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### President's Office

**Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Dimension</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 07-08</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 05-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

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

### Percent Dissatisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Dimension</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office that year.

### Office Use by Employee Group (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Group</th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Non-faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 746 survey respondents, 117 (15.7%) reported having requested or received services from the President's Office in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

1 Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

2 Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees

---

Austin Community College District
Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability, 10/13/2008
## ACC Foundation

### Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 07-08</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 05-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

### Percent Dissatisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

### Office Use by Employee Group (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Non-faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 746 survey respondents, 73 (9.8%) reported having requested or received services from the ACC Foundation in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

1 Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty
2 Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees
### Governmental and Community Relations

**Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Diff. 07-08</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Diff. 05-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

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

### Percent Dissatisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

### Office Use by Employee Group (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty¹</th>
<th>Non-faculty²</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 746 survey respondents, 50 (6.7%) reported having requested or received services from the Governmental & Community Relations office in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees
### Center for Community Based and Non-Profit Organizations
#### Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

### Office Use by Employee Group (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Non-faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 746 survey respondents, 33 (4.4%) reported having requested or received services from the Center for Community-Based and Non-Profit Organizations in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

1 Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

2 Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees
Center for Public Policy and Political Studies
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

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

Percent Dissatisfaction\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty(^1)</th>
<th>Non-faculty(^2)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 746 survey respondents, 25 (3.4%) reported having requested or received services from the Center for Public Policy and Political Studies in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

\(^1\) Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

\(^2\) Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees
### Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability

#### Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Diff. 07-08</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 05-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

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

#### Percent Dissatisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office for that year.

#### Office Use by Employee Group (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Non-faculty</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 746 survey respondents, 124 (16.6%) reported having requested or received services from the Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability office in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

1 Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty

2 Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees
Internal Audit
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Diff. 07-08</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 05-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Dissatisfaction¹</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office that year.

Office Use by Employee Group (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty¹</th>
<th>Non-faculty²</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 746 survey respondents, 52 (7.0%) reported having requested or received services from the Internal Audit office in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

¹ Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty
² Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees
### Public Information & College Marketing

#### Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 07-08</th>
<th>Mean Diff. 05-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promptness</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>service attitude</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey respondents had the option of rating "not applicable" on each or all three of the service dimensions even if they had checked that they had used the office, and these "not applicable" responses are excluded from the analysis. Thus the total number of respondents for each question might vary, yielding slightly different Ns.

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

#### Percent Dissatisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Percent dissatisfaction combines the percent of survey respondents who responded that they were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied" with the overall quality of services provided by the office that year.

#### Office Use by Employee Group (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Adjunct Faculty1</th>
<th>Non-faculty2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N %</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall quality</td>
<td>36 18.4%</td>
<td>20 10.2%</td>
<td>140 71.4%</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 746 survey respondents, 196 (26.3%) reported having requested or received services from the Public Information & College Marketing in the past year. The above table provides the composition by employee group.

1 Adjunct Faculty include Continuing Education and Adult Education Faculty
2 Non-faculty include Administrators, Classified Employees and Professional/Technical Employees