Faculty and Staff Satisfaction with Support Services Provided:

Please indicate the proportions (%) of respondents who rated each aspect as “excellent” or “good” (separately and combined). The Campus Support Services standard is met whenever 75% or more of responses fall in the “good” or “excellent” categories (combined).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction with:</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding Good / Excellent (Combined %)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours of operation</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response time</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of procedures</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of materials</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff helpfulness</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff knowledge</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of service</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
<th>Percent Responding Good / Excellent (Combined %)</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Value of @Cypress</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Value of Chargers</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents on the Web</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents on Campus</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reflect on standards met and any standards not met.

Overall, the results of this assessment are disappointing, with only four areas surpassing the 75% threshold, compared to seven of the eleven in the prior assessment. Moreover, only three of the eleven areas measured showed improvement over the prior survey.

Three major goals to address these failings are included in this report.

Further, a work plan for improving the efficacy of the office has been developed to address ongoing problems with tasks being done at the last minute, late or only after numerous reminders. In support of this work plan, the Director of Foundation and Community Relations has incorporated as one of his primary goals for 2007-2008 to “Work more closely with Public Information Officer in order to assist and help direct his increased productivity, improved time management and improved timeliness in the completion of projects and assignments.”

It should be noted, however, that the majority of specific steps and tools in the work plan do not address the specific shortcomings identified by the Campus Support Services Quality Assessment. Rather, these steps are tied to the top-priority areas of the office that do not relate to the Campus Support Services aspect of the Public Information Office, but to the broader “Administrative Support Services” perspective of the PIO. Specifically, the priorities for the office have been identified as: 1) Media Relations; 2) Advertising; 3) Publications; 4) Community Relations; and 5) On-going events.

Since expectations are not being met by the Public Information Office, better communication about the Public Information Office’s mission is clearly needed as part of the strategy to improve results when the CSSQA is repeated in 2010.

Finally, while the CSSQA illustrates the failings of the Public Information Office from the perspective of service to individual areas of the campus, a recent and independent survey conducted by Interact Communications confirmed the success of the college in both building and communicating a brand strategy to the community.

Standards Met (optional) – To be used when department wants to improve on an indicator even though a standard for this indicator has been met. May also be used to reflect upon major accomplishments.

Four of the eleven areas measured by the CSSQA surpassed the 75% standard: “Quality of materials” at 77.6%, “Staff helpfulness” at 81.0%, “Staff knowledge” at 83.4%, and “Quality and Value of @Cypress” at 82.7%. Of these four areas, two of them — “@Cypress” and “staff helpfulness” — also improved over the previous survey. The value and quality of the weekly @Cypress newsletter showed the greatest increase, moving more than four percentage points.

Two areas where standards were met showed a decreased approval rating over the prior survey. They are “Staff knowledge” and “Quality of materials.” The decrease in the “Staff knowledge” area (from 85.7% to 83.4%), though a modest decline, is most likely an indicator of the overall dissatisfaction with the office’s performance since it’s not likely that the Public Information Officer actually has less knowledge now than three years ago. “Quality of materials” showed a dramatic drop of nearly 10% points (from 86.9% to 77.6%). In light of the data and research by Interact Communications, it is highly likely that this change is also an indicator of dissatisfaction and perhaps a measurement of the “quantity” of materials rather than the “quality” of materials.
The largest number of positive comments about services provided by the Public Information Office pertained to the weekly @Cypress newsletter. Other areas also noted as being exemplary were the specific staff members, the photography provided by the office and some individual publications.

Standards Not Met (required) – Please provide any insight into significant challenges or obstacles that may have contributed to low student satisfaction. Identify the types of changes necessary for improvement.

Hours of Operation — This area recorded a 13% drop from a previously satisfactory assessment at 80.3% to a survey low of 67.3%. During the time between the two surveys, the Public Information Office has actually added a full-time clerical assistant who has increased the hours of operation to begin at 7 a.m. and ensuring office coverage during periods of time when the Public Information Officer is in meetings, on an assignment or otherwise away from the office. With the recent relocation to the Cypress College Complex, the Public Information Office is now adjacent to the Foundation Office, providing additional “backup” office coverage and line-of-sight supervision of the Public Information Officer by his immediate management supervisor.

Response Time — This area recorded an 8.4% drop from the previously unsatisfactory assessment at 65.6%. The result is not unexpected since, at the time of the previous CSSQA, the Public Information Office had staff assistance from a Professional Expert who was able to complete a number of writing tasks, thus improving the overall productivity of the Public Information Office. The period of time between the two surveys has also been one in which the Public Information Officer has been utilized in a constantly increasing role of advertising and marketing for the campus as a whole. Better planning, prioritization and the need to redirect people to appropriate service areas (such as Academic Computing and District Production) are part of the strategy to improve results in this area. For 2007-2008, a calendar of PIO responsibilities and activities, analysis of time required to complete various tasks, budget plan and advertising plan are already in place.

