



***INSTITUTE OF
TECHNOLOGY***

College Employee Satisfaction Report

June 2019

Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology
Okmulgee, Oklahoma

Office of Institutional Research

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The College Employee Satisfaction Survey (CESS) measures satisfaction of faculty, staff, and administrators in five areas including *Campus Culture and Policies*, *Institutional Goals*, *Involvement in Planning and Decision Making*, *Work Environment*, and *Demographics*. Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology-Okmulgee (OSUIT) first administered the CESS in 2016; this marks the second administration of the CESS as part of a three-survey rotation at OSUIT.

General results revealed that employees:

- Take pride in their work;
- Support what OSUIT stands for;
- Focus on students; and
- Find that OSUIT is well-respected in the community.

On the other hand:

- Employees question the administration's sense of purpose and careful planning;
- Teamwork and cooperation need to be addressed; and
- Communication between staff and the administration could improve.

Institutional goals focus on increasing enrollment, improving retention, and addressing employee morale. While director-level administrators, deans, and the local chamber of commerce are perceived as having the right amount of involvement in planning and decision-making, senior administrators are perceived as too involved and that others on-campus are not involved enough.

As for the work environment, employee benefits are seen as valuable, employees are proud to work at OSUIT, and supervisors pay attention to what their workers have to say. Employees would recommend OSUIT to family and friends as a great place to work, and they would be more likely to recommend OSUIT as a great college.

Benchmarks

The comparison group used for benchmarking purposes includes 13 public institutions and 43 private institutions. Only six of the comparison group institutions were public institutions granting primarily associate-level degrees.

Regarding campus culture and policies, OSUIT employees tend to be less satisfied on several items than the comparison group. In particular, *leadership having a clear sense of purpose* and *involving employees in planning for the future* were identified as areas of concern. Whereas the comparison group cited deans and directors as "too involved" in planning and decision-making, OSUIT deans and directors were involved at "just right levels"; OSUIT responses were quite similar to the comparison group on other stakeholder categories. On the Work Environment section, OSUIT responses were similar to the comparison group on importance, but OSUIT employees also reported higher satisfaction than the comparison group.

Changes over time

Satisfaction at OSUIT increased from 2016 to 2019 in general. However, current employees were less satisfied than in 2016 with their level of involvement in *planning for the future*, *leadership's sense of*

purpose, and OSUIT's reputation. Institutional goals remained the same over the two survey administrations, but with higher importance ratings for current employees. Current employees reported that faculty are less involved in planning and decision-making than before, while deans and directors in 2016 were too involved. Satisfaction for Work Environment items increased in most cases, though *having enough staff to do the job well* showed a decline for current employees. Overall satisfaction remained the same, and endorsement of OSUIT *as a great place to work* and *as a great college* did increase slightly, although there were fewer extreme responses (ex., "Strongly agree").

COLLEGE EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION 2019

Introduction

The College Employee Satisfaction Survey (CESS) is one of several surveys included in the Research Toolkit by Ruffalo Noel Levitz. The CESS measures satisfaction of faculty, staff, and administrators in five areas including *Campus Culture and Policies*, *Institutional Goals*, *Involvement in Planning and Decision Making*, *Work Environment*, and *Demographics*. Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology-Okmulgee (OSUIT) first administered the CESS in 2016; it is included in a rotation of surveys administered every third year. This year, 2019, marks the second administration of the CESS at OSUIT.

Notification and Administration

Efforts were made to minimize employee concerns with regard to this survey. Full- and part-time employees were invited to participate. Temporary employees, adjunct faculty, and students employed through a work-study program were excluded, by rule, according to Ruffalo Noel Levitz sampling methods. In a letter sent from the President's Office (Dr. Path), supervisors were directed to allow their employees ample time to complete the survey during working hours. The Office of Institutional Research provided laptops and a location in the Student Union to allow employees to complete their surveys without feeling as if others were watching them. The Office of Institutional Research encouraged employee questions and attempted to make the process as open and transparent as possible while maintaining employee confidentiality. While there were a few brief discussions about the security of the data collection procedures and potential for misuse of the results, the integrity of the Office of Institutional Research and the reporting process went primarily unchallenged.

The initial invitation to participate, signed by President Path, was sent on January 29, 2019 from Institutional Research, and the link was sent on January 31. A total of 314 full- and part-time employees were included in this distribution. Follow-up reminder emails were sent from Institutional Research with a final reminder on February 26, 2019. The survey closed on Monday, March 4, 2019. Out of the 314 employees in the initial sample, 198 submitted surveys for an overall response rate of 63.1%; some survey submissions were incomplete, so tables include tallies of valid responses (for example, see results reported by Ruffalo Noel Levitz in appendix A).

Demographics

Survey respondents were identified very broadly, for the sake of anonymity, by time on the job, position type, and part-time/full-time status as follows.

<i>How long have you worked at this institution?</i>	Count	Percent	Graph
Less than 1 year	21	11.9%	
1 to 5 years	59	33.3%	
6 to 10 years	46	26.0%	
11 to 20 years	35	19.8%	
More than 20 years	16	9.0%	
All responses	177	100.0%	
<i>Is your position:</i>			
Faculty	65	36.9%	
Staff	91	51.7%	
Administrator (Director-level or above)	20	11.4%	
All responses	176	100.0%	
<i>Is your position:</i>			
Full-time	178	98.9%	
Part-time	2	1.1%	
All responses	180	100.0%	

When asked, “How long have you worked at this institution?” results show that the 177 responding employees were reasonably distributed. Staff responded in the largest numbers (n=91, 51.7%) followed by faculty (n=65, 36.9%) and administrators (n=20, 11.4%) for a total of 176 employees reporting position type. Employment status revealed 178 who self-identified as full-time, and 2 as part-time status, for 180 reporting.

Instrument

The CESS includes 70 items in five areas:

1. Campus culture and policies. Employees rated importance and satisfaction on a host of issues including campus mission, budgetary and human resources, departmental communication, pride in work, and training and employee recognition. Employees rated these items on a five-point scale from 1 = “not important at all” to 5 = “very important” on the *Importance* scale, and 1 = “not satisfied at all” to 5 = “very satisfied” on the *Satisfaction* scale.
2. Institutional goals. Employees rated a variety of institutional goals on importance including recruitment, retention, diversity efforts, staff morale, and more. Respondents also listed which goals should be among the top three priorities for this campus; these items were then ranked to determine relative importance, which tends to be more valid and reliable than ratings.
3. Involvement in planning and decision making. Employees rated how much involvement various campus constituents have in the decision-making process, from not enough to too much involvement; custom items were added to represent groups or institutions recognized on this campus as having an effect on the decision-making process. Campus-added items included 1) local government/chamber of commerce; 2) industry partners/advisors; and 3) OSU-Stillwater. In addition, item “Trustees” was changed to “Trustees/Regents” for clarity.
4. Work environment. Employees rated importance and satisfaction on issues such as information flow, employee empowerment, supervisor relationships, professional development, and fulfillment and job satisfaction. Custom items were also added in this

section as follows: 1) “My supervisor discusses my performance evaluation with me”; and 2) “My supervisor evaluates my performance formally on a yearly basis.” These items were rated on a five-point scale, from 1 = “not important at all” to 5 = “very important.” This section ends with a single item of overall satisfaction using the “Satisfaction” scale of 1 = “not satisfied at all” to 5 = “very satisfied.”

5. Demographics. This section polled length of employment, type of position (faculty/staff/administrator), and status as full- or part-time employee. Added to this section were two summary items to reflect overall attitudes toward OSUIT: 1) “I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great place to work,” and 2) “I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college.”

Just as with other Ruffalo Noel Levitz products, such as the Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) and Priorities Survey for Online Learners (PSOL), the CESS focused not only on *satisfaction*, but also on *importance*, which lends context to satisfaction scores; satisfaction is only meaningful if it is also important to the respondent. The mathematical difference between an item’s importance score and its corresponding satisfaction score is referred to as the *performance gap* or *gap score*. A performance gap is simply the importance score minus the satisfaction score. The larger the performance gap, the greater the discrepancy between one’s expectations and one’s satisfaction with the current situation. A high importance score with a relatively high satisfaction score that results in a small gap score may be used to represent an institution’s *strengths*. On the other hand, a high importance score with a relatively low satisfaction score results in a larger gap score and represents an item the institution may focus on as a *challenge*, an issue to be addressed. Again, a relatively low importance score would typically place an item lower on the institution’s list of priorities regardless of the level of satisfaction reported for that item.

OSUIT Results from Ruffalo Noel Levitz

As described above, the main report as delivered by Ruffalo Noel Levitz and the main report with items sorted by *highest to lowest importance* (appendix A) reveal satisfaction levels as perceived by OSUIT employees; these are taken at face value without any additional comparisons or benchmarking. Listing items by importance provides the opportunity to search for patterns in the responses based on context.

Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies. The following are the strengths and challenges identified during the 2019 administration of the CESS pertaining to the culture of the campus and policies at OSUIT, listed from highest to lowest importance, and with the mean satisfaction score in parentheses.

