



TOWN GOVERNMENT STAFF

TOWN GOVERNMENT STAFF

The performance of the Town Government staff was assessed with a set of seven items or questions. These questions were only administered to those respondents who had contact with the Town Government in the past two years. There were 20.8% (22.8% in 2018) or 83 respondents who indicated they had contact within that time frame. A 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) was used to rate performance. The results of the 1998-2018 Cary Biennial Surveys will be included in the tables throughout the report when applicable. The incorporation of the previous survey results facilitates comparisons between survey periods to reveal the Town’s progression.

The results shown in order of ratings indicate continued high marks for the Town Government staff that have improved slightly since 2018 (Tables 2-8). The means improved for courteous (8.37 to 8.50), helpful (8.11 to 8.30), and promptness of response (7.98 to 8.20). In addition, the grade improved from A- to A for courteous with the other grades remaining impressive at the A-level. There were very slight mean decreases for professionalism (8.34 to 8.29) and knowledgeable (8.23 to 8.21) with the grades remaining at the A-level. However, there was a somewhat larger mean decrease for quality of customer service (8.36 to 8.16), again with the grade (A-) remaining unchanged. None of the mean changes from 2018 to 2020 were statistically significant. The mean for courteous (8.50), helpful (8.30), and promptness of response (8.20) were the highest earned to date for these three service dimensions. The Town Government was rated for the first time on being fair and this service dimension ranked second among the service dimensions with a mean of 8.33. Note the “very poor” ratings declined for all the service dimensions this year. In summary, the Town Government staff earned its best overall performance for any year with one grade improving to the A level and other grades remaining very high (A-). See Appendix B for selected Town Government crosstabulations (B1-B51).

The respondents who gave lower scores (below 5) to any of the service dimensions were then asked their concerns with the interaction. There were only 6 total comments and the main concern was rudeness mentioned in 3 of the comments. All the comments are shown in Appendix C.

Table 2. Town Government Staff: Courteous

YEAR	MEAN	GRADE
20	8.50	A
18	8.37	A-
16	8.26	A-
14	8.06	A-
12	8.11	A-
10	7.98	B+
08	8.35	A-
06	7.77	B
04	8.33	A-
02	7.81	B+
00	7.98	B+
98	7.63	B

Table 3. Town Government Staff: Fair

YEAR	MEAN	GRADE
20	8.33	A-

Table 4. Town Government Staff: Helpful

YEAR	MEAN	GRADE
20	8.30	A-
18	8.34	A-
16	8.13	A-
14	7.97	B+
12	8.02	B+

Table 5. Town Government Staff: Professionalism

YEAR	MEAN	GRADE
20	8.29	A-
18	8.34	A-
16	8.13	A-
14	7.97	B+
12	8.02	B+
10	7.99	B+
08	8.14	A-
06	7.57	B
04	8.10	A-
02	7.55	B
00	7.73	B
98	7.32	B-

Table 7. Town Government Staff: Promptness of Response

YEAR	MEAN	GRADE
20	8.20	A-
18	7.98	B+
16	8.04	B+
14	7.84	B+
12	7.84	B+
10	7.79	B+
08	7.75	B
06	7.27	B-
04	7.79	B+
02	7.32	B-
00	7.45	B-
98	7.26	B-

Table 6. Town Government Staff: Knowledgeable

YEAR	MEAN	GRADE
20	8.21	A-
18	8.23	A-
16	8.12	A-
14	7.77	B
12	7.98	B+
10	7.84	B+
08	8.12	A-
06	7.54	B
04	7.95	B+
02	7.44	B-
00	7.70	B
98	7.30	B-

Table 8. Town Government Staff: Quality of Customer Service

YEAR	MEAN	GRADE
20	8.16	A-
18	8.36	A-
16	8.08	A-
14	7.76	B
12	8.01	B+

Table 2. Town Government Staff: Courteous

YEAR	MEAN	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	AVERAGE 5	6	7	8	EXCELLENT 9	GRADE
20	8.50	1.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.4	1.2	2.4	22.6	70.2	A
18	8.37	4.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.1	2.1	16.8	74.7	A-
16	8.26	1.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	2.6	1.3	9.2	22.4	61.8	A-
14	8.06	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.1	3.2	11.7	24.5	55.3	A-
12	8.11	2.4	0.0	1.2	1.2	3.6	4.8	3.6	21.4	61.9	A-
10	7.98	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.8	5.8	10.6	20.2	55.8	B+
08	8.35	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	1.1	2.3	10.2	25.0	60.2	A-
06	7.77	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	5.9	4.9	14.7	27.5	43.1	B
04	8.33	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	5.1	5.1	25.3	61.6	A-
02	7.81	3.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	6.9	1.0	8.9	35.6	43.6	B+
00	7.98	1.2	2.3	1.2	1.2	3.5	3.5	8.1	23.3	55.8	B+
98	7.63	2.4	0.8	0.0	2.4	4.0	1.6	19.8	39.7	29.4	B

Table 3: Town Government Staff: Fair

YEAR	MEAN	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	AVERAGE 5	6	7	8	EXCELLENT 9	GRADE
20	8.33	1.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	4.8	0.0	6.0	20.2	66.7	A-

