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Date: June 24, 2010 

Date of previous quality review: June 11, 2007 

**Satisfaction with Support Services Provided:**

*Please indicate the proportions (%) of respondents who rated each aspect as “excellent” or “good” (separately and combined).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student satisfaction with:</th>
<th>Percent Responding “Excellent”</th>
<th>Percent Responding “Good”</th>
<th>Percent responding Good/Excellent (Combined %)</th>
<th>Percent responding Excellent in 2007</th>
<th>Change between 2007 &amp; 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours of operation</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>+6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of response</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of procedures</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>+1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of materials</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff helpfulness</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>+0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff knowledge</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>-3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of service</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department-specific indicators (if applicable):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Percent Responding “Excellent”</th>
<th>Percent Responding “Good”</th>
<th>Percent responding Good/Excellent in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ease in finding info on website</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of info on website</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services after 5pm</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow through on major tech projects</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Changes since last quality review**

The 2010 Quality Review depicts very high marks in satisfaction overall. There are however, four areas with slight decreases in quality of service in comparison to the 2007 Quality Review identified in the table above. While these decreases are minimal in relation to the overall number of respondents, the ratings remain above.
90% leaving “Quality of Materials” remaining above 80% with a 2.0% decrease in satisfaction indicated in this review.

Four additional and new questions were asked in the 2010 survey all of which are a direct result of future plans mentioned in the 2007 report. One of the questions asked in 2007 was: “Quality of Website” which received a 53.4% overall rating. Since the campus has an entirely new website, this question was expanded into two new questions which directly relate to the “quality” of our website. Respondents to the questions: Ease in finding information and Usefulness of Information received 12% and 19% increase respectively which will help the Campus Website Committee in making further adjustments in continuing to improve the quality of our website.

The question regarding “Services after 5pm” was also a new question and a direct result of planning mentioned in the 2007 review. We now have a benchmark average of 77.1% from which to improve on with roughly 40% of respondents indicating “Excellent” and 36% indicating “Good” service.

The final question of the four was designed to provide feedback in regard to the large number of projects Academic Computing Staff have in progress in contrast to the small number of staff available to complete projects in addition to daily requests across campus. The overall rating was a pleasing 88.5% which would directly relate to the “Overall quality of service” rating at 92.4% only being 0.2% below the 2007 result.

In general, the current ratings are very favorable and helpful in identifying areas needing improvement in addition to maintaining an overall high level of service to the campus community. I believe efforts can be focused equally to all areas receiving lower ratings since they are very minor in change.

**Mission/ Administrative Unit Outcomes**

While Academic Computing does not have a Mission Statement, we will develop one in addition to working with the Institutional Research Office in providing a summary of Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUO’s) by Summer of 2011.

**Faculty/Staff Involvement**

_The Academic Computing staff have been involved in the process of reviewing and commenting on the results of this survey. Additionally, they have had input into setting new goals and aware of the adjustments necessary to bring up scores on the items receiving lower marks for this survey._

**Review Previous Goals and Objectives**

All of the goals and objectives specified in the 2007 review have been met. Those goals include the following in addition to addressing the stated objectives of the 2007 review:

1. **Continue to improve the campus website in support of faculty, staff, and student needs.** – A new and improved website has been constructed and in use. Feedback from the survey questions in addition to comments will help the campus Website Committee modify the website in addressing needs.

2. **Monitor campus Educational Master Plan, Strategic Plan, and Technology Plan to ensure needs are being met.** – This is an ongoing process and in many cases exceeds the needs noted within the campus planning documents. In relation to this process, the Campus Technology Plan undergoes an annual review and update if applicable.

3. **Continue to improve after hour support needs of the campus.** – Having hired an additional IT Coordinator, the campus has evening support till 8:30 five days (nights) a week. In direct response to
the stated objective (…monitor and identify potential changes to provide better support…), we have staff on site from 7am to 8:30pm daily in addition to having software support tools in place to allow staff to access network systems remotely and securely as needs arise.

The only standard not met in 2007 was “Quality of Website” however, the new website has received higher marks and we are hoping to improve upon that in the next review with the feedback and comments provided in this review.

**Long-range Plan and Objectives**

In the following section, identify general goals and specific, measurable objectives your area plans to achieve within the next three years. Programs should identify 3-5 goals, with at least one goal per year. Goals set for next year that require fiscal resources must also be submitted as a Budget Request and Action Plan (separate form). Identify if the goal is aligned with any of the following plans (provide details):

Educational Master Plan, Student Services Plan, Matriculation Plan, Distance Education Plan,

Student Equity Plan, Technology Plan, Basic Skills Plan

I. **Goal:** Continue to improve our new campus website addressing overall needs and suggestions in support of the institution and its visitors.

Supports plan: Educational Master Plan, Student Services Plan, Distance Education Plan,

Technology Plan

1. **Objective:** Integrate suggestions for website improvements in addition to maintain correct and up to date information.

   1.1 Person(s) responsible: Director of Academic Computing

   1.2 Timeframe: Ongoing

   1.3 Fiscal resources need (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

2. **Objective:** In connection with Goal #2, under Direction 3 of the Campus Strategic Plan, we will continue with employee training efforts in the form of short “How to videos” and more published materials made available on the Academic Computing web pages.

   2.1 Person(s) responsible: Director of Academic Computing

   2.2 Timeframe: Ongoing

   2.3 Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

3. **Objective:**

   3.1 Person(s) responsible: Director of Academic Computing

   3.2 Timeframe: Ongoing

   3.3 Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): NA

**Additional resource requirement identified by the results of the Quality Review**

With the exception of additional personnel, Academic Computing is content with the facilities provided to us. We continue to work with the Campus Technology Committee (CTC) and the Campus Technology Plan in providing equipment, service, and support in addition to providing recommendations to the Planning and Budget Committee to fund future technology upgrades.
In regard to additional personnel, we are and have been increasing our technology base annually without keeping pace with support personnel. However, our overall ratings for services remain very high and therefore considering campus/district wide decreased staff levels in every office, we will continue to wait for better economic times and our turn in adding staff.

Fiscal resources and planning

We continue to update our 3-5 year technology planning documents for network infrastructure equipment replacement and work closer with faculty and staff in analyzing our current PC Replacement Plan needs. Additionally, we continue to look for ways to support technology on campus remotely and/or by providing additional training to staff and faculty.

Reviewed by

President/EVP/VP/Dean/Director/Manager

Karen Cant, Vice President

Reviewer’s comments

The computer replacement plan that has been in place for several years and is supported by the technology plan is only funded on a year to year basis with the use of one-time funds. This budget ultimately should be funded with the use of ongoing funds rather than as an annual request.

Reminder: If fiscal resources are needed for next year’s goals, submit a separate Budget Request and Action Plan for budget unit review.