

Town Government Staff

The performance of the Town Government staff was assessed with a set of five items or questions. These questions were only administered to those respondents who had contact with the Town Government in the past two years. Approximately 22.7% (25.4% in 2006) or 92 respondents indicated they had contact within that time frame. A 9-point grading scale from very poor (1) to excellent (9) was used to measure performance.

The results of the 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, and 2006 Cary Biennial Surveys will be included in tables throughout the report when applicable. The 2008 Biennial Survey covered more topics and was inclusive of more questions. For that reason, tables with no comparisons represent the new items to the survey and will be labeled as 08 in the tables. The incorporation of the previous survey facilitates comparisons between survey periods to examine trends.

The results shown in Tables 3-7 show very high ratings for the Town Government staff that have improved from 2006. There were significant mean increases and grade improvements this year. The tables are placed in descending order of ratings. The grades improved for *courteous* (B to A-), *professionalism* (B to A-), *knowledgeable* (B to A-), and *promptness of response* (B- to B). Although the grade (B-) did not increase for *ability to resolve issues*, the mean increased from 7.27 to 7.37 this year. These grades are impressive due to the fact it can be a challenge for the Town Government staff to handle all contacts to the satisfaction of every citizen. Overall, the Town Government staff earned very impressive marks from the respondents with all the means increasing and the grades improving for 4 of the 5 service dimensions this year.

Table 3. Town Government Staff: Courteous.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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 4. Town Government Staff: Professionalism.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	8.14	0.0	1.0	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 5. Town Government Staff: Knowledgeable.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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 6. Town Government Staff: Promptness of Response.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
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 7. Town Government Staff: Ability to Resolve Issues.

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
08	7.37	6.3	1.3	2.5	0.0	11.4	2.5	8.9	17.7	49.4	B-
06	7.27	5.4	1.1	1.1	0.0	11.8	5.4	16.1	20.4	38.7	B-
04	7.15	9.4	2.1	2.1	2.1	8.3	2.1	8.3	16.7	49.0	C+
02	7.06	8.3	0.0	1.0	2.1	8.3	5.2	16.7	28.1	30.2	C+
00	7.12	5.1	5.1	1.3	1.3	3.8	6.4	23.1	16.7	37.2	C+
98	6.77	8.2	0.0	3.3	4.1	6.6	4.1	28.7	21.3	23.8	C

Town Government Staff Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (Appendix B) were conducted on selected demographic variables (age, education, gender, housing type, income, internet access, language, literacy, race). The breakdowns for contact with the Town Government are shown in Tables B1-B9. The subgroups with the highest levels of contact (in order) were over 65 age group (28.3%), 56-65 age group (27.3%), African-Americans (26.9%), and those with a college degree (26.4%). The lowest levels of contact were among apartment dwellers (6.5%), 18-25 age group (11.1%), and those without a college degree (14.8%). The crosstabulations for *courteous* are shown in Tables B10-B18 and the grades were high and consistent across all subgroups. The grades for *professionalism* (B19-B27) were high and consistent with no grades falling below a B while none of the grades for *knowledgeable* (B28-B36) fell below a B+ this time. The *promptness of response* (B37-B45) grades were high and consistent with the only exception a C- given by the 56-65 age group. There were only two lower grades for the service dimension of *ability to resolve issues* (B46-B54). These were the C+ grades given by those without a college degree and \$70,001-\$100,000 income level. Keep in mind, the low sample size subgroups (n<10) were not included in the discussion due to the higher error rates.