College Employee Satisfaction Survey

August 2020

Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology
Okmulgee, Oklahoma

Office of Institutional Research

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

General Results

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*. Due to several substantial changes on campus during the administration of this survey in spring 2019, the administration requested the CESS be repeated in spring 2020.

General results revealed:

- Faculty, staff, and administrators take pride in their work;
- OSUIT promotes excellent employee-student relationships; and,
- OSUIT is well-respected in the community.

On the other hand:

- Communication between staff and the administration could improve.
- Employees question the administration's sense of purpose and careful planning; and,
- Employees are concerned about quality improvement efforts and the reputation of OSUIT.

Employee perceptions of Institutional goals focused on 1) improving retention, 2) addressing employee morale, and 3) increasing enrollment. Senior administrators, OSU-Stillwater, and Trustees/Regents were perceived as exhibiting *more than enough involvement* in planning and decision-making, while students, staff, faculty, alumni, and industry partners were perceived as exhibiting *not quite enough involvement*.

As for satisfaction with the work environment, employees were satisfied with how 1) supervisors evaluated and discussed performance with employees, 2) employees were proud to work at OSUIT, and 3) they found the work personally rewarding.

Benchmarks

OSUIT employees rated items on importance quite similarly to the comparison group. However, OSUIT employees tended to be less satisfied than the comparison group on several items. OSUIT employees were less satisfied than the comparison group regarding the following: (Note: * .05 level of significance, ** .01 level of significance, *** .001 level of significance)

- This institution treats students as its top priority. ***
- This institution involves its employees in planning for the future. ***
- The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose. **
- This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty. **
- There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution. **
- Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution. *
- This institution consistently follows clear processes for selecting new employees. *
- This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students. *

Employees at OSUIT rated the following items as more important than did the comparison group:

- Improve employee morale. *
- Increase the enrollment of new students. ***
- Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds. ***
- Recruit students from new geographic markets. ***

Changes over time

Employees in 2020 were less satisfied than in 2019 with the way new employees were selected. Employees continued to perceive students, staff, and faculty as not quite involved enough in planning and decision-making, while senior administrators were clearly perceived as having more than enough involvement. Director-level administrators were perceived as more involved in 2020, as were deans of academic units. Local government/Chamber of Commerce was perceived as being closest to "just the right involvement." Employees were less satisfied with how their job responsibilities were communicated to them, and they were less satisfied with their opportunities for advancement. Several comments referred to experienced employees being passed over for promotions in favor of outside applicants. Employees in 2020 reported they would be slightly more likely to recommend OSUIT to family and friends as a great place to work, but slightly less likely to recommend OSUIT as a great college as compared to their 2019 responses.

COLLEGE EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION 2020

Introduction

The College Employee Satisfaction Survey (CESS) is one of several surveys included in the Research Toolkit by Ruffalo Noel Levitz. Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology-Okmulgee (OSUIT) first administered the CESS in 2016 and again in 2019; it is included in a rotation of surveys administered every third year. The CESS measures the satisfaction of faculty, staff, and administrators in the areas of *Campus Culture and Policies* (Section 1) and *Work Environment* (Section 4). The CESS also measures employee priorities for *Institutional Goals* (Section 2) and levels of *Involvement in Planning and Decision Making* (Section 3) among OSUIT's stakeholder groups.

Due to noteworthy events during the 2018-2019 academic year, OSUIT employees were surveyed again in spring 2020. Noteworthy events included restructuring of ten academic schools into four which also included closure of some academic programs and an application and hiring process to fill all academic dean positions. During this time, the Learning Management System used throughout the OSU system was also being replaced. Although some return to normalcy was anticipated, the spring 2020 administration of the CESS was likely influenced by preparations for the Higher Learning Commission's 10-year site visit in March 2020 as well as the concerns over the looming threat of a coronavirus pandemic.

Notification and Administration

Efforts were made to minimize employee concerns regarding 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 an email 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 encouraged employee questions and attempted to make the process as open and transparent as possible while maintaining employee confidentiality.

The initial invitation to participate, signed by President Path, was sent on February 13, 2020 from Institutional Research, and the survey link was sent on February 14, 2020. A total of 305 full- and part-time employees were included in this distribution. Follow-up reminder emails were sent from Institutional Research with a final reminder from the Office of Academic Affairs on March 11, 2020. The survey closed on March 16, 2020. Out of the 305 employees in the initial sample, 174 submitted surveys for an overall response rate of 57.0%; some survey submissions were incomplete, so tables include tallies of valid counts of respondents (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:

How long have you worked at this institution?	Count	Percent
Less than 1 year	21	13.4%
1 to 5 years	54	34.4%
6 to 10 years	43	27.4%
11 to 20 years	28	17.8%
More than 20 years	11	7.0%
All responses	157	100.0%

Is your position:	Count	Percent
Faculty	65	42.8%
Staff	66	43.4%
Administrator (Director-level or above)	21	13.8%
All responses	152	100.0%

Is your position:	Count	Percent
Full-time	156	100.0%
Part-time	0	0.0%
All responses	199	100.0%

When asked, "How long have you worked at this institution?" results showed that the 157 responding employees were reasonably distributed. Fewer staff responded in 2020 (66) than in 2019 (91), while the number of faculty and administrators remained relatively unchanged. Employment status showed that among the 174 employees reporting, none self-identified as part-time versus two (2) in 2019.