Strengths (high importance and high satisfaction)

- The institution treats students as its top priority. (3.53)
- Staff take pride in their work. (3.92)
- Faculty take pride in their work. (3.86)
- The institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships. (3.69)
- This institution is well-respected in the community. (3.56)
- Administrators take pride in their work. (3.71)

- Most employees are generally supportive of the mission, purpose, and values of this institution. (3.59)

Challenges (high importance and low satisfaction, large gap)

- The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose. (3.08)
- There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution. (2.95)
- This institution plans carefully. (3.03)
- There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution. (2.99)

Strengths and challenges are identified for the purpose of strategic planning. Strengths are often used to celebrate campus successes and accomplishments. Challenges allow administrators to identify issues that can be addressed quickly and start planning for those that will take some time and resources to achieve.

Section 2: Institutional Goals. Institutional goals were addressed in the CESS in two ways: 1) as a list of items scaled by importance, and 2) as three lists, organized by endorsement of first, second, and third priority goals, respectively. The top three goals according both to importance ratings and to tally of endorsements were: 1) Increase the enrollment of new students, 2) Retain more of its current students to graduation, and 3) Improve employee morale.

Section 3: Involvement in Planning and Decision-making. Employees rated the involvement of various categories of stakeholders; these are reported using a bipolar scale with “too little involvement” and “too much involvement” at the poles, and a rating of “just right involvement” in the middle. Employees reported that staff, students, faculty, alumni, and industry partners are not involved enough in planning and decision-making at OSUIT; senior administrators and, to a lesser extent, OSU-Stillwater and trustees/regents are too involved; while deans, director-level administrators, and local government/Chamber of Commerce are involved at relatively “just right” levels.

Section 4: Work environment. The following are the strengths and challenges identified during the 2019 administration of the CESS pertaining to the work environment at OSUIT, listed from highest to lowest importance, and with the mean satisfaction score in parentheses.

Strengths (high importance and high satisfaction)

- The employee benefits available to me are valuable. (4.18)
- I am proud to work at this institution. (4.22)
- My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say. (4.16)

Challenges (high importance and low satisfaction, large gap)

- My department has the staff needed to do its job well. (3.06)
- I am paid fairly for the work I do. (3.11)
- My department has the budget needed to do its job well. (3.17)

Summary items. Included in Section 4 was a single item to rate an employee’s overall satisfaction working at OSUIT; 186 employees responded to this item on the five-point scale (1=“not satisfied at all” to 5=“very satisfied”) with a mean satisfaction rating of 3.90 and a standard deviation of 0.96.

Beyond the demographic items already mentioned (time on the job, position type, part-time/full-time status), there were two campus-added items included in Section 5. The first item, “I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great place to work” was endorsed (“Somewhat agree” or “Strongly agree”) by 82.6% of the 184 OSUIT employees who responded. The second item, “I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college” was endorsed (“Somewhat agree” or “Strongly agree”) by 91.9% of the 185 OSUIT employees who responded to this question on the CESS.

OSUIT vs. Comparison Group for Benchmarking

Comparison group results were used as benchmarks for external comparisons (appendix B). The current comparison group consisted of 56 community and technical colleges from the United States and Canada who had administered the CESS at some time over the past three years; six of these were 4-year public institutions that primarily grant associate-level degrees (full list of comparison institutions included in appendix B). In terms of demography, while the composition of the comparison group is similar to OSUIT in terms of years of experience and position type, the comparison group included more part-time employees (16.3%) than did OSUIT (1.1%).

Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies. The difference between the mean importance score for OSUIT employees and the comparison group mean did not exceed 0.11 for any particular item, so responses for importance were quite similar. However, for several items, satisfaction for the comparison group exceeded that of OSUIT employees with statistically significant differences reported. The comparison group reported higher satisfaction than OSUIT employees on the following items:

- This institution treats students as its top priority.*
- This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students.*
- This institution involves its employees in planning for the future.**
- The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose.***
- Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff.*
- There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution.*
- There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution.*
- Employee suggestions are used to improve our institution.*

Note: * .05 level of significance, ** .01 level of significance, *** .001 level of significance

Section 2: Institutional Goals. According to OSUIT employees, top-rated goals included:

- Increasing the enrollment of new students. ***
- Retain more of its current students to graduation. ***
- Improve employee morale. ***

Note: Each is higher than the comparison group at the .001 level of significance.

Section 3: Involvement in planning and decision-making. When compared to the comparison group, responses by OSUIT employees on the involvement of various stakeholders in planning and decision-making were more extreme with two exceptions: whereas academic deans and director-level

administrators were involved at ‘just right’ levels at OSUIT, these same stakeholders are more involved at comparison group institutions ($p < .001$).

Section 4: Work environment. While OSUIT employees reported very similar levels of importance for items pertaining to the work environment, they reported higher satisfaction levels than the comparison group on several items:

- The employee benefits available to me are valuable. ***
- My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say. **
- I have the information needed to do my job well. **
- My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me. **
- My supervisor helps me improve my job performance. ***
- The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor. **

Note: * .05 level of significance, ** .01 level of significance, *** .001 level of significance

Summary items. The difference in overall satisfaction for OSUIT (3.90) versus the comparison group (3.82) was not statistically significant. As the remaining two summary items were campus-added by OSUIT, there is no data for the comparison group.

Additional Analyses: Comparison of OSUIT 2016 vs. 2019 Results

With the first administration of the CESS at OSUIT in spring 2016, this survey was included in a three-year rotation of surveys; these also included the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) and the Alumni Outcomes and Loyalty Survey. The 2019 administration of the CESS was the first opportunity to compare employee satisfaction data based on the passage of time. The following analyses compare OSUIT employees’ results from 2016 and 2019 on the CESS (appendix C).

Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies.

Although there was a slight increase overall in 2019 on employee satisfaction, OSUIT employee satisfaction for 2019 decreased, compared to 2016 responses, for the following items:

- This institution involves its employees in planning for the future. *
- The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose. *
- The reputation of this institution continues to improve. *

Note: * .05 level of significance, ** .01 level of significance, *** .001 level of significance

These items suggest that OSUIT employees felt increasingly removed from policy-making and planning; or, perhaps, they did not feel their involvement had kept pace with societal attitudes toward increased transparency, advocacy, and involvement.

Satisfaction for 2019 increased compared to 2016 for the following item:

- This institution consistently follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievements. *

Note: * .05 level of significance, ** .01 level of significance, *** .001 level of significance

This item may reflect employee recognition of initiatives on campus to bring notoriety to employees for exceptional achievement.

Section 2: Institutional Goals. Ratings on the institutional goal items remain similar in pattern to the responses from 2016, though most items were rated slightly higher on importance in 2019; three of these items reached a level of statistical significance:

- Increase the enrollment of new students. *
- Recruit students from new geographic areas. *
- Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body. *

Note: * .05 level of significance, ** .01 level of significance, *** .001 level of significance

Other items in the list scored higher on importance but were not different to any meaningful degree from the 2016 results.

Section 3: Involvement in Planning and Decision-making. Ratings of involvement in planning and decision-making by various stakeholders, again, revealed similar patterns of employee responses in 2016 and 2019. However, there were items with differences large enough to mention.

Perceptions of faculty involvement in planning and decision-making decreased from 2.51 to 2.32 ($p < .05$) placing faculty well into the “not enough involvement” end of the spectrum. In 2016, deans and director-level administrators scored 3.20 and 3.30, respectively, on the five-point scale and placing them in the “too much involvement” category. In 2019, deans and director-level administrators scored lower (2.94 and 2.98 respectively; $p < .05$) placing them nearer to the 3.0 scale anchor for “just right involvement.”

On the other hand, senior administrators (Vice President, Provost-level or above) were seen as having increased involvement (3.65 to 3.82; $p < .05$) and accentuating their place in the “too much involvement” category. Again, these are the items showing a statistically significant difference from 2016 to 2019.

Section 4: Work Environment.

Statistically significant differences between 2016 and 2019 responses were found for the following items:

- I have adequate opportunities for professional development. ***
- I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills. ***
- My department has the budget needed to do its job well. **
- My department meets as a team to plan and coordinate work. **
- I have adequate opportunities for advancement. *
- My supervisor helps me improve my job performance. *
- My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say. *

Note: * .05 level of significance, ** .01 level of significance, *** .001 level of significance

Of the 23 items in this section, only one showed a decrease in satisfaction for 2019: “My department has the staff needed to do its job well.” Although the difference was not statistically significant, the direction of the change from 2016 to 2019 distinguished it from the other items in this category.

Summary items. The overall satisfaction for responses from 2016 (3.88) versus 2019 (3.90) was not statistically significant. Because the campus-added items were left unchanged from the 2016 administration of the CESS, Time₁/Time₂ comparisons were made possible. For both items, as shown below, responses decreased at the extreme polls (Strongly agree, Strongly disagree) while showing a more than corresponding increase for the “Somewhat agree” response. Note also a slight increase in the “Somewhat disagree” response for item “I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college.”

