

# **COPPER MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

## **2008 Faculty/Staff Survey Research Report**



**Final Report  
May 19, 2008**

# **COPPER MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**

## **RESEARCH COMMITTEE**

**MISSION STATEMENT: Our Mission is to recommend, design, execute, analyze, and report the results of research that is useful in establishing and assessing institutional goals. This research will be undertaken in an effort to support decisions that promise to measurably improve success and satisfaction for CMC students, staff, faculty, administration, and the community at large.**

### **Committee Members (2008):**

**Glenda Case, M.S.**

**Michael Danza, M.A.**

**Douglas Morrison, Ed.D., M.B.A.**

**Melynie Schiel, M.A.**

**Roger Wagner, Ph.D.**

**Michael Chlebik, M.S.E.E., M.S. (advisor)**

## **Table of Contents**

<b>I. History</b>	<b>page 4</b>
<b>II. Goals, Limitations, and Methodology</b>	<b>page 4</b>
<b>III. Summary Tables and Analysis</b>	<b>page 7</b>
<b>IV. Distribution List</b>	<b>page 15</b>
<b>V. Appendices included</b>	<b>page 16</b>
A. All Employee Intra-Group Changes '06-'08	pages 16-24
B. Inter-Group Comparison	pages 25-30
C. Rank ordered positive and negative count	pages 31-51
D. Written comments by respondents	pages 51-56
<b>VI. Appendices on file in Greenleaf Library</b>	<b>page 57</b>

## I. History

Taken as a whole, a comparison of the Faculty/Staff Survey data from 2004 to 2006 clearly showed increasingly significant differences in employee-group opinion regarding CMC's climate and Mission based performance. The administration increasingly described a college that adequately complied with all Survey statements while full-time faculty, classified staff and especially part-time faculty described a college that had increasingly failed to comply with many Survey statements, and more importantly with the new WASC accreditation standards on which the Survey instrument is based.

During fall semester of 2007, an abbreviated (twelve-question), interim mini-climate Survey was administered in response to a WASC accreditation recommendation:

“The Team strongly recommends that the college President take decisive measures to improve the campus climate by building trust and fostering mutual respect and communication with all campus constituencies.”

When compared to the results of the 2006 Faculty/Staff Survey, responses to the mini-survey by each employee group showed: part-time faculty remained unchanged 0/12; classified staff showed negative movement on 2/12; and for the first time since 2004, administration acknowledged less satisfaction on 3/12 questions in the areas of leadership, fair and ethical treatment of its' population, and the overall campus environment for employees. Full-time faculty was the only group that moved positively (on 8/12 questions).

The current, 78 question, bi-annual Faculty/Staff Survey was re-administered, as regularly scheduled, during March 2008, and the results are presented and compared to prior Surveys in this report.

## II. Goals, Limitations, and Methodology

### 2008 PROJECT GOALS

- ✓ To track, analyze and interpret historical trends in employee opinion data, relevant to CMC's climate and performance.
  
- ✓ To establish current “benchmark” measures, supporting implementation of ongoing program reviews and strategic planning that are consistent with the College Mission, regulatory requirements, and recent recommendations by the Chancellor's Office, Board of Governor's, the AACJC President, and the WASC accreditation team.

### LIMITATIONS

The samples obtained for this study were not obtained at the same point in the semester as the previous studies (March 2008 versus the mini-survey in September-October 2007 versus August-September in 2006).

The samples obtained for this study were obtained in the same manner as the fall 2007 mini-survey (direct mailing) but the 2006 Survey was administered at a flex activity followed by three classified-staff make-up sessions.

The samples obtained for this study were based on 78 Survey questions versus only 12 "climate" questions on the fall 2007 mini-survey, versus 86 questions on the 2006 Survey.

A slightly different type of employee population may have been sampled at all three points in time as a result of employee turnover.

There is no way of determining how these changes in sampling methods may have affected the results.

The conclusions in this study are based exclusively on employee perceptions of climate and performance, and do not represent conclusions supported by objective, evidence-based performance measurements.