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 planning and decision-making process, from *not enough involvement* to *too much involvement*; custom items were added to represent groups or institutions recognized on this campus as affecting 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. <u>Work environment</u>. Employees rated importance and satisfaction on issues such as information flow, employee empowerment, supervisor relationships, professional development, job satisfaction and personal fulfillment. 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 ended with a single item of overall satisfaction using the "Satisfaction" scale of 1 = "not satisfied at all" to 5 = "very satisfied."

5. <u>Demographics</u>. 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 OSU IT 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 ratings of *satisfaction*, but also on ratings of *importance,* which lend 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 an institution's list of priorities regardless of the level of satisfaction reported for that item.

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.

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.

<u>Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies</u>
Following are the strengths and challenges identified during the 2020 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)
- Faculty take pride in their work. (3.96)
- The institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships. (3.87)
- Staff take pride in their work. (3.85)
- Administrators take pride in their work. (3.74)
- This institution is well-respected in the community. (3.64)
- This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students. (3.55)

Challenges (high importance and low satisfaction, large gap)
- There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution. (2.99)
- There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution. (3.05)
- There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution. (3.13)
- The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose. (3.21)
- This institution consistently follows clear processes for orienting and training new employees. (3.32)
- This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives. (3.35)
- Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution. (3.36)
- The reputation of this institution continues to improve. (3.39)
- This institution treats students as its top priority. (3.51)

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 tally of endorsements were:

1) Increase the enrollment of new students,
2) Retain more of its current students to graduation, and
3) Improve the quality of existing academic programs.

Section 3: Involvement in Planning and Decision-making

Employees rated the involvement of various categories of stakeholders; these are reported using a bipolar five-point scale as follows:

1 = not enough involvement
2 = not quite enough involvement
3 = just the right involvement
4 = more than enough involvement
5 = too much involvement

Consistent with the 2019 results, employees reported that staff, students, faculty, alumni, and industry partners were not quite involved enough in planning and decision-making at OSUIT while senior administrators were involved more than enough. Also reported as more involved, but to a lesser extent, were OSU-Stillwater, Trustees/Regents, administrative deans or directors, and academic deans. The local government/Chamber of Commerce was reportedly perceived as having *just the right involvement* in planning and decision-making at OSUIT.

Section 4: Work environment

The following are strengths and challenges identified during the 2020 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)
- I am proud to work at this institution. (4.20)
- The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding. (4.19)
- My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say. (4.10)
- The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor. (4.03)
- The employee benefits available to me are valuable. (4.03)
- My supervisor helps me improve my job performance. (3.97)
- The work I do is valuable to the institution. (3.95)
- I have the information I need to do my job well. (3.76)
- My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me. (3.69)

Challenges (high importance and low satisfaction, large gap)
- I am paid fairly for the work I do. (3.06)
- My department has the staff needed to do its job well. (3.21)
- My department has the budget needed to do its job well. (3.32)

Summary items

Included in Section 4 was a single item to rate an employee's overall satisfaction working at OSUIT; 158 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 3.86 on the five-point scale.

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 83.0% of the 159 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 90.6% of the 159 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 6 community and technical colleges from the United States who had administered the CESS at some time over the past five years; all six were 4-year public institutions that primarily grant associate-level degrees (full list of comparison institutions included in appendix B). Aside from the fact that no OSUIT employees reported themselves as being in part-time status, the differences in responses were unremarkable.

Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies

The difference between the mean importance score for OSUIT employees and the comparison group mean did not exceed 0.10 for any 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: (Note: * .05 level of significance, ** .01 level of significance, *** .001 level of significance)

- This institution treats students as its top priority. ***
- This institution involves its employees in planning for the future. ***
- The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose. **
- This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty. **
- This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students. *
- There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution. *
- Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution. *
- This institution consistently follows clear processes for selecting new employees. *

Section 2: Institutional Goals

With one exception, the importance of the top-rated goals among OSUIT employees was higher than the comparison group. OSUIT's top-rated goals included: (Note: * .05 level of significance, ** .01 level of significance, *** .001 level of significance, n.s.=not statistically significant)

- Retain more of its current students to graduation. *(n.s.)*
- Increasing the enrollment of new students. ***
- Improve employee morale. ***
- Recruit students from new geographic markets. ***

Section 3: Involvement in Planning and Decision-making

Responses by OSUIT employees suggest that our faculty were not quite involved enough in planning and decision-making, even less than faculty from comparison group institutions (*p<.001*). On the other hand, employee responses suggest that our senior administrators were more than enough involved, and more so than the comparison group (*p<.001*). Likewise, our Trustees/Regents were more than enough involved, and students not quite involved enough, when benchmarked against the comparison group (*p<.05*).

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 the following items: (Note: * .05 level of significance, ** .01 level of significance, *** .001 level of significance, *n.s.=*not statistically significant)

- I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills. ***
- I have adequate opportunities for professional development. ***
- I am comfortable answering student questions about institutional policies and procedures. *

Summary items

The difference in overall satisfaction with employment at OSUIT (3.86) versus the comparison group 3.91) was not statistically significant. As the remaining two summary items were added by OSUIT, there is no data for the comparison group.