Summary Items*					
<i>I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great place to work:</i>	2016		2019		2016-2019
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Change
Strongly agree	102	45.1%	75	40.8%	↓ -4.37%
Somewhat agree	80	35.4%	77	41.8%	↑ 6.45%
Neither agree nor disagree	19	8.4%	17	9.2%	→ 0.83%
Somewhat disagree	15	6.6%	11	6.0%	→ -0.66%
Strongly disagree	10	4.4%	4	2.2%	↓ -2.25%
All responses	226	100.0%	184	100.0%	0.00%
<i>I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college:</i>	2016		2019		2016-2019
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Change
Strongly agree	150	65.8%	115	62.2%	↓ -3.63%
Somewhat agree	56	24.6%	55	29.7%	↑ 5.17%
Neither agree nor disagree	15	6.6%	9	4.9%	↓ -1.71%
Somewhat disagree	2	0.9%	6	3.2%	↑ 2.37%
Strongly disagree	5	2.2%	0	0.0%	↓ -2.19%
All responses	228	100.0%	185	100.0%	0.00%
*Summary items are optional campus-defined items and not part of the original survey.					

Open-ended Comments

The CESS included four open-ended items for employee comments; these items were not included in this report because of personally identifiable information contained therein. All comments as written were provided to Dr. Path; redacted comments went to the Vice Presidents. Because responses could possibly result in personal identification, the President and Vice Presidents were asked not to share the comments as written with anyone else. Open-ended comments often become a pulpit for pent up frustrations, so one may expect some responses to be controversial. Whether constructive or otherwise, comments can provide helpful suggestions for quick-fix actions as well as illuminate issues that require more in-depth planning and resource allocation.

The first open-ended comment area in the survey was at the end of *Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies* which states, “Please provide any additional feedback about the campus culture and policies at Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology.” Approximately one-third of the respondents (63) commented on this item.

Section 2: Institutional Goals included two open-ended items. After first rating, and then ranking the institutional goals listed in the survey, employees were asked, “What other institutional goals do you

think are important?” Employees provided 54 responses, and then followed with 31 additional responses to the follow-up item, “Please provide any additional feedback about OSUIT’s goals.”

Section 4: Work Environment included an open-ended item resulting in 42 responses addressing the item, “Please provide any additional feedback about the work environment at Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology.”

A number of responses across all the open-ended responses appeared to reflect content from the scaled items in the survey. Several responses were very pointed; other responses clearly reflect employee pride in the institution and appreciation of their co-workers. Regardless of the character of the response, mitigating factors should be considered so as to place these responses in their proper context. For example, the timing of a recent salary increase and reconfiguration of the academic schools may have had an impact on responses. In addition, some employees at OSUIT may be unaware of the impact of budget restrictions on other institutions in the State of Oklahoma and the comparative strength of OSUIT’s position. A recurring theme in the comments deals with employees being unaware of the increased visibility OSUIT benefits from due to the work of the executive team, work that may be best characterized from an employee viewpoint as *behind-the-scenes*.

In reference to comments concerning administration’s involvement with the community, we discovered that word-of-mouth and community involvement are crucial to OSUIT’s recruitment. In another study (Applicant Poll: Initial Report, 2019), a sample of OSUIT applicants were asked how they first learned about OSUIT; 157 (37.2%) listed *Family/friends* as the source of their initial knowledge of OSUIT, followed by *Counselor/teacher* (53, 12.6%), *Local-familiar with OSUIT* (35, 8.3%), and *OSUIT recruiter/presenter/faculty/staff* (33, 7.8%). When further asked to mark all items directly affecting their decision to apply to OSUIT, the respondents endorsed every item in the list at least once, so every item revealed some amount of impact. Although local experience and word-of-mouth seem to be the primary means to learn about OSUIT, this may have more to do with perception and recall. Other activities such as leadership on committees, work with governmental bodies, and “town-and-gown” relationship building help add to the “buzz” about OSUIT increasing the broader community’s awareness of our institution. The cumulative effects of multiple and various influences develop into the scripts that become word-of-mouth messages for those in our circles of influence and make us all brand ambassadors for OSUIT.

Conclusions

Results from the 2019 administration of the CESS at OSUIT revealed that employees 1) take pride in their work, 2) support what OSUIT stands for, 3) focus on students, and 4) the institution is well-respected in the community. On the other hand, 1) employees question the administration’s sense of purpose and careful planning, 2) teamwork and cooperation need to be addressed, and 3) communication between staff and the administration could improve. Institutional goals focus on increasing enrollment, improving retention, and addressing employee morale. While director-level administrators, deans, and the local chamber of commerce are perceived as having the right amount of involvement in planning and decision-making, senior administrators are perceived as too involved and other on-campus stakeholders as not involved enough. As for the work environment, 1) employee benefits are seen as valuable, 2) employees are proud to work at OSUIT, and 3) supervisors pay attention to what their

workers have to say. Employees would recommend OSUIT to family and friends as a great place to work, and they would be more likely to recommend OSUIT as a great college.

Benchmarks

Of the 56 institutions listed in the comparison group, only 13 were public institutions; at least 43 institutions included in this report were private colleges. Only six of the comparison group institutions were public institutions granting primarily associate-level degrees.

Regarding campus culture and policies, OSUIT employees rated items on importance quite similarly to the comparison group. However, OSUIT employees tended to be less satisfied on several items. In particular, *leadership having a clear sense of purpose* and *involving employees in planning for the future* were identified as areas of concern. Whereas the comparison group cited deans and directors as too involved in planning and decision-making, those at OSUIT were at “just the right level”; OSUIT reflected the comparison group with regard to other stakeholders, whether positive or negative but with more amplitude. OSUIT, again, rated items in the Work Environment section similarly to the comparison group on importance, but also reported higher satisfaction than the comparison group.

Changes over time

In general, satisfaction at OSUIT increased from the first administration in 2016 to the current administration, 2019. However, current employees were less satisfied than in 2016 with their level of involvement in planning for the future, leadership’s sense of purpose, and OSUIT’s reputation. Institutional goals remained the same, but with higher levels of importance for current employees. Current employees reported that faculty are even less involved in planning and decision-making than previously, whereas in 2016 deans and directors were perceived as being too involved. Satisfaction regarding the work environment increased in most cases, though *having enough staff to do the job well* did show a decline for current employees. Overall satisfaction remained the same and endorsement of OSUIT *as a great place to work* and *as a great college* did increase slightly, although there were fewer extreme responses (ex., “Strongly agree”).

APPENDIX A:

Results of College Employee Satisfaction Survey: Main Report

Sorted by Importance (pg. 29)

Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	IMPORTANCE			SATISFACTION			GAP
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents	
This institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships	4.56	.65	196	3.69	.96	194	0.87
This institution treats students as its top priority	4.64	.64	194	3.53	1.08	196	1.12
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students	4.57	.66	194	3.43	.99	196	1.13
The mission, purpose, and values of this institution are well understood by most employees	4.48	.72	194	3.45	1.10	196	1.03
Most employees are generally supportive of the mission, purpose, and values of this institution	4.50	.68	194	3.59	1.04	196	0.91
The goals and objectives of this institution are consistent with its mission and values	4.46	.71	194	3.51	1.14	195	0.96
This institution involves its employees in planning for the future	4.36	.97	194	2.80	1.34	196	1.56
This institution plans carefully	4.46	.90	193	3.03	1.28	194	1.43
The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose	4.52	.89	192	3.08	1.39	196	1.44
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty	4.39	.92	192	3.09	1.23	196	1.29
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of staff	4.45	.74	186	3.10	1.14	186	1.35
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of administrators	4.28	.87	183	3.53	1.06	186	0.75
This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives	4.44	.76	186	3.18	1.21	189	1.26
This institution makes sufficient staff resources available to achieve important objectives	4.31	.82	186	3.18	1.12	187	1.12
There are effective lines of communication between departments	4.39	.88	183	2.69	1.18	188	1.70
Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff	4.44	.78	186	2.94	1.25	189	1.50
There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution	4.40	.82	183	2.91	1.24	188	1.49
There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution	4.45	.72	183	2.99	1.17	187	1.46
Faculty take pride in their work	4.57	.71	185	3.86	1.02	188	0.71
Staff take pride in their work	4.57	.66	184	3.92	.95	186	0.65
Administrators take pride in their work	4.51	.72	184	3.71	1.09	187	0.80
There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution	4.47	.73	187	2.95	1.26	188	1.52
The reputation of this institution continues to improve	4.59	.69	186	3.20	1.23	188	1.38
This institution is well-respected in the community	4.56	.63	182	3.56	1.10	188	1.00
Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution	4.48	.66	185	3.26	1.24	187	1.22
Employee suggestions are used to improve our institution	4.28	.90	183	2.74	1.27	187	1.54
This institution consistently follows clear processes for selecting new employees	4.39	.75	186	3.31	1.28	187	1.08
This institution consistently follows clear processes for orienting and training new employees	4.39	.74	185	3.29	1.24	187	1.11
This institution consistently follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievements	4.23	.85	186	3.24	1.14	188	0.99
This institution has written procedures that clearly define who is responsible for each operation and service	4.28	.82	184	3.21	1.17	188	1.08

