

**COLLEGE OF SAN MATEO
CAMPUS CLIMATE & SATISFACTION SURVEYS, SPRING 2010
CLASSIFIED STAFF AND
FACULTY & ADMINISTRATORS**

NARRATIVE ANALYSIS

OVERVIEW

In May through June 2010 CSM's Office of Planning, Research, and Institutional Effectiveness (PRIE) conducted two employee campus climate & satisfaction surveys administrated online to all CSM employees: 1) *Classified Staff Campus Climate & Satisfaction Survey* (44 respondents) and 2) *Faculty & Administrators Campus Climate & Satisfaction Survey* (101 respondents). Note: Data concerning demographics of participants is included in the last section.

To develop these employee satisfaction surveys, PRIE staff reviewed a variety of campus climate and employee surveys employed by numerous 2-year and 4-year institutions as well as CSM's past accreditation instruments. The result was two survey instruments: one designed for faculty and administrators as a group and one designed for classified staff.

Both surveys contained a common thematic structure to allow for comparison of attitudes regarding the same topics between the two study populations. In addition, survey respondents were asked questions unique to their employee group: e.g., faculty were asked about issues pertaining to academic freedom and using the library for course assignments; staff were asked about issues pertaining to their "customer service" levels, etc.¹ Both surveys contained items used in the *CSM Student Campus Climate & Satisfaction Survey*. The *Faculty/Administrators Survey* also contained questions about library usage which were parallel to the student survey.²

The common thematic areas are as follows:

- Overall impressions and attitudes about CSM;
- Attitudes regarding co-workers, senior administration, workload, on-the-job recognition, and supervision;
- Opportunities for training and professional development;

¹ Note: faculty and administrators were grouped together and, while several questions were designed as unique to faculty, none were unique to administrators.

² The discrete section on library usage in the *Faculty/Administrators Survey* is not analyzed in this narrative.

- Work and family balance;
- Campus safety and security;
- Effectiveness of channels of communication, shared governance, and institutional planning;
- Diversity awareness, overall campus climate, and CSM as a respectful place;
- Satisfaction with facilities, maintenance, and technology support;
- Effectiveness of student support programs and services, including the library and labs; and
- Effectiveness of instructional programs and offerings.

These themes were organized into categories for respondents in the following order:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| • <i>Campus & Facilities</i> | • <i>Impressions of CSM</i> |
| • <i>Career Opportunities</i> | • <i>Job Attitudes</i> |
| • <i>Communication</i> | • <i>Overall Attitude toward CSM</i> |
| • <i>Co-workers</i> | • <i>Programs and Services</i> |
| • <i>CSM's Senior Leadership</i> | • <i>Recognition, Supervision</i> |
| • <i>Diversity Awareness</i> | • <i>Training & Professional Development</i> |
| • <i>Equipment & Technology</i> | • <i>Work & Family/Life Balance</i> |
| • <i>Governance & Planning</i> | • <i>Workload</i> |

METHODS OF ANALYSIS

Conducted by staff from PRIE, this narrative analysis highlights the strengths and challenges for CSM identified in the surveys. It does not address all response items. Discussion is organized into categories and includes comparative analysis of the findings from both surveys; in addition, where appropriate the comparative analysis includes data from the *CSM Student Campus Climate & Satisfaction Survey (CSM Student Survey)*. Generally, this analysis discusses data from both surveys in terms of total satisfaction and dissatisfaction levels (e.g. a sum of "agree" + "agree strongly").

STRENGTHS

Strengths: Employees Overall Positive Attitudes toward CSM

Like student participants in the CSM *Student Survey*, respondents in both employee surveys have very positive overall attitudes toward CSM. They very much like working at CSM (classified staff, 100%; faculty/administrators, 95%). They are proud to be employees at CSM, they would recommend CSM to a family member or friend looking for a job, and a healthy majority would choose to work at CSM if starting over (85% to 98% satisfaction).

This positive theme is further reflected in employees' ranking of adjectival descriptors in the section, "Impressions of CSM," a section common to both surveys. Respondents were asked to rank terms to complete the sentence "CSM is...." While ranking them slightly differently, both groups selected the same descriptors as the 5 highest ranking (86% to 96%). They indicate a sense of CSM as a tolerant, welcoming place and include rating with the following terms: "Tolerant of Diversity," "Friendly," "Welcoming," "Respectful," and "Safe." Students also selected these descriptors as the 5 highest ranking.