Additional Analyses: Comparison of OSUIT 2016, 2019 and 2020 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 a follow-up administration. Due to a major realignment of academic schools, program closures, and changes in leadership, the institutional research office was asked to administer the CESS again in 2020. The following analyses compare OSUIT employees' results from 2016, 2019, and 2020 on the CESS (see appendix C for data tables).

Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies

OSUIT employee satisfaction with *Campus Culture and Policies* items was placed in context by the relative importance of each item. Items above the median based on *importance* for 2020 were included with comparable results from 2016 and 2019; previous results falling below the median threshold for importance were marked "n/a" (not applicable) in the table below. Items with a relatively small performance gap (difference between mean *importance* and mean *satisfaction*) were listed as strengths, while items with large performance gaps were listed as challenges, as follows:

Items in order of importance (highest to lowest)	2016	2019	2020
This institution treats students as its top priority	Strength	Strength	Strength
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students	Strength	Strength	Strength
Staff take pride in their work	Strength	Strength	Strength
The reputation of this institution continues to improve	Strength	Challenge	Strength
Faculty take pride in their work	Strength	Strength	Strength
This institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships	Strength	Strength	Strength
Administrators take pride in their work	Strength	Strength	Strength
The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose	Strength	Challenge	Challenge
There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution	n/a	n/a	Challenge
This institution is well-respected in the community	Strength	Strength	Strength
Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution	Strength	Strength	Strength
This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives	Challenge	n/a	Strength
There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution	Challenge	Challenge	Challenge
This institution consistently follows clear processes for orienting and training new employees	Challenge	n/a	Strength
There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution	n/a	n/a	Challenge

Section 2: Institutional Goals

For each of the three administrations of the CESS on the OSUIT campus, employees listed the same top four goals on the importance scale:

- Increase the enrollment of new students
- Retain more of its current students to graduation
- Improve employee morale
- Improve the quality of existing programs

The prevailing message from the Office of Student Services throughout the administration period 2016-2020 has been, and continues to be, the need to enroll and retain students. When employees listed goals by priority (first, second, and third), *Increase enrollment of new students* and *Retain more of its current students to graduation* continued as the highest-ranking goals. Although *Improve employee morale* was listed with the highest mean importance score (tied with *Increase enrollment of new students*, mean importance = 4.76), once the total votes for each goal were tallied, it was the *fourth* priority for employees in 2020 behind *Improve the quality of existing programs*.

Section 3: Involvement in Planning and Decision-making

The involvement of stakeholder groups in planning and decision-making at OSUIT (using a five-point scale: 1 = not enough involvement, 2 = not quite enough involvement, 3 = just the right involvement, 4 = more than enough involvement, 5 = too much involvement) did not vary greatly between 2016 and 2020. However, one consistent trend over time shows that employees perceived the senior administrators (VP and above) as having more than enough involvement in planning and decision-making, increasingly so with each successive administration of the CESS. The following table shows results for the three administrations of the CESS based on 2020 mean scores for involvement (lowest to highest):

Stakeholder Groups	2016	2019	2020
Students	2.25	2.26	2.22
Staff	2.29	2.13	2.26
Faculty	2.51	2.32	2.39
Alumni	2.44	2.53	2.53
Industry Partners/Advisory Committee Members	2.84	2.75	2.76
Local government/Chamber of Commerce	2.95	2.98	3.08
Deans or chairs of academic units	3.20	2.94	3.18
Deans or directors of administrative units	3.30	2.98	3.27
Trustees	3.34	3.24	3.32
OSU-Stillwater	3.36	3.33	3.40
Senior administrators (VP, Provost level or above)	3.65	3.82	3.92

Section 4: Work Environment

With major changes in the work environment during the 2019 administration of the CESS, some differences in results were expected. Satisfaction with the work environment decreased from 2019 to 2020 for *I have adequate opportunities for advancement* and *My job responsibilities are communicated*

clearly to me. The table below shows an analysis of the results from each of the past three administrations of the CESS on items pertaining to satisfaction with the Work Environment. Items above the median on *importance* for 2020 were included with comparable results from 2016 and 2019. Items with a relatively small performance gap (mean *importance* minus mean *satisfaction*) were listed as strengths, while items with larger performance gaps were listed as challenges, as follows:

Items in order of importance (highest to lowest)	2016	2019	2020
I am paid fairly for the work I do	Challenge	Challenge	Challenge
My department has the staff needed to do its job well	Challenge	Challenge	Challenge
My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say	Strength	Strength	Strength
The employee benefits available to me are valuable	Strength	Strength	Strength
I am proud to work at this institution	Strength	Strength	Strength
My department has the budget needed to do its job well	Challenge	Challenge	Challenge
The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding	Strength	Strength	Strength
The work I do is valuable to the institution	Strength	Strength	Strength
My supervisor helps me improve my job performance	Strength	Strength	Strength
I have the information I need to do my job well	Strength	Strength	Challenge
My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me	Strength	Strength	Challenge
The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor	Strength	Strength	Strength

Summary items

The differences in mean satisfaction from 2016 (3.88), 2019 (3.90), and 2020 (3.86) for the summary item *Overall Satisfaction* were not statistically significant. Two additional summary items were included; these were optional campus-defined items and not part of the original survey. Because the campus-added items were retained unchanged from the 2019 administration of the CESS, trend comparisons were made possible.