Section 2: Institutional Goals

RATE: IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all / 5 = "Very important")	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	4.82	0.43	188
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	4.81	0.44	188
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	4.38	0.81	187
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	4.20	1.02	188
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	3.95	1.15	187
[F] Develop new academic programs	3.89	1.04	188
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	4.65	0.66	187
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	4.35	0.82	188
[I] Improve employee morale	4.76	0.63	187
[J] Some other goal	3.73	1.22	135

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) First priority goal:	Count	Percent
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	52	27.5%
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	41	21.7%
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	5	2.6%
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	1	0.5%
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	2	1.1%
[F] Develop new academic programs	5	2.6%
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	30	15.9%
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	7	3.7%
[I] Improve employee morale	45	23.8%
[J] Some other goal	1	0.5%
All responses	189	100.0%

COLLEGE EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS
OSUIT - Spring 2019 Respondents

College Employee Satisfaction Report 2019

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) Second priority goal:	Count	Percent
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	55	29.1%
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	54	28.6%
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	7	3.7%
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	6	3.2%
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	8	4.2%
[F] Develop new academic programs	6	3.2%
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	26	13.8%
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	9	4.8%
[I] Improve employee morale	17	9.0%
[J] Some other goal	1	0.5%
All responses	189	100.0%

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) Third priority goal:	Count	Percent
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	35	18.6%
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	32	17.0%
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	13	6.9%
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	7	3.7%
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	6	3.2%
[F] Develop new academic programs	12	6.4%
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	32	17.0%
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	17	9.0%
[I] Improve employee morale	32	17.0%
[J] Some other goal	2	1.1%
All responses	188	100.0%

Copyright 2016, Ruffalo Noel Levitz, LLC. All rights reserved.

TOTAL "VOTES" FOR EACH GOAL	First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority	TOTAL	TOTAL PERCENT
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	52	55	35	142	25.1%
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	41	54	32	127	22.4%
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	5	7	13	25	4.4%
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	1	6	7	14	2.5%
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	2	8	6	16	2.8%
[F] Develop new academic programs	5	6	12	23	4.1%
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	30	26	32	88	15.5%
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	7	9	17	33	5.8%
[I] Improve employee morale	45	17	32	94	16.6%
[J] Some other goal	1	1	2	4	0.7%
All responses	189	189	188	566	100.0%

Section 3: Involvement in Planning and Decision-making

RATE: INVOLVEMENT (1 = "Not enough involvement" / 3 = "Just the right involvement" / 5 = "Too much involvement")	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents
How involved are: Faculty	2.32	0.92	183
How involved are: Staff	2.13	0.84	181
How involved are: Deans or directors of administrative units	2.98	0.96	186
How involved are: Deans or chairs of academic units	2.94	0.95	185
How involved are: Senior administrators (VP, Provost level or above)	3.82	0.89	187
How involved are: Students	2.26	0.88	186
How involved are: Trustees/Regents	3.24	0.91	181
How involved are: Alumni	2.53	0.88	178
How involved are: Local government/Chamber of Commerce (campus-added item)	2.98	0.90	178
How involved are: Industry Partners/Advisory Committee Members (campus-added item)	2.75	0.82	181
How involved are: OSU-Stillwater (campus-added item)	3.33	1.04	184

Section 4: Work Environment

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	IMPORTANCE			SATISFACTION			GAP
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents	
It is easy for me to get information at this institution	4.40	0.64	185	3.34	1.03	186	1.06
I learn about important campus events in a timely manner	4.19	0.80	184	3.61	1.05	186	0.58
I am empowered to resolve problems quickly	4.38	0.70	184	3.52	1.20	186	0.85
I am comfortable answering student questions about institutional policies and procedures	4.29	0.74	184	3.66	0.99	185	0.63
I have the information I need to do my job well	4.58	0.56	183	3.87	1.01	183	0.71
My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me	4.58	0.56	184	3.97	1.02	186	0.61
My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say	4.60	0.53	184	4.16	1.16	184	0.43
My supervisor helps me improve my job performance	4.56	0.57	183	4.08	1.12	186	0.48
My department or work unit has written, up-to-date objectives	4.28	0.77	183	3.82	1.11	184	0.46
My department meets as a team to plan and coordinate work	4.36	0.75	183	4.08	1.07	186	0.28
My department has the budget needed to do its job well	4.54	0.60	185	3.17	1.14	186	1.37
My department has the staff needed to do its job well	4.62	0.55	185	3.06	1.26	186	1.56
I am paid fairly for the work I do	4.58	0.59	184	3.11	1.21	185	1.47
The employee benefits available to me are valuable	4.66	0.58	185	4.18	0.90	186	0.48
I have adequate opportunities for advancement	4.30	0.78	185	3.20	1.21	185	1.10
I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills	4.44	0.68	185	3.77	1.11	186	0.67
I have adequate opportunities for professional development	4.43	0.71	185	3.82	1.10	185	0.61
The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding	4.55	0.60	184	4.16	0.95	186	0.39
The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor	4.53	0.63	185	4.17	1.04	186	0.36
The work I do is valuable to the institution	4.62	0.56	185	3.98	1.11	186	0.63
I am proud to work at this institution	4.61	0.58	184	4.22	0.96	186	0.40
My supervisor evaluates my performance formally on a yearly basis. (campus-added item)	4.42	0.74	183	4.34	0.98	185	0.08
My supervisor discusses my performance evaluation with me. (campus-added item)	4.44	0.70	183	4.32	0.95	186	0.12

Overall Satisfaction

Rate your overall satisfaction with your employment here so far:	3.90	0.96	186
--	------	------	-----

Section 5: Demographics

<i>How long have you worked at this institution?</i>	Count	Percent
Less than 1 year	21	11.9%
1 to 5 years	59	33.3%
6 to 10 years	46	26.0%
11 to 20 years	35	19.8%
More than 20 years	16	9.0%
All responses	177	100.0%

<i>Is your position:</i>	Count	Percent
Faculty	65	36.9%
Staff	91	51.7%
Administrator (Director-level or above)	20	11.4%
All responses	176	100.0%

<i>Is your position:</i>	Count	Percent
Full-time	178	98.9%
Part-time	2	1.1%
All responses	180	100.0%

<i>I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great place to work: (campus added item)</i>	Count	Percent
Strongly agree	75	40.8%
Somewhat agree	77	41.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	17	9.2%
Somewhat disagree	11	6.0%
Strongly disagree	4	2.2%
All responses	184	100.0%

<i>I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college: (campus-added item)</i>	Count	Percent
Strongly agree	115	62.2%
Somewhat agree	55	29.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	9	4.9%
Somewhat disagree	6	3.2%
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%
All responses	185	100.0%

Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	IMPORTANCE			SATISFACTION			GAP
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents	
This institution treats students as its top priority	4.64	.64	194	3.53	1.08	196	1.12
The reputation of this institution continues to improve	4.59	.69	186	3.20	1.23	188	1.38
Faculty take pride in their work	4.57	.71	185	3.86	1.02	188	0.71
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students	4.57	.66	194	3.43	.99	196	1.13
Staff take pride in their work	4.57	.66	184	3.92	.95	186	0.65
This institution is well-respected in the community	4.56	.63	182	3.56	1.10	188	1.00
This institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships	4.56	.65	196	3.69	.96	194	0.87
The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose	4.52	.89	192	3.08	1.39	196	1.44
Administrators take pride in their work	4.51	.72	184	3.71	1.09	187	0.80
Most employees are generally supportive of the mission, purpose, and values of this institution	4.50	.68	194	3.59	1.04	196	0.91
Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution	4.48	.66	185	3.26	1.24	187	1.22
The mission, purpose, and values of this institution are well understood by most employees	4.48	.72	194	3.45	1.10	196	1.03
There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution	4.47	.73	187	2.95	1.26	188	1.52
The goals and objectives of this institution are consistent with its mission and values	4.46	.71	194	3.51	1.14	195	0.96
This institution plans carefully	4.46	.90	193	3.03	1.28	194	1.43
There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution	4.45	.72	183	2.99	1.17	187	1.46
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of staff	4.45	.74	186	3.10	1.14	186	1.35
Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff	4.44	.78	186	2.94	1.25	189	1.50
This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives	4.44	.76	186	3.18	1.21	189	1.26
There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution	4.40	.82	183	2.91	1.24	188	1.49
This institution consistently follows clear processes for orienting and training new employees	4.39	.74	185	3.29	1.24	187	1.11
There are effective lines of communication between departments	4.39	.88	183	2.69	1.18	188	1.70
This institution consistently follows clear processes for selecting new employees	4.39	.75	186	3.31	1.28	187	1.08
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty	4.39	.92	192	3.09	1.23	196	1.29
This institution involves its employees in planning for the future	4.36	.97	194	2.80	1.34	196	1.56
This institution makes sufficient staff resources available to achieve important objectives	4.31	.82	186	3.18	1.12	187	1.12
This institution has written procedures that clearly define who is responsible for each operation and service	4.28	.82	184	3.21	1.17	188	1.08
Employee suggestions are used to improve our institution	4.28	.90	183	2.74	1.27	187	1.54
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of administrators	4.28	.87	183	3.53	1.06	186	0.75
This institution consistently follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievements	4.23	.85	186	3.24	1.14	188	0.99