This overall positive attitude is also seen when they are asked to rate their personal interactions. Both groups view their interactions with students and staff as "friendly" (more than 90%). Classified staff view their interactions with administrators in a slightly more positive way than faculty (83% vs. 79%); classified staff are also slightly more positive about district personnel than are faculty (71% vs. 64%).

Strengths: Employees' Positive Attitudes about their Workplace "Sphere"

CSM's employees like the nature of their work. When asked directly if they like their jobs, almost all employees affirm they do (classified staff, 95%; faculty/administrators, 97%). Both groups experience a "sense of accomplishment at work (classified staff, 91%; faculty/administrators, 98%). Both groups also indicate they have the freedom to make decisions that affect their work and have the opportunity to use their "skills and talents" (classified staff, 88% & 84%; faculty/administrators, 94% & 92%).

Note: Several studies of faculty job satisfaction in higher education indicate that faculty do receive job satisfaction from working in their discipline and "administrating to clients"—in other words, the work itself. In addition, "pleasant, concerned and enthusiastic co-workers" positively affect job satisfaction (Milosheff, 1990).

In addition to overall satisfaction with the nature of their jobs, CSM's employees like the people with whom they work within their immediate "sphere"—their co-workers and

the administrators with whom they interact. They feel “respected” by their co-workers and have good working relationships with them. Both groups indicate that staff as well as other faculty treat them with “respect” (classified staff, 95% & 93%; faculty/administrators, 97% & 95%). In fact for both groups, all 8 items concerned explicitly with co-workers had high satisfaction levels, in the top 80th percentile. Even the two lowest ranking areas in the section on co-workers showed high levels of satisfaction, above 80% by both groups: whether administrators with whom they work respect them and whether employees in their “work area” work as a team.

In addition, when asked whether their “supervisor” treats them with respect, both groups have positive responses (classified staff, 95%; faculty/administrators, 83%). When asked whether CSM’s senior administration (including the president, vice presidents, and deans) respects employees, 80% of both groups also indicate agreement.

Note: Several studies of faculty job satisfaction illustrate that satisfaction with supervision “often relates directly to the direct supervisors under which a faculty member is working” (Klein and Takeda-Tinker, 2009;).

A sense of “being respected” is reflected in a similar way by students. In the CSM *Student Survey*, for example, students indicated in all items explicitly related to feeling “respected,” 90% or higher levels of satisfaction.

Strengths: Roles in Governance

Both groups indicate that CSM understands its purpose: They both affirm, for example, that CSM works actively to fulfill its mission and vision (classified staff, 97%; faculty/administrators, 88%) and that the mission statement guides institutional planning and decision making (classified staff, 93%; faculty/administrators, 83%). In addition, they clearly understand their personal role on the planning committees on which they serve and the purpose of those planning committees (classified staff, 94%; faculty/administrators, 86%). Classified staff have a more positive view than faculty of whether strategic planning identifies areas of improvement and sets goals for institutional change (classified staff, 93%; faculty/administrators, 69%). They also have a more positive view of how “constituency groups work collaboratively toward achievement of *College Institutional Priorities: 2008-2011* (classified staff, 80%; faculty/administrators, 72%).

Strengths: Diversity Awareness

In the CSM *Student Survey* students indicated very high levels of satisfaction (93%-98%) with almost all question items related to diversity awareness. A positive view of how CSM handles diversity is also generally shared by classified staff and faculty. And it's

clear that CSM has made big strides in this area and diversity awareness is becoming an institutional strength. Both groups indicate that CSM supports students regardless of ethnicity, gender, religious beliefs, etc. (classified staff, 92%; faculty/administrators, 91%). Both groups also believe CSM supports all employees in the same way (classified staff, 82%; faculty/administrators, 89%). They also share a perception that CSM offers opportunities for them to increase their understanding of diverse populations (classified staff, 81%; faculty, 84%).

In addition, faculty believe that CSM faculty are willing to incorporate racial, ethnic, and gender perspectives into their courses (89%). (Classified staff were not asked this question.) However, a lower percentage of faculty/administrators (77%) and classified staff (68%) feel that CSM has a cultural diverse curriculum.

Strengths: Safety, Facilities, and Technology

Generally employees indicate agreement that the campus is safe and that offices and classrooms are "conducive to learning"; both groups indicate high levels of satisfaction (77% to 97%) on question items related to having access to well-maintained computer technology, the technology required by his or her job, and timely technical support and assistance.