For the campus-added item *I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great place to work*, as shown below, responses did not vary greatly over the three administration periods:

I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great place to work:	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Strongly agree	102	45.10%	75	40.80%	72	45.30%
Somewhat agree	80	35.40%	77	41.80%	60	37.70%
Neither agree nor disagree	19	8.40%	17	9.20%	15	9.40%
Somewhat disagree	15	6.60%	11	6.00%	7	4.40%
Strongly disagree	10	4.40%	4	2.20%	5	3.10%
All responses	226	100.00%	184	100.00%	159	100.00%

Likewise, responses to the campus-added item *I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college* did not vary greatly:

I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college:	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Strongly agree	150	65.80%	115	62.20%	100	62.90%
Somewhat agree	56	24.60%	55	29.70%	44	27.70%
Neither agree nor disagree	15	6.60%	9	4.90%	11	6.90%
Somewhat disagree	2	0.90%	6	3.20%	3	1.90%
Strongly disagree	5	2.20%	0	0.00%	1	0.60%
All responses	228	100.00%	185	100.00%	159	100.00%

Whereas overall satisfaction over the three administration periods ranged from 3.86 to 3.90 on a five-point scale, employees showed greater satisfaction in response to the campus-added summary items. Mean satisfaction for *I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great place to work* ranged from 4.10 in 2016 to 4.18 in 2020. Likewise, mean satisfaction for *I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college* was 4.51 in 2016 and 2019, and 4.50 in 2020.

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 within. All comments as written were provided to Dr. Path; redacted comments were delivered 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.

Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies

The first open-ended comment area in the survey appeared 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-quarter of the respondents (47) commented on this item.

Section 2: Institutional Goals

Comments for 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 41 responses followed by 18 additional responses to the follow-up item, "Please provide any additional feedback about OSUIT's goals."

Section 4: Work Environment

Comments on Work Environment included an open-ended item resulting in 30 responses addressing the item, "Please provide any additional feedback about the work environment at Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology."

Feedback works best when it is sought and accepted. Surveys such as the CESS are administered for the purpose of communication and feedback, to allow employees to voice their opinions, each expressing their individual perspectives. Because everyone's perspective is unique, the voices sometimes contradict each other.   With each comment read, campus leaders receive the feedback needed to determine what may be considered the collective voice of the campus. More than a few responses across all the open-ended responses appeared to reflect content from the scaled items in the survey. Several responses were very pointed, particularly regarding communication, leadership, and quality of instruction. Other responses clearly reflected employee pride in the institution and appreciation of their co-workers within their departments. Regardless of the character of the response, mitigating factors should be considered to place these responses in their proper context.

For example, at the time of the spring 2019 administration of the CESS, there had been a recent salary increase that some employees considered inequitable. Further, efforts were under way to reconfigure the academic schools and their leadership which led to heightened concerns across campus, even with listening sessions provided to communicate the planned changes and allow for employee discussion and feedback. During that same period, the learning management system, *Desire2Learn*, was replaced with *Canvas*. The CESS was administered again in spring 2020 to see if attitudes and opinions might have improved "after the dust settled". Consequently, challenges continued including the threat of a worldwide pandemic. Due to the continuation of such impactful events, some employee concerns have become more difficult to address such as more hands-on experiences for students, better communication, more employee recognition, and better relationships with industry partners. State budgets continue to tighten. Disruption, constraint, and cancellation of campus-wide events further impact the campus climate.

Conclusions

Results from the 2020 administration of the CESS at OSUIT revealed 1) OSUIT employees take pride in their work; 2) OSUIT promotes excellent employee-student relationships; 3) OSUIT is well respected in the community; and 4) OSUIT does a good job of meeting the needs of students. On the other hand, 1) communication between staff and the administration could improve; 2) employees question the administration's sense of purpose; 3) employees are concerned about quality improvement efforts and our reputation at OSUIT. Our most important Institutional goals focus on improving retention with resulting increases in graduation rates, increasing enrollment of new students, improving the quality of existing academic programs, and employee morale. While the local chamber of commerce is perceived as having the right amount of involvement in planning and decision-making, senior administrators are perceived as having more than enough involvement. Implied is that administrators do not listen to employee opinions or feedback when making decisions. Other stakeholders seen as having more than enough involvement in planning and decision-making for OSUIT include OSU-Stillwater and Trustees/Regents. Stakeholders seen as not quite enough involved include students, staff, faculty, alumni, and industry partners. As for satisfaction with the work environment, 1) supervisors evaluate and discuss performance with employees, 2) employees are proud to work at OSUIT, and 3) they find the work personally rewarding. In 2020, employees were slightly more likely to recommend OSUIT to family and friends as a great place to work, but slightly less likely to recommend OSUIT as a great college than in 2019.