### METHODOLOGY

The 2008 Faculty/Staff Survey and cover letter were mailed to the residences of all full-time and part-time college employees ( $N$  {population size} = 213,  $n$  {sample size} = 97). All survey responses are confidential in that individual respondents cannot be identified by name. The proportion of usable response to the population surveyed was 93/213 (43.7%) for intra and inter employee-group comparisons, and 97/213 (45.5%) for aggregated employee-group responses. The number of respondents by employee category was as follows: Administrators 9/16 (56.3%), Full-time Faculty 19/37 (51.4%), Part-time Faculty 36/105 (34.3%), Full-time Classified 21/41 (51.2%), and Part-time Classified 8/14 (57.1%).

Responses will be summarized for analysis using both descriptive and inferential statistics. The inferential tests included nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis One-way Analysis of Variance by ranks, two-tailed, at a level of significance of  $\alpha = .05$ . Nonparametric methods are uniquely useful for testing nominal (categorical) and ordinal (ordered) scaled data--situations where parametric tests are not generally available. An important second use is when an underlying assumption for a parametric method has been violated. As no post-hoc testing is done on nonparametric data to ascertain data



connection, a separate procedure, the Goodman and Kruskal test of concordance/discordance was used. A data pair is concordant if the subject ranking on variable X (time) also ranks higher on variable Y (employee dissatisfaction); otherwise the pair is discordant, as the subject ranking is higher on variable X and lower in variable Y.

The results of our statistical tests and analysis will be presented in four parts: (1) aggregate responses for all employee-groups for 2006 and 2008 (see Table 1); (2) overall changes in intra-group responses between 2006 and 2008 (see Tables 2) and detailed changes in intra-group responses between 2006-2007, 2007-2008, and 2006-2008 (see Table 3); (3) selected inter-group comparisons as of March 2008 (Table 4); and (4) a March 2008 rank order summary of the fifteen most negative responses for all employee groups combined in 2006 and 2008 (Table 5). Finally, employee comments will be analyzed to ascertain any patterns of positive or negative response in relation to Tables 1 through 5 and related appendices.

The results of the 2008 Faculty Staff survey are presented in five summary tables. Each table is followed by analysis and discussion.

Table 1	
Statistically Significant Changes for All Employee Groups, 2006 - 2008	
At 95% Confidence, based on a comparison of 78 Survey Questions	
Change	Survey Questions
Better	6. I have had sufficient opportunity to participate in the planning process at CMC.
Worse	25. I am satisfied with my personal safety and security at the college.
Worse	31. I am satisfied with the comfort and attractiveness of the buildings and grounds.
Worse	32. The management, maintenance, cleanliness and operation of the physical facilities is efficient and of a quality necessary to support programs and services.
Worse	35. The organization for administering CMC budget and finances is clearly defined.
Worse	36. The college's overall use of financial resources is consistent with it's educational goals.
Worse	37. College guidelines and processes for financial planning and budget development are clearly defined and followed.
Better	40. In general, I am aware of the faculty's role in various governing, planning, budgeting and policy making bodies at the college.
Better	41. The faculty exercise a substantial voice in matters related to educational programs, the hiring of faculty and other personnel, and institutional policies.
Better	42. I have a substantive role in college governance and policy-making that related to my areas of responsibility and expertise.
Worse	60. College-wide and unit planning are linked to resource allocation at CMC.
Better	68. Classified staff are treated respectfully by faculty.
Worse	70. Written policies ensuring fairness are adhered to in employment procedures.

*All changes for employee population are noted in this table. See Appendix A for review of all questions*

**TABLE 1 ANALYSIS**

Questions #6, #40, #41 and #42, regarding the extent of employee participation in College planning, show positive change from 2006 to 2008. This is particularly true with respect to faculty participation in College planning, and Question #68 also indicates greater respect for classified staff is being shown by faculty. The result of Question #68 should be interpreted with care since full-time and part-time faculty responses appear to be responsible for the change. Since planning is the first step in the WASC program review cycle, these responses suggest improved coordination/participation in College planning.