Section 2: Institutional Goals (Priorities sorted by count)

RATE: IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all / 5 = "Very important")	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	4.82	0.43	188
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	4.81	0.44	188
[I] Improve employee morale	4.76	0.63	187
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	4.65	0.66	187
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	4.38	0.81	187
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	4.35	0.82	188
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	4.20	1.02	188
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	3.95	1.15	187
[F] Develop new academic programs	3.89	1.04	188
[J] Some other goal	3.73	1.22	135

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) First priority goal:	Count	Percent
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	52	27.5%
[I] Improve employee morale	45	23.8%
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	41	21.7%
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	30	15.9%
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	7	3.7%
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	5	2.6%
[F] Develop new academic programs	5	2.6%
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	2	1.1%
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	1	0.5%
[J] Some other goal	1	0.5%
All responses	189	100.0%

COLLEGE EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS
 OSUIT - Spring 2019 Respondents **SORTED BY MEAN IMPORTANCE**

College Employee Satisfaction Report 2019

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) Second priority goal:	Count	Percent
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	55	29.1%
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	54	28.6%
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	26	13.8%
[I] Improve employee morale	17	9.0%
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	9	4.8%
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	8	4.2%
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	7	3.7%
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	6	3.2%
[F] Develop new academic programs	6	3.2%
[J] Some other goal	1	0.5%
All responses	189	100.0%

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) Third priority goal:	Count	Percent
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	35	18.6%
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	32	17.0%
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	32	17.0%
[I] Improve employee morale	32	17.0%
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	17	9.0%
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	13	6.9%
[F] Develop new academic programs	12	6.4%
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	7	3.7%
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	6	3.2%
[J] Some other goal	2	1.1%
All responses	188	100.0%

TOTAL "VOTES" FOR EACH GOAL (sorted by TOTAL)	First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority	TOTAL	TOTAL PERCENT
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	52	55	35	142	25.1%
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	41	54	32	127	22.4%
[I] Improve employee morale	45	17	32	94	16.6%
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	30	26	32	88	15.5%
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	7	9	17	33	5.8%
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	5	7	13	25	4.4%
[F] Develop new academic programs	5	6	12	23	4.1%
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	2	8	6	16	2.8%
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	1	6	7	14	2.5%
[J] Some other goal	1	1	2	4	0.7%
All responses	189	189	188	566	100.0%

Section 3: Involvement in Planning and Decision-making (sorted by INVOLVEMENT)

RATE: INVOLVEMENT (1 = "Not enough involvement" / 3 = "Just the right involvement" / 5 = "Too much involvement")	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents
How involved are: Senior administrators (VP, Provost level or above)	3.82	0.89	187
How involved are: OSU-Stillwater (campus-added item)	3.33	1.04	184
How involved are: Trustees/Regents	3.24	0.91	181
How involved are: Deans or directors of administrative units	2.98	0.96	186
How involved are: Local government/Chamber of Commerce (campus-added item)	2.98	0.90	178
How involved are: Deans or chairs of academic units	2.94	0.95	185
How involved are: Industry Partners/Advisory Committee Members (campus-added item)	2.75	0.82	181
How involved are: Alumni	2.53	0.88	178
How involved are: Faculty	2.32	0.92	183
How involved are: Students	2.26	0.88	186
How involved are: Staff	2.13	0.84	181

Section 4: Work Environment

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	IMPORTANCE			SATISFACTION			GAP
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents	
The employee benefits available to me are valuable	4.66	0.58	185	4.18	0.90	186	0.48
My department has the staff needed to do its job well	4.62	0.55	185	3.06	1.26	186	1.56
The work I do is valuable to the institution	4.62	0.56	185	3.98	1.11	186	0.63
I am proud to work at this institution	4.61	0.58	184	4.22	0.96	186	0.40
My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say	4.60	0.53	184	4.16	1.16	184	0.43
I am paid fairly for the work I do	4.58	0.59	184	3.11	1.21	185	1.47
My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me	4.58	0.56	184	3.97	1.02	186	0.61
I have the information I need to do my job well	4.58	0.56	183	3.87	1.01	183	0.71
My supervisor helps me improve my job performance	4.56	0.57	183	4.08	1.12	186	0.48
The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding	4.55	0.60	184	4.16	0.95	186	0.39
My department has the budget needed to do its job well	4.54	0.60	185	3.17	1.14	186	1.37
The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor	4.53	0.63	185	4.17	1.04	186	0.36
I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills	4.44	0.68	185	3.77	1.11	186	0.67
My supervisor discusses my performance evaluation with me. (campus-added item)	4.44	0.70	183	4.32	0.95	186	0.12
I have adequate opportunities for professional development	4.43	0.71	185	3.82	1.10	185	0.61
My supervisor evaluates my performance formally on a yearly basis. (campus-added item)	4.42	0.74	183	4.34	0.98	185	0.08
It is easy for me to get information at this institution	4.40	0.64	185	3.34	1.03	186	1.06
I am empowered to resolve problems quickly	4.38	0.70	184	3.52	1.20	186	0.85
My department meets as a team to plan and coordinate work	4.36	0.75	183	4.08	1.07	186	0.28
I have adequate opportunities for advancement	4.30	0.78	185	3.20	1.21	185	1.10
I am comfortable answering student questions about institutional policies and procedures	4.29	0.74	184	3.66	0.99	185	0.63
My department or work unit has written, up-to-date objectives	4.28	0.77	183	3.82	1.11	184	0.46
I learn about important campus events in a timely manner	4.19	0.80	184	3.61	1.05	186	0.58

Overall Satisfaction

Rate your overall satisfaction with your employment here so far:	3.90	0.96	186
--	------	------	-----

Section 5: Demographics (not sorted)

<i>How long have you worked at this institution?</i>	Count	Percent
Less than 1 year	21	11.9%
1 to 5 years	59	33.3%
6 to 10 years	46	26.0%
11 to 20 years	35	19.8%
More than 20 years	16	9.0%
All responses	177	100.0%

<i>Is your position:</i>	Count	Percent
Faculty	65	36.9%
Staff	91	51.7%
Administrator (Director-level or above)	20	11.4%
All responses	176	100.0%

<i>Is your position:</i>	Count	Percent
Full-time	178	98.9%
Part-time	2	1.1%
All responses	180	100.0%

<i>I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great place to work: (campus added item)</i>	Count	Percent
Strongly agree	75	40.8%
Somewhat agree	77	41.8%
Neither agree nor disagree	17	9.2%
Somewhat disagree	11	6.0%
Strongly disagree	4	2.2%
All responses	184	100.0%

<i>I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college: (campus-added item)</i>	Count	Percent
Strongly agree	115	62.2%
Somewhat agree	55	29.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	9	4.9%
Somewhat disagree	6	3.2%
Strongly disagree	0	0.0%
All responses	185	100.0%

APPENDIX B:
OSUIT Results vs. Comparison Group

Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies (sorted by OSUIT IMPORTANCE)

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	OSUIT			Comparison group			IMP Sig diff	SAT Sig diff
	IMP Mean	SAT Mean	GAP	IMP Mean	SAT Mean	GAP		
This institution treats students as its top priority	4.64	3.53	1.12	4.66	3.68	0.99	NS	*
The reputation of this institution continues to improve	4.59	3.20	1.38	4.56	3.39	1.17	NS	*
Faculty take pride in their work	4.57	3.86	0.71	4.62	3.91	0.72	NS	NS
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students	4.57	3.43	1.13	4.65	3.58	1.07	NS	*
Staff take pride in their work	4.57	3.92	0.65	4.58	3.82	0.76	NS	NS
This institution is well-respected in the community	4.56	3.56	1.00	4.56	3.57	0.99	NS	NS
This institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships	4.56	3.69	0.87	4.57	3.75	0.82	NS	NS
The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose	4.52	3.08	1.44	4.59	3.40	1.19	NS	***
Administrators take pride in their work	4.51	3.71	0.80	4.56	3.78	0.78	NS	NS
Most employees are generally supportive of the mission, purpose, and values of this institution	4.50	3.59	0.91	4.39	3.62	0.77	*	NS
Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution	4.48	3.26	1.22	4.47	3.35	1.12	NS	NS
The mission, purpose, and values of this institution are well understood by most employees	4.48	3.45	1.03	4.40	3.58	0.81	NS	NS
There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution	4.47	2.95	1.52	4.53	3.12	1.40	NS	*
The goals and objectives of this institution are consistent with its mission and values	4.46	3.51	0.96	4.46	3.59	0.88	NS	NS
This institution plans carefully	4.46	3.03	1.43	4.50	3.14	1.35	NS	NS
There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution	4.45	2.99	1.46	4.40	3.06	1.34	NS	NS
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of staff	4.45	3.10	1.35	4.41	3.09	1.32	NS	NS
Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff	4.44	2.94	1.50	4.44	3.11	1.33	NS	*
This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives	4.44	3.18	1.26	4.46	3.07	1.40	NS	NS
There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution	4.40	2.91	1.49	4.42	3.08	1.34	NS	*
This institution consistently follows clear processes for orienting and training new employees	4.39	3.29	1.11	4.35	3.16	1.19	NS	NS
There are effective lines of communication between departments	4.39	2.69	1.70	4.44	2.80	1.63	NS	NS
This institution consistently follows clear processes for selecting new employees	4.39	3.31	1.08	4.33	3.17	1.17	NS	NS
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty	4.39	3.09	1.29	4.41	3.24	1.16	NS	NS
This institution involves its employees in planning for the future	4.36	2.80	1.56	4.36	3.04	1.32	NS	**
This institution makes sufficient staff resources available to achieve important objectives	4.31	3.18	1.12	4.39	3.03	1.36	NS	NS
This institution has written procedures that clearly define who is responsible for each operation and service	4.28	3.21	1.08	4.29	3.09	1.21	NS	NS
Employee suggestions are used to improve our institution	4.28	2.74	1.54	4.30	2.93	1.36	NS	*
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of administrators	4.28	3.53	0.75	4.21	3.59	0.62	NS	NS
This institution consistently follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievements	4.23	3.24	0.99	4.24	3.09	1.16	NS	NS