<u>Benchmarks</u>

The comparison group setting the benchmarks for 2019 consisted of 56 institutions, only 13 of which were public institutions; at least 43 institutions were private colleges. For 2020, only six comparison institutions were listed, but all were public institutions in the United States and 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 than the comparison group on several items. OSUIT employees were less satisfied than the comparison group regarding the following: (Note: * .05 level of significance, ** .01 level of significance, *** .001 level of significance)

- This institution treats students as its top priority. ***
- This institution involves its employees in planning for the future. ***
- The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose. **
- This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty. **
- There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution. **
- Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution. *
- This institution consistently follows clear processes for selecting new employees. *
- This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students. *

Employees at OSUIT rated the following as *more* important than did the comparison group:

- Improve employee morale. *
- Increase the enrollment of new students. ***
- Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds. ***
- Recruit students from new geographic markets. ***

On the other hand, OSUIT employees rated *Improve the academic ability of entering student classes* as less important than did the comparison group (*p<.05*).

Students, staff, and faculty at OSUIT were considered *not involved enough* in planning and decision-making, even less so than those from the comparison group. OSUIT senior administrators and Trustees/Regents were considered too involved in planning and decision making versus the benchmark.

<u>Changes over time</u>

Employee satisfaction with *Campus Culture and Policies* at OSUIT generally increased from the first administration in 2016 to the 2019 administration. However, employees in 2019 were less satisfied than in 2016 with their level of involvement in planning for the future, with leadership's sense of purpose, and with OSUIT's reputation. *Institutional goals* remained the same, but levels of importance were greater for 2019 employees. In 2019, employees reported that faculty were not involved enough in planning and decision-making compared to 2016, whereas in 2016 deans and directors were perceived as being more than enough involved. Satisfaction regarding the *Work Environment* increased in most cases, though *having enough staff to do the job well* did show a decline among employees in 2019. Overall satisfaction remained the same, and endorsement of OSUIT *as a great place to work* and *as a great college* both increased slightly in 2019, although with fewer extreme responses (ex., "Strongly agree").

Employee satisfaction with *Campus Culture and Policies* remained unchanged between 2019 and 2020. However, current employees were less satisfied than in 2019 with the way new employees were selected. Institutional goals also remained the same in 2020 from 2019. Employee perceptions of students, staff, and faculty involvement in planning and decision-making were lowest among stakeholders at OSUIT as having not quite enough involvement. On the other hand, senior administrators (director-level and above) were perceived as having more than enough involvement, increasingly so since the initial CESS report in 2016. Also listed in 2020 as having more than enough involvement were OSU-Stillwater and the Trustees/Regents. Director-level administrators and deans of academic units were perceived as more involved than in 2019. Local government/Chamber of Commerce was perceived as being closest to "just the right involvement". However, this should not be overstated. All employee perceptions fell between 2.22 and 3.92 on a one-to-five scale within the moderate ratings of the scale (2 = not quite enough involvement, 4 = more than enough involvement), but not extending into the extremes of this bipolar scale (1 = not enough involvement, 5 = too much involvement).

Over time, employees have become less satisfied with how their job responsibilities were communicated to them, and less satisfied with their opportunities for advancement. Several open-ended comments in 2020 referred to experienced employees being passed over for promotions in favor of outside applicants.

Detailed results are found in the appendices. Appendix A provides the main report; it also includes a listing of the satisfaction items (Sections 1 and 4) arranged from most-to-least important. Appendix B provides benchmarking data with OSUIT results shown side-by-side with those of the comparison group followed by the list of comparison group institutions used in the 2020 analysis. Appendix C provides tables with side-by-side results from the 2016, 2019, and 2020 administrations of the CESS.

Submitted by:

Curtis Miller, Analyst

OSUIT Institutional Research

APPENDIX A:

Results of College Employee Satisfaction Survey:

Main Report and Satisfaction Items Sorted by Importance

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 Mean	Importance Standard Deviation	Importance Valid Count	Satisfaction Mean	Satisfaction Standard Deviation	Satisfaction Valid Count	Gap: Mean Difference
This institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships	4.57	.62	171	3.87	.84	171	0.70
This institution treats students as its top priority	4.65	.63	171	3.51	1.03	171	1.14
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students	4.63	.59	170	3.55	.92	169	1.08
The mission, purpose, and values of this institution are well understood by most employees	4.33	.72	171	3.56	.98	171	0.77
Most employees are generally supportive of the mission, purpose, and values of this institution	4.41	.66	171	3.63	.94	171	0.78
The goals and objectives of this institution are consistent with its mission and values	4.44	.70	171	3.68	1.02	171	0.76
This institution involves its employees in planning for the future	4.38	.79	170	2.85	1.22	171	1.53
This institution plans carefully	4.43	.70	170	3.12	1.22	170	1.31
The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose	4.55	.74	169	3.21	1.36	170	1.34
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty	4.39	.78	171	3.13	1.17	171	1.26
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of staff	4.44	.73	162	3.14	1.05	162	1.30
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of administrators	4.24	.80	164	3.69	.94	160	0.55
This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives	4.48	.68	164	3.35	1.09	161	1.13
This institution makes sufficient staff resources available to achieve important objectives	4.39	.70	164	3.33	1.04	161	1.06
There are effective lines of communication between departments	4.44	.74	165	2.82	1.20	162	1.62
Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff	4.44	.71	166	3.07	1.25	163	1.37
There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution	4.52	.62	165	2.99	1.24	161	1.53
There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution	4.45	.73	163	3.13	1.18	159	1.32
Faculty take pride in their work	4.61	.61	166	3.96	.95	164	0.65
Staff take pride in their work	4.62	.55	165	3.85	.92	162	0.77
Administrators take pride in their work	4.57	.68	163	3.74	1.07	159	0.83
There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution	4.47	.63	160	3.05	1.16	160	1.42
The reputation of this institution continues to improve	4.62	.59	161	3.39	1.29	158	1.23
This institution is well-respected in the community	4.51	.62	161	3.64	1.07	158	0.87
Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution	4.50	.65	160	3.36	1.15	158	1.14
Employee suggestions are used to improve our institution	4.33	.75	161	2.87	1.21	156	1.46