However, both groups also indicate some dissatisfaction with whether campus facilities are "adequately maintained" (classified staff, 59%; faculty/administrators, 72%). (Note: during Spring 2010, massive construction and renovation was taking place at CSM,)

CHALLENGES & THEMES TO INVESTIGATE

This section is intended to identify themes in those items ranked lowest or where there may be large gaps among the employee groups or gaps within sections. In some cases the "challenges" or themes suggested here are subtle issues. These themes may suggest areas to be further explored in future surveys and in-depth focus groups or interviews.

Notable Differences Between Faculty/Administrators and Classified Staff

In the section on "Supervision" classified staff rate their supervisors more highly than faculty rate theirs. Classified staff indicate higher levels of satisfaction than faculty on the 5 items related to "recognition" on the job. When asked if they are "recognized" when they do good work, 86% of classified staff indicate satisfaction vs. 75% for faculty (though both indicate high approval ratings here.)

Classified staff also rate questions related to work/life balance more highly than faculty. Both, for example, indicate they can “balance personal/family responsibilities with their current workload” (classified staff, 93%; faculty/administrators, 81%) but classified staff are significantly more satisfied with their work schedules than those in the faculty/administrators group (classified staff, 91%; faculty/administrators, 72%). In addition, the faculty/administrators group indicate comparatively less satisfaction with how fairly teaching assignments (74%) and non-teaching assignments (68%) are awarded.

Classified staff indicate that their workload has increased in the last year in a much higher proportion than faculty, 93% vs. 75%.—clearly a reflection of managed hiring. A slightly greater number of classified staff than faculty indicate that their “work unit” is “adequately staffed” (classified staff, 44%; faculty/administrators, 36%). Classified staff are also not as satisfied with the professional development options available to them: 56% indicate that they have access to such activities while on several items related to faculty training and professional development, 72% to 81% of faculty/administrators indicate satisfaction.

There are also gaps between the employee groups in the area of governance and planning. For example, 77% of classified staff indicate agreement with the idea that shared governance is “working well” at CSM vs. 59% of faculty/administrators who indicate agreement. Yet in general, classified staff seemed to indicate slightly more extreme levels of agreement/ disagreement on items in this section than the faculty/administrators group. Items rated below 50% by classified staff, for example, include the idea that CSM actively “encourages staff participation in decision-making” and that the respondents “understand CSM’s decision making processes.”

Possible Challenge: Diversity Awareness

As noted above, both employee groups generally indicate positive attitudes and high levels of satisfaction with diversity awareness at CSM. However, in both groups there are some individuals who perceive racial or ethnic tensions on campus; feel isolated because of [their] background; and think sexual harassment is a problem at CSM. (See section, “Diversity Awareness.”) CSM needs to continue its institutional efforts in this area.

Possible Challenge: Relations outside the Immediate Workplace “Sphere”

As noted, employees in both groups generally indicate satisfaction with their jobs, their immediate supervisors, and their close co-workers and work arenas. In addition, both groups indicate that there is “open, two-way communication” in [their]

department/division. They also indicate that conflicts are handled civilly at CSM and they understand their own roles in "managing conflict."

However, in the section "Communication" both groups indicate the least agreement (under 70%) for the notions that there is two-way communication between departments and two-way communication "throughout" the college.

There is a suggestion throughout both surveys that some employees are more dissatisfied with issues and people outside of their immediate sphere of association and influence. The more distant the association, the greater the degree of discomfort. This has implications for CSM's approach to shared governance, planning, and campus-wide communication.

As noted above, employees feel respected by their supervisors, by the administrators with whom they interact, and by CSM's senior administration. Yet they also indicate comparatively low levels of agreement with the notion that "employees truly respect CSM leadership" (classified staff, 54%; faculty/administrators, 60%). Note: "CSM leadership" was defined in the survey as including deans, vice presidents, and president.

Note: as discussed earlier, the importance of the "direct" supervisor (administrator) in faculty job satisfaction has been documented by several studies. Typically faculty have the "most confidence in the administrators closest to them" (Johnson, 2009), a phenomena illustrated here.

In addition, while both groups generally indicate feeling valued as an individual in question items concerned with their immediate job environment, they indicate comparatively lower levels of satisfaction with the statement "CSM is...concerned about me as an individual" (classified staff, 63%; faculty/administrators, 53%).