Significance levels: NS = no significant difference; * = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001

Section 2: Institutional Goals (priorities sorted by OSUIT COUNT)

RATE: IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all / 5 = "Very important")	OSUIT Mean	Comparison group Mean	Significant difference
A) Increase the enrollment of new students	4.82	4.23	***
B) Retain more of its current students to graduation	4.81	4.64	***
I) Improve employee morale	4.76	4.51	***
G) Improve the quality of existing academic programs	4.65	4.51	**
C) Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	4.38	4.34	NS
H) Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	4.35	3.78	***
D) Recruit students from new geographic markets	4.20	3.86	***
E) Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	3.95	3.86	NS
F) Develop new academic programs	3.89	3.82	NS

Significance levels: NS = no significant difference; * = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) First priority goal:	OSUIT Count	OSUIT Percent	Comparison group Count	Comparison group Percent	Difference
A) Increase the enrollment of new students	52	27.7%	4,173	22.8%	4.9%
I) Improve employee morale	45	23.9%	2,669	14.6%	9.4%
B) Retain more of its current students to graduation	41	21.8%	4,684	25.5%	-3.7%
G) Improve the quality of existing academic programs	30	16.0%	3,029	16.5%	-0.6%
H) Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	7	3.7%	362	2.0%	1.7%
C) Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	5	2.7%	1,849	10.1%	-7.4%
F) Develop new academic programs	5	2.7%	803	4.4%	-1.7%
E) Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	2	1.1%	518	2.8%	-1.8%
D) Recruit students from new geographic markets	1	0.5%	248	1.4%	-0.8%
All responses	188	100.0%	18,335	100.0%	

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) Second priority goal:	OSUIT Count	OSUIT Percent	Comparison group Count	Comparison group Percent	Difference
A) Increase the enrollment of new students	55	29.3%	3419	18.4%	10.8%
B) Retain more of its current students to graduation	54	28.7%	4882	26.3%	2.4%
G) Improve the quality of existing academic programs	26	13.8%	3157	17.0%	-3.2%
I) Improve employee morale	17	9.0%	2141	11.5%	-2.5%
H) Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	9	4.8%	580	3.1%	1.7%
E) Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	8	4.3%	758	4.1%	0.2%
C) Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	7	3.7%	1808	9.7%	-6.0%
D) Recruit students from new geographic markets	6	3.2%	558	3.0%	0.2%
F) Develop new academic programs	6	3.2%	1248	6.7%	-3.5%
All responses	188	100.0%	18,551	100.0%	

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) Third priority goal:	OSUIT Count	OSUIT Percent	Comparison group Count	Comparison group Percent	Difference
A) Increase the enrollment of new students	35	18.8%	2646	14.6%	4.2%
B) Retain more of its current students to graduation	32	17.2%	2890	15.9%	1.3%
G) Improve the quality of existing academic programs	32	17.2%	2926	16.1%	1.1%
I) Improve employee morale	32	17.2%	2783	15.3%	1.9%
H) Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	17	9.1%	957	5.3%	3.9%
C) Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	13	7.0%	1897	10.5%	-3.5%
F) Develop new academic programs	12	6.5%	1918	10.6%	-4.1%
D) Recruit students from new geographic markets	7	3.8%	989	5.5%	-1.7%
E) Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	6	3.2%	1133	6.2%	-3.0%
All responses	186	100.0%	18,139	100.0%	

TOTAL "VOTES" FOR EACH GOAL (sorted by OSUIT TOTAL)	OSUIT TOTAL	OSUIT Percent	Comparison group TOTAL	Comparison group PERCENT	Difference
A) Increase the enrollment of new students	142	25.3%	10,238	18.6%	6.7%
B) Retain more of its current students to graduation	127	22.6%	12,456	22.6%	0.0%
I) Improve employee morale	94	16.7%	7,593	13.8%	2.9%
G) Improve the quality of existing academic programs	88	15.7%	9,112	16.6%	-0.9%
H) Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	33	5.9%	1,899	3.5%	2.4%
C) Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	25	4.4%	5,554	10.1%	-5.6%
F) Develop new academic programs	23	4.1%	3,969	7.2%	-3.1%
E) Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	16	2.8%	2,409	4.4%	-1.5%
D) Recruit students from new geographic markets	14	2.5%	1,795	3.3%	-0.8%
All responses	562	100.0%	55,025	100.0%	

Section 3: Involvement in planning and decision-making (sorted by OSUIT INVOLVEMENT)

RATE: INVOLVEMENT (1 = "Not enough involvement" / 3 = "Just the right involvement" / 5 = "Too much involvement")	OSUIT Mean	Comparison group Mean	Significant difference
How involved are: Senior administrators (VP, Provost level or above)	3.82	3.70	NS
How involved are: OSU-Stillwater (campus-added item)	3.33	n/a	n/a
How involved are: Trustees/Regents	3.24	3.45	**
How involved are: Deans or directors of administrative units	2.98	3.29	***
How involved are: Local government/Chamber of Commerce (campus-added item)	2.98	n/a	n/a
How involved are: Deans or chairs of academic units	2.94	3.24	***
How involved are: Industry Partners/Advisory Committee Members (campus-added item)	2.75	n/a	n/a
How involved are: Alumni	2.53	2.63	NS
How involved are: Faculty	2.32	2.69	***
How involved are: Students	2.26	2.44	**
How involved are: Staff	2.13	2.31	**

Significance levels: NS = no significant difference; * = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001

Section 4: Work environment sorted by OSUIT IMPORTANCE)

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	OSUIT			Comparison group			IMP	SAT
	IMP Mean	SAT Mean	GAP	IMP Mean	SAT Mean	GAP	Sig diff	Sig diff
The employee benefits available to me are valuable	4.66	4.18	0.48	4.55	3.79	0.76	*	***
My department has the staff needed to do its job well	4.62	3.06	1.56	4.56	3.00	1.57	NS	NS
The work I do is valuable to the institution	4.62	3.98	0.63	4.56	3.98	0.58	NS	NS
I am proud to work at this institution	4.61	4.22	0.40	4.55	4.07	0.48	NS	NS
My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say	4.60	4.16	0.43	4.59	3.93	0.66	NS	**
I am paid fairly for the work I do	4.58	3.11	1.47	4.56	2.97	1.59	NS	NS
My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me	4.58	3.97	0.61	4.56	3.73	0.83	NS	**
I have the information I need to do my job well	4.58	3.87	0.71	4.58	3.64	0.93	NS	**
My supervisor helps me improve my job performance	4.56	4.08	0.48	4.46	3.76	0.70	NS	***
The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding	4.55	4.16	0.39	4.57	4.02	0.55	NS	NS
My department has the budget needed to do its job well	4.54	3.17	1.37	4.51	3.00	1.51	NS	NS
The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor	4.53	4.17	0.36	4.47	3.91	0.56	NS	**
I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills	4.44	3.77	0.67	4.36	3.34	1.02	NS	***
My supervisor discusses my performance evaluation with me (campus-added item)	4.44	4.32	0.12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
I have adequate opportunities for professional development	4.43	3.82	0.61	4.36	3.33	1.03	NS	***
My supervisor evaluates my performance formally on a yearly basis (campus-added item)	4.42	4.34	0.08	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
It is easy for me to get information at this institution	4.40	3.34	1.06	4.44	3.26	1.17	NS	NS
I am empowered to resolve problems quickly	4.38	3.52	0.85	4.38	3.37	1.01	NS	NS
My department meets as a team to plan and coordinate work	4.36	4.08	0.28	4.35	3.69	0.65	NS	***
I have adequate opportunities for advancement	4.30	3.20	1.10	4.28	3.00	1.28	NS	*
I am comfortable answering student questions about institutional policies and procedures	4.29	3.66	0.63	4.18	3.54	0.64	NS	NS
My department or work unit has written, up-to-date objectives	4.28	3.82	0.46	4.24	3.58	0.67	NS	**
I learn about important campus events in a timely manner	4.19	3.61	0.58	4.15	3.54	0.61	NS	NS

Significance levels: NS = no significant difference; * = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001