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	Importance Mean	Importance Standard Deviation	Importance Valid Count	Satisfaction Mean	Satisfaction Standard Deviation	Satisfaction Valid Count	Gap: Mean Difference
This institution consistently follows clear processes for selecting new employees	4.37	.72	160	3.04	1.26	159	1.33
This institution consistently follows clear processes for orienting and training new employees	4.47	.64	158	3.32	1.22	157	1.15
This institution consistently follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievements	4.32	.79	159	3.17	1.18	158	1.15
This institution has written procedures that clearly define who is responsible for each operation and service	4.42	.64	160	3.25	1.16	159	1.17

Section 2: Institutional Goals

RATE: IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all / 5 = "Very important")	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Count
Increase the enrollment of new students	4.75	0.49	161
Retain more of its current students to graduation	4.76	0.51	161
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	4.30	0.95	161
Recruit students from new geographic markets	4.18	0.95	161
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	3.89	1.14	159
Develop new academic programs	3.89	0.99	161
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	4.63	0.58	160
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	4.30	0.82	161
Improve employee morale	4.76	0.47	160
Some other goal	3.39	1.26	111

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) First priority goal:	Count	Percent
Increase the enrollment of new students	59	36.6%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	32	19.9%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	5	3.1%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	4	2.5%
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	5	3.1%
Develop new academic programs	5	3.1%
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	28	17.4%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	3	1.9%
Improve employee morale	20	12.4%
Some other goal	0	0.0%
All responses	161	100.0%

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) Second priority goal:	Count	Percent
Increase the enrollment of new students	37	23.0%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	51	31.7%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	8	5.0%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	3	1.9%
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	2	1.2%
Develop new academic programs	12	7.5%
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	16	9.9%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	11	6.8%
Improve employee morale	20	12.4%
Some other goal	1	0.6%
All responses	161	100.0%

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) Third priority goal:	Count	Percent
Increase the enrollment of new students	25	15.7%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	20	12.6%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	11	6.9%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	12	7.5%
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	12	7.5%
Develop new academic programs	9	5.7%
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	28	17.6%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	11	6.9%
Improve employee morale	29	18.2%
Some other goal	2	1.3%
All responses	159	100.0%

TOTAL "VOTES" FOR EACH GOAL	First Priority	Second Priority	Third Priority	Total	Total Percent
Increase the enrollment of new students	59	37	25	121	25.2%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	32	51	20	103	21.4%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	5	8	11	24	5.0%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	4	3	12	19	4.0%
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	5	2	12	19	4.0%
Develop new academic programs	5	12	9	26	5.4%
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	28	16	28	72	15.0%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	3	11	11	25	5.2%
Improve employee morale	20	20	29	69	14.3%
Some other goal	0	1	2	3	0.6%
All responses	161	161	159	481	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 Count
How involved are: Faculty	2.39	0.93	159
How involved are: Staff	2.26	0.84	157
How involved are: Deans or directors of administrative units	3.27	0.89	156
How involved are: Deans or chairs of academic units	3.18	0.84	156
How involved are: Senior administrators (VP, Provost level or above)	3.92	0.86	158
How involved are: Students	2.22	0.82	158
How involved are: Trustees/Regents	3.32	0.81	155
How involved are: Alumni	2.53	0.77	156
How involved are: Local government/Chamber of Commerce	3.08	0.85	155
How involved are: Industry Partners/Advisory Committee Members	2.76	0.74	158
How involved are: OSU-Stillwater	3.40	1.00	158