Clarity of procedures — This is a third area that both fails to meet the standard and experienced a decline from the previous assessment, falling from 72.8% to 67.4%. As noted in the opening narrative above, better communication is required. This area is tied to hours of operation and is addressed in the “Long-range Plan and Objectives” section of this report.

Overall quality of service — This area fell out of the acceptable range, dropping 11.3 points from 82.7% to 71.4%. This is one of the most dramatic declines between the two assessments. Individual comments indicate a dissatisfaction with the priorities established by the Public Information Officer and a number of specific complaints from the Fine Arts Division about lack of publicity in that area. Other complaints received in specific comments related to the Web site (largely the responsibility of the Academic Computing area), support for individual programs and issues related to follow up and timeliness. That last concern is specifically addressed in the work plan mentioned above. Public Information Office staff has also been increased for the months of June and July to help address these areas.

Quality and Value of Chargers — This publication was a defunct student newsletter at the time of the initial assessment. Late in 2006, it was revived as an alumni newsletter with little to no distribution on campus. Those facts aside, respondents actually looked more favorably on the publication this time, making it the only area measured that is both unsatisfactory, but improved from the previous CSSQA. It improved by 3.5 points, from
69.3% to 72.8%. A subsequent edition of this publication is currently in development for distribution this summer.

Documents on the Web — The number and types of documents on the campus Web site have actually increased between the two survey periods. However, this category fell out of the acceptable range from a previous rating of 81.4% to 68.8%, a drop of 12.6 points. The results are almost certainly a reflection of the pervasive dissatisfaction with the Web site. There has also been a recent lack of activity in terms of adding new documents, in large part because of two primary factors: workload and the upcoming overhaul of the Web site.

Documents on Campus — This area previously rounded up into the acceptable range, with a rating of 74.7% on the initial CSSQA. It fell in the current survey to 68.3%. While the question was intended to measure the ability of people on campus to obtain physical copies of existing documents, the results likely are a reaction to people not being able to have documents created in a timely or satisfactory manner. In the period between the two surveys, and in an effort to improve the area of document creation, people were referred in increasing numbers to the District Production Center to meet these needs. To improve in this area, that strategy must be effective since the Public Information Office does not have the resources to adequately support the campus’ need for documents. The results may also be reflection of the trend away from physical documents to those existing primarily or exclusively in electronic format.
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).

I. Goal: Increase awareness of the Public Information Office’s role, the scope of the projects assigned to the office in an effort to improve results on the next CSSQA and the general perception of the office on campus

Supports Strategic Direction (if applicable): _______________________

1. Objective: Develop a mission statement and strategic goals & objectives for the office
   1.1. Person(s) responsible: Marc Posner
   1.2. Timeframe: Prior to the start of the Fall 2007 semester
   1.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A

2. Objective: Develop procedures for how the office handles requests, a list of available services and links to other resources, and a “frequently asked questions” guide. Make these items available to the campus community.
   2.1. Person(s) responsible: Marc Posner
   2.2. Timeframe: Prior to the start of the Fall 2007 semester
   2.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A

3. Objective: Communicate the accomplishments of the office and broadly share when new resources become available.
   3.1. Person(s) responsible: Marc Posner
   3.2. Timeframe: Ongoing
   3.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A

II. Goal: Improve response time to requests and communication to the office

Supports Strategic Direction (if applicable): _______________________

1. Objective: Utilize clerical assistant in three critical areas to improve the overall office productivity: Gatekeeper, calendar of events and projects, and a “tickler” to ensure that deadlines are met.
   1.1. Person(s) responsible: Marc Posner, Rhonda Kraft
   1.2. Timeframe: Immediately and ongoing
   1.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A

2. Objective: Refer people to appropriate service locations on campus, especially to Academic Computing for Web needs and District Production for design and printing needs.
   2.1. Person(s) responsible: Marc Posner, Rhonda Kraft
   2.2. Timeframe: Immediately and ongoing
   2.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A
3. Objective: Better estimate the time it takes to complete tasks and projects so that a realistic expectations can be set in the minds of those seeking the assistance of the Public Information Office.
   3.1. Person(s) responsible: Marc Posner, in consultation with Raul Alvarez
   3.2. Timeframe: Immediately and ongoing
   3.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A

4. Objective: Utilize new strategies for organization, including a more effective use of task-management and project-management software and e-mail.
   4.1. Person(s) responsible: Marc Posner, in consultation with Raul Alvarez, and Rhonda Kraft
   4.2. Timeframe: Immediately and ongoing
   4.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A

III. Goal: Focus on the most-pressing priorities of the office.

Supports Strategic Direction (if applicable): ______________________

1. Objective: Set priorities that are most appropriate and are supported by the PIO’s immediate management supervisor and the college president.
   1.1. Person(s) responsible: Marc Posner
   1.2. Timeframe: Immediately and ongoing
   1.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A

2. Objective: Reject projects and tasks that don’t meet these priorities
   2.1. Person(s) responsible: Marc Posner, Raúl Alvarez
   2.2. Timeframe: Immediately and ongoing
   2.3. Fiscal resources needed (if not applicable, indicate “NA”): N/A

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