Cypress College  
Campus Support Services Quality Review Report

Department: Faculty/Staff Service Center  (Production Center)  Manager: Cant/Miranda/Simpson

Names of those participating in the report: Karen Cant, Bob Simpson, Melissa Barrios, Greg Eng, Miguel Miranda, Anita Rogers

Date: August 26, 2010  Date of previous quality review: 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</th>
<th>Percent Responding Good / Excellent (Combined %)</th>
<th>Percent responding Good/Excellent in 2007</th>
<th>Change between 2007 &amp; 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours of operation</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>-11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness of response</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of procedures</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of materials</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff helpfulness</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>-8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff knowledge</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of service</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>-6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department-specific indicators (if applicable):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copies via email</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Changes since last quality review

Please provide a comparative analysis of current results with the previous cycle. Use this section to document accomplishments or improvements since last review. Also, please provide any insight into significant challenges or obstacles that may have contributed to lower customer satisfaction.

The 2010 satisfaction survey which identified the “Production Center” as the service being evaluated likely had survey responses which related to three different functions (Extended Day Operations, Mailroom Services, and the Production Center) since they are now all housed in one location adjacent to the campus Bookstore which is generally referred to as “the Production Center”. In any case, when compared to the 2007 satisfaction survey for the Production Center customer satisfaction declined in all areas except one. The decline in satisfaction measured for each category ranged from 3.2% for Staff Knowledge to 11.7% to for Hours of Operation.
The move to the shared facility occurred in May 2008. Originally the programs had difficulty adapting to the space because the facility design was not suited to the current operational needs of each area. By summer 2009 modifications were made to the facility to improve the functionality of the space. The main change was expanding the built-in mail boxes to allow space for centralized mail distribution, but also included moving the evening administrators work area to the mailroom office space.

In the new location staffing became an issue because in the previous location each function had been part of a larger office areas internally located in building allowing some measure of security and oversight by other staff if left unattended for a period of time. In the new location the facility was designed for direct access from outside making it impossible to leave the facility unattended and open. This led to many extended periods of time when the facility was locked and staff from across campus needing access to pick up mail or drop of copy requests would have to go next door to ask Bookstore staff to open the facility and lock it up again when they were done. There were several complaints lodged about the inconvenience of this. This likely contributed to the drop in satisfaction.

It also appears, based on user comments in the Quality Review, that the staff unhappiness with the facility may have also impacted the delivery of service creating several unhappy encounters the “customers”.

### Mission/ Administrative Unit Outcomes

Please provide the mission statement of your unit (if any).

The Faculty/Staff Service Center will support the college mission by providing services that are accurate, timely, friendly and professional in the areas of Production, Mail Services, and Extended Day Support.

Please provide a summary of Administrative Unit Outcomes (AUO) for the department. If AUOs have not been developed, please provide a timeline for developing AUOs.

Will be completed by June 2011.

### Faculty/Staff Involvement

Summarize the involvement of faculty/staff in the review process.

Upon receiving results of the Quality Review a staff meeting was scheduled for all who worked in the facility to share the results and review the decline in customer satisfaction for each of the effected categories. Copies of the comments, both positive and negative, were also distributed. Discussion followed regarding expectations for the service provided and ways to improve customer satisfaction. Minutes were recorded and a follow up meeting was scheduled to discuss the next steps to take toward improvement. A draft of the Quality Review Report for 2010 was distributed at the meeting with requests for review and feedback.
Review Previous Goals and Objectives

Please describe if the goals and objectives identified in the previous review was met or not. Please provide explanations if the goals were not met.

The previous goals were specific to the photocopy services of the Production Center in its previous location. New goals will be crafted to address the services of all functions in the new location that now includes: Production, Mailroom, and Extended Day.

The goals established in 2007 were based primarily on the acquisition of new equipment. The acquisition of a color copier, back office photocopier, replacement of faculty walk-up copiers, upgrade of the software and new high-volume printer for the “back office” were all achieved. The only goal not completed was getting a plaque which identified hours of operation, staff, and email addresses. This will be added to the 2010 goals.

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: Provide friendly convenient access at the Campus Service Center to all faculty and staff.

Supports plan: Educational Master Plan, Student Services Master Plan

1. Objective: Do a better job of informing the campus of services available and hours of operation. (Provide signage, create brochure, FAQ sheet, and on-line information).
   - Facilitators: Vice-President, Exec. Vice-President, Director Facilities
   - Timeframe: June 2011
   - Fiscal resources need (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A

2. Objective: Develop a climate of quality service. (Timely, accessible, friendly service).
   - Facilitators: Vice-President, Exec. Vice-President, Director Facilities
   - Timeframe: Immediately and ongoing improvement
   - Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A

3. Objective: Develop a plan that keeps the facility open consistently.
   - Facilitators: Vice-President, Exec. Vice-President, Director Facilities
   - Timeframe: December 2010
   - Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A

4. Objective: Identify facility modification as needed to improve efficiency and access.
   - Facilitators: Vice-President, Exec. Vice-President, Director Facilities
   - Timeframe: December 2010
   - Fiscal resources needed: TBD some resources may be needed to carry out the plan depending on what modifications are recommended.
**Additional resource requirement identified by the results of the Quality Review**

Identify the resources needed by the department. The resource identification process should link the findings of survey with AUOs and departmental mission. The resource needs should address three distinct areas:

- Facilities – It is anticipated that there will be a need for some minor facility modifications to improve the functionality of the centralized mail service. Cost TBD.
- Technology
- Personnel

**Fiscal resources and planning**

Describe how the department wants to utilize the resources to accomplish its goals. Please provide an analysis of how the department plans to achieve its goals if resources identified are not available immediately.

Some thoughts related to facility improvement include removing the roll-up door on the east side of the facility, replace some mail slots, with shelving, providing an awning for the entry door, graphic signage on the storefront window, replacement of cupboards. Some plans will be easily implemented with little or no cost. Others will require further discussion and a need to identify budget to fund the project. If resources are not available for the facility changes other objectives could still be accomplished but perhaps not in the most efficient manner.

**Reviewed by**

President/EVP/VP/Dean/Director/Manager

Karen Cant – Vice President
Albert Miranda – Facilities Director
Bob Simpson – Executive Vice President

**Reviewer’s comments**

The first staff meetings held to address issues identified in the Quality Review Satisfaction Survey have been constructive and positive. The goal and objectives established are reasonable and achievable yet will have a brought impact on the campus community serviced by the Staff/Faculty Service Center.

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