

Spring 2008 Internal College Survey Office Reports

Table of Contents

President's Office

ACC Foundation

Governmental and Community Relations

Center for Community Based and Non-Profit Organizations

Center for Public Policy and Political Studies

Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability

Internal Audit

Public Information & College Marketing

President's Office														
Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	131	4.21	1.07	n/a	n/a	n/a	149	4.31	1.23	114	4.34	1.15	0.03	0.13
promptness	128	4.15	1.11	n/a	n/a	n/a	149	4.30	1.21	114	4.32	1.15	0.03	0.18
service attitude	132	4.18	1.17	n/a	n/a	n/a	149	4.34	1.22	114	4.35	1.16	0.02	0.17

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			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	8.4%	n/a	11.4%	9.6%

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)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
21	17.9%	7	6.0%	89	76.1%	117

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

ACC Foundation Mean Ratings (2005 -- 2008)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	74	4.09	1.09	51	4.39	0.94	71	4.61	0.71	71	4.24	1.22	-0.37	0.14
promptness	74	4.09	1.09	51	4.31	0.97	72	4.63	0.72	69	4.26	1.26	-0.36	0.17
service attitude	74	4.16	1.11	51	4.35	1.13	71	4.68	0.67	70	4.13	1.37	-0.55	-0.03

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			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	7.0%	5.9%	2.8%	12.7%

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)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
19	26.0%	6	8.2%	48	65.8%	73

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)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	71	3.23	1.34	33	4.09	1.21	51	3.90	1.46	46	3.72	1.41	-0.18	0.49
promptness	72	3.21	1.34	33	4.18	1.10	50	3.84	1.54	45	3.64	1.42	-0.20	0.44
service attitude	70	3.17	1.36	33	4.12	1.22	50	3.90	1.52	45	3.69	1.41	-0.21	0.52

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			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	25.4%	15.2%	19.6%	21.7%

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)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
6	12.0%	5	10.0%	39	78.0%	50

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)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	41	4.20	1.21	31	4.06	1.31	-0.14	n/a
promptness	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	41	4.15	1.20	31	4.06	1.36	-0.09	n/a
service attitude	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	41	4.20	1.25	30	4.07	1.36	-0.13	n/a

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			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	n/a	n/a	9.8%	12.9%

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)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
8	24.2%	3	9.1%	22	66.7%	33

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)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	23	3.61	1.31	n/a	n/a
promptness	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	22	3.77	1.38	n/a	n/a
service attitude	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	23	3.65	1.27	n/a	n/a

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			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	n/a	n/a	n/a	21.7%

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)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
4	16.0%	2	8.0%	19	76.0%	25

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

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			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	10.6%	18.8%	9.6%	18.7%

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)						Total
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
36	29.0%	8	6.5%	80	64.5%	124

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)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	89	3.47	1.38	37	3.78	1.38	67	3.73	1.32	50	3.90	1.31	0.17	0.43
promptness	87	3.53	1.27	37	3.86	1.40	66	3.80	1.27	50	3.86	1.32	0.06	0.33
service attitude	87	3.37	1.46	37	3.73	1.50	67	3.69	1.37	50	3.80	1.39	0.11	0.43

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			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	21.1%	21.6%	17.9%	14.0%

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)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
7	13.5%	2	3.8%	43	82.7%	52

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)														
	2005			2006			2007			2008			Mean Diff. 07-08	Mean Diff. 05-08
	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	N	Mean	Std. Dev.		
overall quality	96	4.29	0.92	146	3.82	1.36	213	4.39	0.87	195	4.08	1.15	-0.31	-0.21
promptness	93	4.22	0.99	144	3.85	1.33	212	4.30	0.98	194	4.01	1.17	-0.29	-0.20
service attitude	93	4.22	1.01	142	3.92	1.32	212	4.38	0.94	193	4.11	1.15	-0.27	-0.11

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			
	2005	2006	2007	2008
overall quality	5.2%	11.4%	4.7%	12.8%

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)						
Full-time Faculty		Adjunct Faculty ¹		Non-faculty ²		Total
N	%	N	%	N	%	N
36	18.4%	20	10.2%	140	71.4%	196

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