Table 4. Town Government Staff: Helpful

YEAR	MEAN	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	AVERAGE 5	6	7	8	EXCELLENT 9	GRADE
20	8.30	1.2	0.0	1.2	1.2	3.6	0.0	6.0	21.4	65.5	A-
18	8.11	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2	1.1	4.2	14.7	70.5	A-
16	8.08	1.4	0.0	1.4	1.4	1.4	4.1	13.5	21.6	55.4	A-
14	7.82	3.2	1.1	0.0	2.1	4.3	4.3	10.6	23.4	51.1	B+
12	7.94	4.8	1.2	0.0	0.0	3.6	4.8	3.6	22.9	59.0	B+

Table 5: Town Government Staff: Professionalism

YEAR	MEAN	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	AVERAGE 5	6	7	8	EXCELLENT 9	GRADE
20	8.29	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0	4.8	19.0	67.9	A-
18	8.34	4.2	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	2.1	17.9	73.7	A-
16	8.13	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	1.3	6.5	10.4	22.1	57.1	A-
14	7.97	3.2	2.1	0.0	1.1	2.1	2.1	9.6	23.4	56.4	B+
12	8.02	2.4	0.0	1.2	1.2	3.6	6.0	6.0	21.4	58.3	B+
10	7.99	2.9	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.8	6.7	6.7	24.8	54.3	B+
08	8.14	0.0	0.0	2.2	0.0	4.4	4.4	11.1	18.9	58.9	A-
06	7.57	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	6.9	3.9	22.5	20.6	40.2	B
04	8.10	2.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	5.0	1.0	9.0	21.0	60.0	A-
02	7.55	3.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	7.9	3.0	17.8	32.7	33.7	B
00	7.73	1.2	2.3	1.2	0.0	3.5	7.0	19.8	19.8	45.3	B
98	7.32	3.2	1.6	3.2	0.8	4.0	2.4	27.0	31.7	26.2	B-

Table 6. Town Government Staff: Knowledgeable

YEAR	MEAN	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	AVERAGE 5	6	7	8	EXCELLENT 9	GRADE
20	8.21	2.4	0.0	2.4	0.0	3.6	0.0	6.0	19.0	66.7	A-
18	8.23	3.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.0	0.0	7.4	17.9	68.4	A-
16	8.12	1.4	0.0	0.0	1.4	2.7	4.1	12.2	23.0	55.4	A-
14	7.77	3.2	1.1	0.0	2.1	5.3	5.3	8.5	25.5	48.9	B
12	7.98	2.4	1.2	1.2	1.2	3.6	4.8	3.6	25.3	56.6	B+
10	7.84	2.9	1.0	0.0	1.0	4.8	7.7	8.7	22.1	51.9	B+
08	8.12	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	5.6	2.2	12.4	22.5	55.1	A-
06	7.54	2.9	1.0	2.0	0.0	7.8	3.9	18.6	23.5	40.2	B
04	7.95	2.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	4.1	15.3	22.4	51.0	B+
02	7.44	4.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	10.1	2.0	17.2	27.3	36.4	B-
00	7.70	2.4	1.2	1.2	2.4	2.4	2.4	21.2	24.7	42.4	B
98	7.30	1.6	2.4	1.6	1.6	6.3	9.4	20.5	29.1	27.6	B-

Table 7: Town Government Staff: Promptness of Response

YEAR	MEAN	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	AVERAGE 5	6	7	8	EXCELLENT 9	GRADE
20	8.20	2.4	0.0	1.2	0.0	4.8	1.2	4.8	21.4	64.3	A-
18	7.98	6.5	0.0	1.1	2.2	1.1	1.1	3.2	19.4	65.6	B+
16	8.04	2.7	1.3	0.0	0.0	2.7	5.3	9.3	20.0	58.7	B+
14	7.84	3.2	0.0	0.0	1.1	6.5	2.2	14.0	24.7	48.4	B+
12	7.84	3.7	1.2	1.2	1.2	3.7	3.7	7.3	24.4	53.7	B+
10	7.79	3.9	0.0	0.0	1.9	4.9	4.9	13.6	19.4	51.5	B+
08	7.75	3.5	1.2	0.0	1.2	7.1	1.2	14.1	22.4	49.4	B
06	7.27	2.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	9.8	3.9	19.6	24.5	33.3	B-
04	7.79	2.1	1.0	2.1	2.1	7.2	3.1	5.2	25.8	51.5	B+
02	7.32	4.9	1.0	0.0	1.0	8.8	1.0	21.6	35.3	26.5	B-
00	7.45	3.6	3.6	1.2	0.0	3.6	6.0	18.1	25.3	38.6	B-
98	7.26	4.8	0.0	0.8	1.6	4.0	8.0	24.0	35.2	21.6	B-

Table 8: Town Government Staff: Quality of Customer Service

YEAR	MEAN	VERY POOR 1	2	3	4	AVERAGE 5	6	7	8	EXCELLENT 9	GRADE
20	8.16	2.4	1.2	0.0	1.2	3.6	1.2	6.0	21.4	63.1	A-
18	8.36	3.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	1.1	0.0	2.1	17.9	73.7	A-
16	8.08	1.3	1.3	1.3	0.0	2.7	1.3	16.0	17.3	58.7	A-
14	7.76	3.1	1.0	0.0	1.0	5.2	7.3	10.4	22.9	49.0	B
12	8.01	2.4	0.0	1.2	1.2	4.8	4.8	3.6	25.3	56.6	B+