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 Mean	Importance Standard Deviation	Importance Valid Count	Satisfaction Mean	Satisfaction Standard Deviation	Satisfaction Valid Count	Gap: Mean Difference
It is easy for me to get information at this institution	4.44	0.66	160	3.38	1.03	157	1.06
I learn about important campus events in a timely manner	4.25	0.71	160	3.64	0.97	158	0.61
I am empowered to resolve problems quickly	4.50	0.61	160	3.58	1.07	158	0.92
I am comfortable answering student questions about institutional policies and procedures	4.30	0.78	160	3.82	0.93	157	0.48
I have the information I need to do my job well	4.53	0.63	159	3.76	1.00	157	0.77
My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me	4.53	0.56	159	3.69	1.03	156	0.84
My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say	4.58	0.57	159	4.10	1.13	157	0.48
My supervisor helps me improve my job performance	4.54	0.62	157	3.97	1.14	158	0.57
My department or work unit has written, up-to-date objectives	4.36	0.74	159	3.75	1.09	158	0.61
My department meets as a team to plan and coordinate work	4.44	0.70	159	3.96	1.10	158	0.48
My department has the budget needed to do its job well	4.56	0.56	158	3.32	1.11	154	1.24
My department has the staff needed to do its job well	4.59	0.58	159	3.21	1.16	156	1.38
I am paid fairly for the work I do	4.62	0.56	157	3.06	1.18	157	1.56
The employee benefits available to me are valuable	4.58	0.61	159	4.03	0.81	157	0.55
I have adequate opportunities for advancement	4.28	0.89	159	2.93	1.21	157	1.35
I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills	4.47	0.69	159	3.80	1.04	157	0.67
I have adequate opportunities for professional development	4.41	0.76	158	3.83	0.96	156	0.58
The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding	4.56	0.59	158	4.19	1.00	157	0.37
The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor	4.51	0.58	159	4.03	1.06	157	0.48
The work I do is valuable to the institution	4.55	0.56	159	3.95	1.04	157	0.60
I am proud to work at this institution	4.57	0.62	158	4.20	1.00	157	0.37
My supervisor evaluates my performance formally on a yearly basis	4.31	0.84	159	4.21	0.97	157	0.10
My supervisor discusses my performance evaluation with me	4.37	0.78	159	4.18	0.98	157	0.19

Overall satisfaction	Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Count
Rate your overall satisfaction with your employment here so far:	3.86	0.94	158

Section 5: Demographics

How long have you worked at this institution?	Count	Percent
Less than 1 year	21	13.4%
1 to 5 years	54	34.4%
6 to 10 years	43	27.4%
11 to 20 years	28	17.8%
More than 20 years	11	7.0%
All responses	157	100.0%

Is your position:	Count	Percent
Faculty	65	42.8%
Staff	66	43.4%
Administrator (Director-level or above)	21	13.8%
All responses	152	100.0%

Is your position:	Count	Percent
Full-time	156	78.4%
Part-time	43	21.6%
All responses	199	100.0%

I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great place to work:	Count	Percent
Strongly agree	72	45.3%
Somewhat agree	60	37.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	15	9.4%
Somewhat disagree	7	4.4%
Strongly disagree	5	3.1%
All responses	159	100.0%

I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college:	Count	Percent
Strongly agree	100	62.9%
Somewhat agree	44	27.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	11	6.9%
Somewhat disagree	3	1.9%
Strongly disagree	1	0.6%
All responses	159	100.0%

Section 1: Campus Culture and Policies (Listed by Mean Importance, highest to lowest)

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	Importance Mean	Importance Standard Deviation	Importance Valid Count	Satisfaction Mean	Satisfaction Standard Deviation	Satisfaction Valid Count	Gap: Mean Difference
This institution treats students as its top priority	4.65	0.63	171	3.51	1.03	171	1.14
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students	4.63	0.59	170	3.55	0.92	169	1.08
Staff take pride in their work	4.62	0.55	165	3.85	0.92	162	0.77
The reputation of this institution continues to improve	4.62	0.59	161	3.39	1.29	158	1.23
Faculty take pride in their work	4.61	0.61	166	3.96	0.95	164	0.65
This institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships	4.57	0.62	171	3.87	0.84	171	0.70
Administrators take pride in their work	4.57	0.68	163	3.74	1.07	159	0.83
The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose	4.55	0.74	169	3.21	1.36	170	1.34
There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution	4.52	0.62	165	2.99	1.24	161	1.53
This institution is well-respected in the community	4.51	0.62	161	3.64	1.07	158	0.87
Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution	4.5	0.65	160	3.36	1.15	158	1.14
This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives	4.48	0.68	164	3.35	1.09	161	1.13
There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution	4.47	0.63	160	3.05	1.16	160	1.42
This institution consistently follows clear processes for orienting and training new employees	4.47	0.64	158	3.32	1.22	157	1.15
There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution	4.45	0.73	163	3.13	1.18	159	1.32
The goals and objectives of this institution are consistent with its mission and values	4.44	0.70	171	3.68	1.02	171	0.76
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of staff	4.44	0.73	162	3.14	1.05	162	1.30
There are effective lines of communication between departments	4.44	0.74	165	2.82	1.20	162	1.62
Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff	4.44	0.71	166	3.07	1.25	163	1.37
This institution plans carefully	4.43	0.70	170	3.12	1.22	170	1.31
This institution has written procedures that clearly define who is responsible for each operation and service	4.42	0.64	160	3.25	1.16	159	1.17
Most employees are generally supportive of the mission, purpose, and values of this institution	4.41	0.66	171	3.63	0.94	171	0.78
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty	4.39	0.78	171	3.13	1.17	171	1.26

