.6(0.7)21(2-5)

Are IPFACE services cost effective

2.5(2.08)21(0-5)

Quality of interaction and advise

4.14(1.3)21(0-5)

Overall Experience

4.57(0.7)21(2-5)

Feedback For Jobs Done

How well your request was understood and defined?

4.8(0.4)5(4-5)

Was the service provided in a truly and prompt manner?

4.8(0.4)5(4-5)

Were the results delivered on time as promised?

4.6(0.5)5(4-5)

Quality of Work

4.2(0.4)5(4-5)

IPFACE services Cost effective?

4(0.7)5(3-5)

Overall Experience

4.4(0.5)5(4-5)

For the period: April 2014 to June 2014

Suggestions received:

1. Please bring down the cost
2. It's the first time I am visiting, suggestions can only be shared after few more interactions
3. Good and helpful approach
4. Too soon to suggest
5. Arrangements and Concessions for students