Four of eight remaining significant changes suggest increasing dissatisfaction with fairness in hiring processes, campus security, physical plant, cleanliness and maintenance.

The remaining four negative responses involve a crucial element of the WASC program review cycle, the implementation phase (stage 2 of the process). Specifically, question

#60 suggests the need to improve the link between planning and resource allocation and responses to questions #32, #35, and #36 emphatically reinforce the same point.

Table 2		
Intra-group count of questions with change 2006-2008		
Statistically Significant at 95% Confidence, based on a total of 78 Survey Questions		
	<b>Better</b>	<b>Worse</b>
Administration	0	30
Full-time Faculty	16	0
Part-time Faculty	3	1
Full-time Classified	0	1
Part-time Classified	0	2
Total	<b>19</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>All Employee Groups</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>
<i>See Appendix A for all intra-group comparisons.</i>		

### TABLE 2 ANALYSIS

The thirteen (5 better, 8 worse) changes presented for all employee groups in Table 1 (and again on the last line of Table 2 above) obscure larger movements in opinion within each individual employee group since the 2006 Faculty/Staff Survey. While classified staff and part-time faculty show very few significant changes, full-time faculty moved exclusively in a positive direction on 16/78 questions (20.5%), and administration moved exclusively in a negative direction on 30/78 questions (38.5%).

Possible explanations for the substantive change in opinion by the full-time faculty and administration include: the arrival of three new Vice Presidents and an interim President in fall 2007; the most recent 50% Law hearing and subsequent Board of Governor's ruling; Barbara Beano's (AACJC) visit and comments; and the one-year return visit by representatives of the WASC accreditation team to evaluate progress on the seven accreditation recommendations from 2006. Based on data from the current Survey, the causative impact of the fall 2007 administrative changes on employee opinion can be examined in greater depth using the information contained in Table 3.



Table 3																
Intra-Group Changes on 12 "Mini" Climate Survey Questions, 2006-2007, 2007-2008, 2006-2008																
Statistically Significant at 95% Confidence																
All	Admin			Full-time Faculty			Part-time Faculty			Full-time Classified			Part-time Classified			Questions
	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2008	2006-2007	2007-2008	2006-2008	
																6. I have had sufficient opportunity to participate in the planning process at CMC.
																15. I am satisfied with the college hiring process for my constituent group.
																19. My immediate supervisor encourages and supports my participation in professional development activities.
																21. The general college climate is respectful and responsive to a diverse educational and cultural campus environment.
																42. I have a substantive role in college governance and policy-making that related to my areas of responsibility and expertise.
																43. The Administration supports and uses a decision-making process that involves the persons who will be affected.
																45. The Administration provides effective leadership to define goals, develop plans and establish priorities for the institution.
																46. The Administration has established and utilized effective methods of communication to exchange information in a timely and efficient manner.
																47. I am personally treated with respect at this college.
																51. The programs and services of CMC provide fair and ethical treatment of it's entire population.
																69. CMC administration handles grievances fairly.
																86. Overall, how would you assess the campus climate/environment at CMC for employees?

+ Statistically significant positive movement

- Statistically significant negative movement

**TABLE 3 ANALYSIS**

As Table 3 shows, the Mini-climate Survey, administered in fall 2007, showed no change in part-time faculty or part-time classified opinions that might be attributed to administrative changes. There was a slightly negative impact on full-time classified (-1) and part-time classified (-2), and the administration also moved negatively on 3/12 Survey questions. In contrast, in fall of 2007, full-time faculty responded more positively on 8/12 Mini-survey questions relative to their responses to the 2006 Survey. However, by spring of 2008, six of the eight positive full-time faculty responses from fall 2007 had disappeared, resulting in a net improvement on only 2/12 questions from 2006 to 2008. This suggests that the arrival of new leadership may have had a positive initial impact on full-time faculty, but those gains are no longer evident in the 2008 climate responses as represented by the 12 Mini-survey questions in Table 3.