Overall satisfaction	OSUIT Mean	Comparison group Mean	Significant difference
Rate your overall satisfaction with your employment here so far:	3.90	3.82	NS

Significance levels: NS = no significant difference; * = p < .05; ** = p < .01; *** = p < .001

Section 5: Demographics (not sorted)

<i>How long have you worked at this institution?</i>	OSUIT Count	OSUIT Percent	Comparison group Count	Comparison group Percent
Less than 1 year	59	33.3%	6,392	31.7%
1 to 5 years	35	19.8%	4,653	23.1%
6 to 10 years	46	26.0%	4,736	23.5%
11 to 20 years	21	11.9%	1,912	9.5%
More than 20 years	16	9.0%	2,488	12.3%
All responses	177	100.0%	20,181	100.0%

<i>Is your position:</i>	OSUIT Count	OSUIT Percent	Comparison group Count	Comparison group Percent
Faculty	65	36.9%	7,012	38.2%
Staff	91	51.7%	9,443	51.4%
Administrator	20	11.4%	1,899	10.3%
All responses	176	100.0%	18,354	100.0%

<i>Is your position:</i>	OSUIT Count	OSUIT Percent	Comparison group Count	Comparison group Percent
Full-time	178	98.9%	15,810	83.7%
Part-time	2	1.1%	3,074	16.3%
All responses	180	100.0%	18,884	100.0%

Comparison Group	YEARS	TYPE	TYPE II	STATE
Alabama State University	4	Public		Alabama
Alma College	4	Private NFP		Michigan
Alverno College	4	Private NFP		Wisconsin
Ambrose University (Saint Ambrose)	4	Private NFP		Iowa
Baker College	4	Private NFP	Primarily Assoc.	Michigan
Baptist College of Health Sciences	4	Private NFP		Tennessee
Biola University	4	Private NFP		California
Bloomsburg University	4	Public		Pennsylvania
Bluefield State College	4	Public		West Virginia
Booth University College				CANADA
Bryan College of Health Sciences	4	Private NFP		Nebraska
California Lutheran University	4	Private NFP		California
Canadian College of Naturopathic Medicine				CANADA
Cascadia Community College	4	Public	Primarily Assoc.	Washington
Chicago State University	4	Public		Illinois
Criswell College	4	Private NFP		Texas
Daytona State College	4	Public	Primarily Assoc.	Florida
DeSales University	4	Private NFP		Pennsylvania
Dine College	4	Public	Primarily Assoc.	Arizona
Dunwoody College of Technology	4	Private NFP	Primarily Assoc.	Minnesota
Elms College	4	Private NFP		Massachusetts
Friends University	4	Private NFP		Kansas
Gallaudet University	4	Private NFP		Washington, D.C.
Gulf Coast State College	4	Public	Primarily Assoc.	Florida
Indiana Institute of Technology	4	Private NFP		Indiana
King University	4	Private NFP		Tennessee
Laboure College	4	Private NFP	Primarily Assoc.	Massachusetts
Lane College	4	Private NFP		Tennessee
Mars Hill University	4	Private NFP		North Carolina
Mercy College of Ohio	4	Private NFP	Primarily Assoc.	Ohio
Methodist College	4	Private NFP		Illinois
Midland College	4	Public	Primarily Assoc.	Texas
Midstate College	4	Private NFP	Primarily Assoc.	Illinois
Milwaukee School of Engineering	4	Private NFP		Wisconsin
Misericordia University	4	Private NFP		Pennsylvania
Mount Saint Mary College	4	Private NFP		New York
National Louis University	4	Private NFP		Illinois
Nebraska Wesleyan University	4	Private NFP		Nebraska
New Mexico State University	4	Public		New Mexico
Norwich University	4	Private NFP		Vermont
Ottawa University	4	Private NFP		<i>multiple locations</i>
Saint Lukes College of Health Sciences	4	Private NFP		Missouri
Schreiner University	4	Private NFP		Texas
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology	4	Public		South Dakota
Southern Arkansas University Main Campus	4	Public		Arkansas
St Josephs College New York	4	Private NFP		New York
Suffolk University	4	Private NFP		Massachusetts
Touro University California	4	Private NFP	Graduate-level	California
Touro University Nevada	4	Private NFP		Nevada
Unity College	4	Private NFP		Maine
University of Mary	4	Private NFP		North Dakota
University of Saint Francis	4	Private NFP		Indiana
University of St. Thomas	4	Private NFP		Minnesota or Texas
Upper Iowa University	4	Private NFP		Iowa
Viterbo University	4	Private NFP		Wisconsin
West Virginia University at Parkersburg	4	Public	Primarily Assoc.	West Virginia

Notes:

All survey data has been collected within the last 3 years.

Please refer to College Navigator for additional details on individual institutions: <http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/>

APPENDIX C:
OSUIT Comparison Results: 2016 vs. 2019

COLLEGE EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS
OSUIT - Comparing Spring 2016 and Spring 2019 Results

College Employee Satisfaction Report 2019

Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies (sorted by 2019 Mean Importance)

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	2016			2019			2016 to 2019	
	Mean Importance	Mean Satisfaction	GAP	Mean Importance	Mean Satisfaction	GAP	Gap Change	Satis- faction
This institution treats students as its top priority	4.71	3.37	1.34	4.64	3.53	1.12	↓ -0.22	↑ 0.16
The reputation of this institution continues to improve	4.62	3.47	1.15	4.59	3.20	1.38	↑ 0.23	↓ -0.27
Faculty take pride in their work	4.61	3.80	0.81	4.57	3.86	0.71	↓ -0.10	↑ 0.06
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students	4.63	3.36	1.27	4.57	3.43	1.13	↓ -0.13	↑ 0.07
Staff take pride in their work	4.58	3.75	0.83	4.57	3.92	0.65	↓ -0.18	↑ 0.17
This institution is well-respected in the community	4.58	3.53	1.06	4.56	3.56	1.00	↓ -0.05	↑ 0.03
This institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships	4.56	3.61	0.95	4.56	3.69	0.87	↓ -0.08	↑ 0.08
The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose	4.56	3.35	1.22	4.52	3.08	1.44	↑ 0.23	↓ -0.27
Administrators take pride in their work	4.53	3.79	0.74	4.51	3.71	0.80	↑ 0.06	↓ -0.08
Most employees are generally supportive of the mission, purpose, and values of this institution	4.39	3.43	0.96	4.50	3.59	0.91	↓ -0.05	↑ 0.16
Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution	4.48	3.34	1.14	4.48	3.26	1.22	↑ 0.09	↓ -0.09
The mission, purpose, and values of this institution are well understood by most employees	4.36	3.35	1.01	4.48	3.45	1.03	↑ 0.02	↑ 0.11
There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution	4.46	2.93	1.53	4.47	2.95	1.52	→ -0.01	↑ 0.02
The goals and objectives of this institution are consistent with its mission and values	4.41	3.60	0.81	4.46	3.51	0.96	↑ 0.15	↓ -0.09
This institution plans carefully	4.43	3.13	1.30	4.46	3.03	1.43	↑ 0.13	↓ -0.10
There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution	4.38	2.86	1.52	4.45	2.99	1.46	↓ -0.06	↑ 0.14
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of staff	4.39	2.89	1.49	4.45	3.10	1.35	↓ -0.14	↑ 0.20
Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff	4.37	3.05	1.32	4.44	2.94	1.50	↑ 0.18	↓ -0.11
This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives	4.43	3.12	1.30	4.44	3.18	1.26	↓ -0.04	↑ 0.06
There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution	4.34	3.06	1.29	4.40	2.91	1.49	↑ 0.20	↓ -0.14
This institution consistently follows clear processes for orienting and training new employees	4.43	3.06	1.37	4.39	3.29	1.11	↓ -0.27	↑ 0.23
There are effective lines of communication between departments	4.38	2.57	1.81	4.39	2.69	1.70	↓ -0.11	↑ 0.13
This institution consistently follows clear processes for selecting new employees	4.35	3.15	1.21	4.39	3.31	1.08	↓ -0.12	↑ 0.16
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty	4.38	3.09	1.29	4.39	3.09	1.29	→ 0.01	→ 0.00
This institution involves its employees in planning for the future	4.27	3.04	1.23	4.36	2.80	1.56	↑ 0.33	↓ -0.25
This institution makes sufficient staff resources available to achieve important objectives	4.30	3.03	1.27	4.31	3.18	1.12	↓ -0.14	↑ 0.15
This institution has written procedures that clearly define who is responsible for each operation and service	4.32	3.16	1.16	4.28	3.21	1.08	↓ -0.09	↑ 0.04
Employee suggestions are used to improve our institution	4.29	2.89	1.40	4.28	2.74	1.54	↑ 0.14	↓ -0.14
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of administrators	4.20	3.68	0.53	4.28	3.53	0.75	↑ 0.23	↓ -0.15
This institution consistently follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievements	4.20	3.00	1.20	4.23	3.24	0.99	↓ -0.22	↑ 0.24

Section 2: Institutional Goals (sorted by 2019 Mean IMPORTANCE)

