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The Internal College Survey was administered on the web to ACC employees in Summer 2006. Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with overall quality, promptness of service, and the service attitude provided by support offices in the previous year. The survey was designed to reflect the organizational structure of ACC in Fall 2005; therefore, all analysis is based on that structure. There were 481 respondents to the survey.

**Who uses this office?**

Of the 481 survey respondents, 44 (9.1%) reported having requested or received services from the Office of the VP for College Support Systems and ISD Relations in the past year. Of those respondents:

- 77% (34 respondents) were Non-faculty (includes Administrators, Classified Employees, and Professional/Technical Employees);
- 18% (8 respondents) were Full-time Faculty;
- 5% (2 respondents) were Adjunct Faculty (includes Continuing and Adult Education Faculty).

**How satisfied are employees with overall services from this office?**

Results of the Summer 2006 Internal College Survey indicate moderate increases in mean satisfaction for overall quality, promptness and service attitude from Spring 2005. Mean satisfaction with these service dimensions decreased slightly from 2003 to 2004, increased somewhat from 2004 to 2005 and have now increased to be above the 2003 levels.
For each office survey respondents were asked if they had used the services of that office during the past year. If they indicated they had used the services of the office they were then directed to an additional screen where they were asked to rate their satisfaction with the office on overall quality, promptness and service attitude. Not every employee responded to all questions about an office. Survey respondents also had the option of rating “not applicable” on the three dimensions of service and these responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus, the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 05-06</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 03-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction Scores
1= Very Dissatisfied
2= Dissatisfied
3= Neutral
4= Satisfied
5= Very Satisfied
Early College Start / College Connection

The Internal College Survey was administered on the web to ACC employees in Summer 2006. Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with overall quality, promptness of service, and the service attitude provided by support offices in the previous year. The survey was designed to reflect the organizational structure of ACC in Fall 2005; therefore, all analysis is based on that structure. There were 481 respondents to the survey.

Who uses this office?

Of the 481 survey respondents, 130 (27.0%) reported having requested or received services from the Office of Early College Start / College Connection in the past year. Of those respondents:
- 67% (87 respondents) were Non-faculty (includes Administrators, Classified Employees, and Professional/Technical Employees);
- 20% (26 respondents) were Full-time Faculty;
- 13% (17 respondents) were Adjunct Faculty (includes Continuing and Adult Education Faculty).

How satisfied are employees with overall services from this office?

Results of the Summer 2006 Internal College Survey indicate slight decreases in mean satisfaction for overall quality, promptness and service attitude from Spring 2005. Mean satisfaction with these service dimensions increased moderately from 2003 to 2004 but the last two years have declined.
For each office survey respondents were asked if they had used the services of that office during the past year. If they indicated they had used the services of the office they were then directed to an additional screen where they were asked to rate their satisfaction with the office on overall quality, promptness and service attitude. Not every employee responded to all questions about an office. Survey respondents also had the option of rating “not applicable” on the three dimensions of service and these responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus, the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Diff. 05-06</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Diff. 03-06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Diff. 05-06</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Diff. 03-06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Diff. 05-06</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Diff. 03-06</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction Scores
1= Very Dissatisfied
2= Dissatisfied
3= Neutral
4= Satisfied
5= Very Satisfied
Grants Development

The Internal College Survey was administered on the web to ACC employees in Summer 2006. Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with overall quality, promptness of service, and the service attitude provided by support offices in the previous year. The survey was designed to reflect the organizational structure of ACC in Fall 2005; therefore, all analysis is based on that structure. There were 481 respondents to the survey.

**Who uses this office?**

Of the 481 survey respondents, 48 (10%) reported having requested or received services from the Grants Office in the past year. Of those respondents:
- 83% (40 respondents) were Non-faculty (includes Administrators, Classified Employees, and Professional/Technical Employees);
- 10% (5 respondents) were Full-time Faculty;
- 6% (3 respondent) were Adjunct Faculty (includes Continuing and Adult Education Faculty).

**How satisfied are employees with overall services from this office?**

Results of the Summer 2006 Internal College Survey indicate moderate increases in mean satisfaction for overall quality, promptness and service attitude from Spring 2005. Mean satisfaction for these service dimensions increased substantially from 2003 to 2004, decreased slightly from 2004 to 2005, and have now increased to be at or above the 2004 levels.

![Graph showing satisfaction over time](image)
For each office survey respondents were asked if they had used the services of that office during the past year. If they indicated they had used the services of the office they were then directed to an additional screen where they were asked to rate their satisfaction with the office on overall quality, promptness and service attitude. Not every employee responded to all questions about an office. Survey respondents also had the option of rating “not applicable” on the three dimensions of service and these responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus, the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants Development</th>
<th>Comparison of Survey Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction Scores
1= Very Dissatisfied
2= Dissatisfied
3= Neutral
4= Satisfied
5= Very Satisfied
The Internal College Survey was administered on the web to ACC employees in Summer 2006. Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with overall quality, promptness of service, and the service attitude provided by support offices in the previous year. The survey was designed to reflect the organizational structure of ACC in Fall 2005; therefore, all analysis is based on that structure. There were 481 respondents to the survey.

Who uses this office?

Of the 481 survey respondents, 102 (21.2%) reported having requested or received services from the Instructional Development office in the past year. Of those respondents:
- 50% (51 respondents) were Non-faculty (includes Administrators, Classified Employees, and Professional/Technical Employees);
- 27% (28 respondents) were Full-time Faculty;
- 23% (23 respondents) were Adjunct Faculty (includes Continuing and Adult Education Faculty).

How satisfied are employees with overall services from this office?

Results of the Summer 2006 Internal College Survey indicate substantial increases in mean satisfaction for overall quality, promptness and service attitude from Spring 2005. After decreasing between 2004 and 2005 mean satisfaction for all three service dimensions have risen above the 2004 levels.
For each office survey respondents were asked if they had used the services of that office during the past year. If they indicated they had used the services of the office they were then directed to an additional screen where they were asked to rate their satisfaction with the office on overall quality, promptness and service attitude. Not every employee responded to all questions about an office. Survey respondents also had the option of rating “not applicable” on the three dimensions of service and these responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus, the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

### Instructional Development
(formerly Curriculum Services / Schedule Development)
Comparison of Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 05-06</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 04-06</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction Scores
1= Very Dissatisfied
2= Dissatisfied
3= Neutral
4= Satisfied
5= Very Satisfied