

For the period: July 2014 to Sept 2014

Number of evaluations received for meetings:

■ 10

**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?

4.6(0.6)31(2-5)

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

4.4(0.6)31(2-5)

Were you comfortable speaking freely with the IP associates?

4.6(0.6)31(2-5)

Are IPFACE services cost effective

3.3(1.8)31(0-5)

Quality of interaction and advise

4.09(1.3)31(0-5)

Overall Experience

4.6(0.6)31(2-5)

## Feedback For Jobs Done

How well your request was understood and defined?

4.5(0.5)11(4-5)

Was the service provided in a truly and prompt manner?

4.5(0.5)11(4-5)

Were the results delivered on time as promised?

4.2(0.7)11(3-5)

Quality of Work

4.4(0.5)11(4-5)

IPFACE services Cost effective?

4(0.5)11(3-5)

Overall Experience

4.4(0.5)11(4-5)



# Service Quality Survey



For the period: July 2014 to Sept 2014

## Suggestions received:

1. Must include some sort of funding support for patent filing