Possible Challenge: CSM's Identity as Innovative

In the Section, "Impressions of CSM," among the 5 lowest ranked adjectival phrases used to describe CSM are "Up-to-Date" and "Cutting Edge" (These were also among the 5 lowest ranked descriptors for students). A concern about innovation was also indicated by both groups in response to the item "curricular and instructional innovations can be readily initiated" (classified staff, 63%; faculty/administrators, 59%). In the section, "Equipment & Technology," the question item concerned with planning for and supporting technology innovation was ranked lowest within the section by faculty/administrators (77%); classified staff, other the other hand, indicate a high level of satisfaction with this item (94%).

Possible Challenge: Programs

In both surveys, employees generally indicate pride in CSM's programs and services. However, the lowest rated items included "adequate tutorial services" and operating hours for computer labs "sufficient" to meet the needs of students.

These areas will be addressed as new services are offered in the newly-opened Student Center.

EVALUATION OF SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

Both sets of respondents were asked to evaluate the survey instruments' ease of use and whether the instruments reflected issues important to the respondents.

Both employee groups indicate a high rate of satisfaction with their respective instruments.

<u>Survey Impressions: Faculty & Administrators</u>	<u>Agree Strongly</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree Strongly</u>	<u>Total Agree</u>	<u>Total Disagree</u>
1. This survey was easy to use.	38.4% (38)	51.5% (51)	9.1% (9)	1.0% (1)	89.9% (89)	10.1% (10)
2. This survey adequately addressed issues that are important to me.	27.8% (27)	54.6% (53)	17.5% (17)	0.0% (0)	82.5% (80)	17.5% (17)

<u>Survey Impressions: Classified Staff</u>	<u>Agree Strongly</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree Strongly</u>	<u>Total Agree</u>	<u>Total Disagree</u>
1. This survey was easy to use.	25.6% (11)	67.4% (29)	7.0% (3)	0.0% (0)	93.0% (40)	7.0% (3)
2. This survey adequately addressed issues that are important to me.	18.6% (8)	67.4% (29)	14.0% (6)	0.0% (0)	86.0% (37)	14.0% (6)

DEMOGRAPHICS

Faculty/Administrators

Demographics

1. Employment Status	Count	Percent
Adjunct Faculty	31	31.3
Full-Time Faculty	61	61.6
Administrator	5	5.1
Retired or Post-Retirement	2	2.0
# of Faculty	99	

2. Years Worked in SMCCCD	Count	Percent
1-5	17	17.2
6-10	15	15.2
11-20	41	41.4
21+	26	26.3
# of Faculty	99	

3. Ethnicity	Count	Percent
African-American	2	2.1
Asian	10	10.5
Hispanic/Latino	6	6.3
Native American	0	0.0
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	65	68.4
Multi-Racial	6	6.3
Other (please specify):	6	6.3
# of Faculty	95	

4. Gender	Count	Percent
Female	57	60.6
Male	37	39.4
# of Faculty	94	

Classified Staff

Demographics

1. Employment Status	Count	Percent
Full-Time Staff	41	95.3
Part-Time Staff	1	2.3
Post-Retirement or Retired	1	2.3
# of Staff	43	

2. Years Worked in SMCCCD	Count	Percent
1-5	12	27.9
6-10	10	23.3
11-20	12	27.9
21+	9	20.9
# of Staff	43	

3. Ethnicity	Count	Percent
African-American	2	4.9
Asian	9	22.0
Hispanic/Latino	2	4.9
Native American	0	0.0
Pacific Islander	0	0.0
White	24	58.5
Multi-Racial	1	2.4
Other (please specify):	3	7.3
# of Staff	41	

4. Gender	Count	Percent
Female	29	69.0
Male	13	31.0
# of Staff	42	

REFERENCES

- Johnson, Gina M. (2009). What is it that satisfies faculty?: rank as a consideration in factors related to job satisfaction. Presented at the 2009 meeting of the Association of Institutional Research in the Upper Midwest. Retrieved from http://www.oir.umn.edu/static/papers/AIRUM_2009/AIRUM_2009_What_satisfies_faculty_paper.pdf
- Klein, Jaime & Takeda-Tinker, Becky (2009). The impact of leadership on community college faculty job satisfaction. *Academic Leadership: the Online Journal*, 9(2). Retrieved from <http://www.academicleadership.org/article/the-impact-of-leadership-on-community-college-faculty-job-satisfaction>
- Milosheee, Ellen (1990). Factors contributing to job satisfaction in the community college. *Community College Review*, 18(1). Available from <http://crw.sagepub.com/content/18/1/12.extract>