RATE: IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all / 5 = "Very important")	2016			2019			Change
	Mean	Std Dev	Valid Resp	Mean	Std Dev	Valid Resp	
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	4.72	0.53	236	4.82	0.43	188	↑ 0.09
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	4.72	0.54	236	4.81	0.44	188	↑ 0.09
[I] Improve employee morale	4.70	0.61	236	4.76	0.63	187	↑ 0.07
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	4.64	0.57	236	4.65	0.66	187	→ 0.01
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	4.44	0.72	236	4.38	0.81	187	↓ -0.06
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	4.27	0.91	234	4.35	0.82	188	↑ 0.08
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	3.94	1.06	236	4.20	1.02	188	↑ 0.25
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	3.66	1.17	236	3.95	1.15	187	↑ 0.29
[F] Develop new academic programs	3.76	1.06	236	3.89	1.04	188	↑ 0.14
[J] Some other goal	3.67	1.26	175	3.73	1.22	135	↑ 0.05

PRIORITIES: TOTAL "VOTES" FOR EACH GOAL (sorted by 2019 TOTAL)	2016					2019					Change in Total Percent
	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL	TOTAL PERCENT	1st	2nd	3rd	TOTAL	TOTAL PERCENT	
[A] Increase the enrollment of new students	68	56	38	162	23.3%	52	55	35	142	25.1%	↑ 1.78%
[B] Retain more of its current students to graduation	59	66	26	151	21.7%	41	54	32	127	22.4%	→ 0.71%
[I] Improve employee morale	35	30	45	110	15.8%	45	17	32	94	16.6%	→ 0.78%
[G] Improve the quality of existing academic programs	34	36	36	106	15.3%	30	26	32	88	15.5%	→ 0.30%
[H] Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	9	11	22	42	6.0%	7	9	17	33	5.8%	→ -0.21%
[C] Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	9	11	18	38	5.5%	5	7	13	25	4.4%	↓ -1.05%
[F] Develop new academic programs	9	13	19	41	5.9%	5	6	12	23	4.1%	↓ -1.84%
[E] Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	4	4	12	20	2.9%	2	8	6	16	2.8%	→ -0.05%
[D] Recruit students from new geographic markets	4	2	14	20	2.9%	1	6	7	14	2.5%	→ -0.40%
[J] Some other goal	1	3	1	5	0.7%	1	1	2	4	0.7%	→ -0.01%
All responses	232	232	231	695	100.0%	189	189	188	566	100.0%	

Section 3: Involvement in Planning and Decision-making (sorted by 2019 Mean INVOLVEMENT)

RATE: INVOLVEMENT (1 = "Not enough involvement" / 3 = "Just the right involvement" / 5 = "Too much involvement")	2016			2019		
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Respondents
How involved are: Senior administrators (VP, Provost level or above)	3.65	0.81	226	3.82	0.89	187
How involved are: OSU-Stillwater	3.36	1.05	226	3.33	1.04	184
How involved are: Trustees/Regents	3.34	0.81	219	3.24	0.91	181
How involved are: Deans or directors of administrative units	3.30	0.84	225	2.98	0.96	186
How involved are: Local government/Chamber of Commerce	2.95	0.82	222	2.98	0.90	178
How involved are: Deans or chairs of academic units	3.20	0.91	226	2.94	0.95	185
How involved are: Industry Partners/Advisory Committee Members	2.84	0.72	225	2.75	0.82	181
How involved are: Alumni	2.44	0.85	225	2.53	0.88	178
How involved are: Faculty	2.51	0.93	229	2.32	0.92	183
How involved are: Students	2.25	0.88	227	2.26	0.88	186
How involved are: Staff	2.29	0.86	228	2.13	0.84	181

Section 4: Work Environment (sorted by 2019 Mean Importance)

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	2016			2019			2016 to 2019		
	Mean Importance	Mean Satisfaction	GAP	Mean Importance	Mean Satisfaction	GAP	Gap change	Satisfaction	
The employee benefits available to me are valuable	4.69	4.03	0.66	4.66	4.18	0.48	↓ -0.18	↑ 0.15	
My department has the staff needed to do its job well	4.57	3.28	1.29	4.62	3.06	1.56	↑ 0.27	↓ -0.22	
The work I do is valuable to the institution	4.57	4.03	0.54	4.62	3.98	0.63	→ 0.09	→ -0.05	
I am proud to work at this institution	4.62	4.30	0.33	4.61	4.22	0.40	→ 0.07	→ -0.08	
My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say	4.59	3.92	0.67	4.60	4.16	0.43	↓ -0.23	↑ 0.25	
I am paid fairly for the work I do	4.57	2.97	1.60	4.58	3.11	1.47	↓ -0.12	↑ 0.14	
My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me	4.60	3.81	0.79	4.58	3.97	0.61	↓ -0.17	↑ 0.16	
I have the information I need to do my job well	4.59	3.71	0.88	4.58	3.87	0.71	↓ -0.17	↑ 0.16	
My supervisor helps me improve my job performance	4.53	3.81	0.72	4.56	4.08	0.48	↓ -0.25	↑ 0.27	
The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding	4.51	4.06	0.46	4.55	4.16	0.39	→ -0.06	→ 0.10	
My department has the budget needed to do its job well	4.60	2.80	1.80	4.54	3.17	1.37	↓ -0.42	↑ 0.37	
The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor	4.52	3.96	0.56	4.53	4.17	0.36	↓ -0.19	↑ 0.21	
I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills	4.40	3.38	1.02	4.44	3.77	0.67	↓ -0.36	↑ 0.39	
My supervisor discusses my performance evaluation with me.	4.36	4.21	0.15	4.44	4.32	0.12	→ -0.03	↑ 0.11	
I have adequate opportunities for professional development	4.36	3.41	0.95	4.43	3.82	0.61	↓ -0.34	↑ 0.41	
My supervisor evaluates my performance formally on a yearly basis.	4.34	4.27	0.07	4.42	4.34	0.08	→ 0.01	→ 0.07	
It is easy for me to get information at this institution	4.51	3.30	1.21	4.40	3.34	1.06	↓ -0.15	→ 0.04	
I am empowered to resolve problems quickly	4.45	3.51	0.94	4.38	3.52	0.85	→ -0.09	→ 0.01	
My department meets as a team to plan and coordinate work	4.36	3.74	0.62	4.36	4.08	0.28	↓ -0.34	↑ 0.34	
I have adequate opportunities for advancement	4.30	2.92	1.39	4.30	3.20	1.10	↓ -0.29	↑ 0.28	
I am comfortable answering student questions about institutional policies and procedures	4.37	3.65	0.72	4.29	3.66	0.63	→ -0.09	→ 0.01	
My department or work unit has written, up-to-date objectives	4.29	3.62	0.67	4.28	3.82	0.46	↓ -0.21	↑ 0.21	
I learn about important campus events in a timely manner	4.28	3.45	0.82	4.19	3.61	0.58	↓ -0.24	↑ 0.16	
							TOTAL ↓ -3.50	↑ 3.48	

Section 5: Demographics (not sorted)

<i>How long have you worked at this institution?</i>	2016		2019		2016-2019
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Change
Less than 1 year	22	9.8%	21	11.9%	↑ 2.04%
1 to 5 years	98	43.8%	59	33.3%	↓ -10.42%
6 to 10 years	39	17.4%	46	26.0%	↑ 8.58%
11 to 20 years	44	19.6%	35	19.8%	⇒ 0.13%
More than 20 years	21	9.4%	16	9.0%	⇒ -0.34%
All responses	224	100.0%	177	100.0%	

<i>Is your position:</i>	2016		2019		2016-2019
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Change
Administrator	20	9.0%	20	11.4%	↑ 2.31%
Faculty	85	38.5%	65	36.9%	↓ -1.53%
Staff	116	52.5%	91	51.7%	⇒ -0.78%
All responses	221	100.0%	176	100.0%	

<i>Is your position:</i>	2016		2019		2016-2019
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Change
Full-time	223	98.7%	178	98.9%	⇒ 0.22%
Part-time	3	1.3%	2	1.1%	⇒ -0.22%
All responses	226	100.0%	180	100.0%	

Summary Items*

<i>I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great place to work:</i>	2016		2019		2016-2019
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Change
Strongly agree	102	45.1%	75	40.8%	↓ -4.37%
Somewhat agree	80	35.4%	77	41.8%	↑ 6.45%
Neither agree nor disagree	19	8.4%	17	9.2%	⇒ 0.83%
Somewhat disagree	15	6.6%	11	6.0%	⇒ -0.66%
Strongly disagree	10	4.4%	4	2.2%	↓ -2.25%
All responses	226	100.0%	184	100.0%	

<i>I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college:</i>	2016		2019		2016-2019
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Change
Strongly agree	150	65.8%	115	62.2%	↓ -3.63%
Somewhat agree	56	24.6%	55	29.7%	↑ 5.17%
Neither agree nor disagree	15	6.6%	9	4.9%	↓ -1.71%
Somewhat disagree	2	0.9%	6	3.2%	↑ 2.37%
Strongly disagree	5	2.2%	0	0.0%	↓ -2.19%
All responses	228	100.0%	185	100.0%	