

## Town Government Staff

The performance of the Town Government staff was assessed with a set of six 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 26.4% (22.7% in 2008) or 105 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 measure performance. The results of the 1998, 2000, 2002, 2004, 2006, and 2008 Cary Biennial Surveys will be included in tables throughout the report when applicable. The 2010 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 10 (i.e., 2010) in the tables. The incorporation of the previous surveys facilitate comparisons between survey periods to examine trends.

The results show high ratings for the Town Government staff in 2010; although, there has been a slight decline from 2008. This year three of the means decreased resulting in the decline of three grades. However, two other means increased and their grades improved accordingly. Tables 2-6 placed in descending order of ratings indicate the grades declined for *professionalism* (A- to B+), *courteous* (A- to B+), and *knowledgeable* (A- to B+). There is a degree of concern with the larger mean decrease for *courteous* (8.35 to 7.98). On the positive side, the grades improved for *promptness of response* (B to B+) and *ability to resolve issues* (B- to B). Note the significant mean increase for *ability to resolve issues*. This is impressive due to the fact it can be a challenge for the Town staff to handle all contacts to the satisfaction of every citizen. The improved means for these two dimensions are the highest they have earned to date. Overall, the Town Government staff earned very high marks falling off slightly from 2008 with three of the five means decreasing and three grades declining. This was somewhat offset by the two means and two grades that improved.

**Table 2. Town Government Staff: Professionalism.**

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
<b>10</b>	<b>7.99</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>6.7</b>	<b>24.8</b>	<b>54.3</b>	<b>B+</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 3. Town Government Staff: Courteous.**

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
<b>10</b>	<b>7.98</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>5.8</b>	<b>10.6</b>	<b>20.2</b>	<b>55.8</b>	<b>B+</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 4. Town Government Staff: Knowledgeable.**

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
<b>10</b>	<b>7.84</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<b>7.7</b>	<b>8.7</b>	<b>22.1</b>	<b>51.9</b>	<b>B+</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 5. Town Government Staff: Promptness of Response.**

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade
<b>10</b>	<b>7.79</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>4.9</b>	<b>13.6</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>51.5</b>	<b>B+</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 6. Town Government Staff: Ability to Resolve Issues.**

Year	Mean	Very Poor 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Excellent 9	Grade

Year	Mean	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Grade
10	7.71	4.1	1.0	0.0	4.1	3.3	7.1	6.1	22.4	52.0	B
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

The respondents who gave lower marks (below 5) to any of the service dimensions were subsequently asked what they recalled about the interaction. There were only 9 comments and they are shown in Appendix C. All appear to be separate issues that were unresolved from the perspective of the respondents.

#### Town Government Staff Crosstabulations

The crosstabulations (Appendix B) were conducted on selected demographic variables (age, education, gender, housing type, income, race, years in Cary). Any subgroupings with sample sizes less than 10 will not be discussed in the report due to excessive margins of error. The breakdowns for contact with the Town Government are shown in Tables B1-B7. The highest levels of contact (in order) were \$70,001-\$100,000 income level (34.8%), PhD/JD/MD (34.6%), 56-65 age group (33.3%), those with a college degree (31.3%), over \$100,000 income level (31.1%), and over 65 age group (31.0%). Note that males had more contact than females (29.3% versus 24.0%). The lowest levels of contact with the Town Government were 0-1 year residents (4.3%), Asians (9.1%), other races (12.5%), African-Americans (13.3%), and \$30,001-\$50,000 income level (14.3%). None of the 30 apartment dwellers surveyed had contact with the Town in the past two years. The crosstabulations for *professionalism* (B8-B14), *courteous* (B15-B21), *knowledgeable* (B22-B28), and *promptness of response* (B29-B35) showed high and consistent grades across all subgroups with no grades falling below a B- except in subgroups with sample size below 10. The marks were also high and consistent for *ability to resolve issues* (B36-B42) with only one lower grade given of C+ from the over \$100,000 income level. This was the only grade falling in the "C" range.