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	Importance Mean	Importance Standard Deviation	Importance Valid Count	Satisfaction Mean	Satisfaction Standard Deviation	Satisfaction Valid Count	Gap: Mean Difference
This institution makes sufficient staff resources available to achieve important objectives	4.39	0.70	164	3.33	1.04	161	1.06
This institution involves its employees in planning for the future	4.38	0.79	170	2.85	1.22	171	1.53
This institution consistently follows clear processes for selecting new employees	4.37	0.72	160	3.04	1.26	159	1.33
The mission, purpose, and values of this institution are well understood by most employees	4.33	0.72	171	3.56	0.98	171	0.77
Employee suggestions are used to improve our institution	4.33	0.75	161	2.87	1.21	156	1.46
This institution consistently follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievements	4.32	0.79	159	3.17	1.18	158	1.15
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of administrators	4.24	0.80	164	3.69	0.94	160	0.55

Section 4: Work Environment (Listed by Mean Importance, highest to lowest)

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	Importance Mean	Importance Standard Deviation	Importance Valid Count	Satisfaction Mean	Satisfaction Standard Deviation	Satisfaction Valid Count	Gap: Mean Difference
I am paid fairly for the work I do	4.62	0.56	157	3.06	1.18	157	1.56
My department has the staff needed to do its job well	4.59	0.58	159	3.21	1.16	156	1.38
My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say	4.58	0.57	159	4.10	1.13	157	0.48
The employee benefits available to me are valuable	4.58	0.61	159	4.03	0.81	157	0.55
I am proud to work at this institution	4.57	0.62	158	4.20	1.00	157	0.37
My department has the budget needed to do its job well	4.56	0.56	158	3.32	1.11	154	1.24
The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding	4.56	0.59	158	4.19	1.00	157	0.37
The work I do is valuable to the institution	4.55	0.56	159	3.95	1.04	157	0.60
My supervisor helps me improve my job performance	4.54	0.62	157	3.97	1.14	158	0.57
I have the information I need to do my job well	4.53	0.63	159	3.76	1.00	157	0.77
My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me	4.53	0.56	159	3.69	1.03	156	0.84
The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor	4.51	0.58	159	4.03	1.06	157	0.48
I am empowered to resolve problems quickly	4.50	0.61	160	3.58	1.07	158	0.92
I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills	4.47	0.69	159	3.80	1.04	157	0.67
It is easy for me to get information at this institution	4.44	0.66	160	3.38	1.03	157	1.06
My department meets as a team to plan and coordinate work	4.44	0.70	159	3.96	1.10	158	0.48

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	Importance Mean	Importance Standard Deviation	Importance Valid Count	Satisfaction Mean	Satisfaction Standard Deviation	Satisfaction Valid Count	Gap: Mean Difference
I have adequate opportunities for professional development	4.41	0.76	158	3.83	0.96	156	0.58
My supervisor discusses my performance evaluation with me	4.37	0.78	159	4.18	0.98	157	0.19
My department or work unit has written, up-to-date objectives	4.36	0.74	159	3.75	1.09	158	0.61
My supervisor evaluates my performance formally on a yearly basis	4.31	0.84	159	4.21	0.97	157	0.10
I am comfortable answering student questions about institutional policies and procedures	4.30	0.78	160	3.82	0.93	157	0.48
I have adequate opportunities for advancement	4.28	0.89	159	2.93	1.21	157	1.35
I learn about important campus events in a timely manner	4.25	0.71	160	3.64	0.97	158	0.61

APPENDIX B:

OSUIT Results vs. Comparison Group

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")	OSUIT Importance Mean	OSUIT Satisfaction Mean	OSUIT Gap	Comparison Group Importance Mean	Comparison Group Satisfaction Mean	Comparison Group Gap	Importance Significant difference	Satisfaction Significant Difference
This institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships	4.57	3.87	0.70	4.62	3.82	0.80	NS	NS
This institution treats students as its top priority	4.65	3.51	1.14	4.70	3.80	0.90	NS	***
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students	4.63	3.55	1.08	4.67	3.71	0.96	NS	*
The mission, purpose, and values of this institution are well understood by most employees	4.33	3.56	0.77	4.39	3.61	0.78	NS	NS
Most employees are generally supportive of the mission, purpose, and values of this institution	4.41	3.63	0.78	4.43	3.68	0.75	NS	NS
The goals and objectives of this institution are consistent with its mission and values	4.44	3.68	0.76	4.46	3.75	0.71	NS	NS
This institution involves its employees in planning for the future	4.38	2.85	1.53	4.39	3.18	1.21	NS	***
This institution plans carefully	4.43	3.12	1.31	4.46	3.25	1.21	NS	NS
The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose	4.55	3.21	1.34	4.55	3.49	1.06	NS	**
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty	4.39	3.13	1.26	4.42	3.36	1.06	NS	**
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of staff	4.44	3.14	1.30	4.46	3.18	1.28	NS	NS
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of administrators	4.24	3.69	0.55	4.29	3.75	0.54	NS	NS
This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives	4.48	3.35	1.13	4.46	3.26	1.20	NS	NS
This institution makes sufficient staff resources available to achieve important objectives	4.39	3.33	1.06	4.42	3.17	1.25	NS	NS
There are effective lines of communication between departments	4.44	2.82	1.62	4.48	2.85	1.63	NS	NS
Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff	4.44	3.07	1.37	4.46	3.17	1.29	NS	NS
There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution	4.52	2.99	1.53	4.43	3.20	1.23	NS	*
There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution	4.45	3.13	1.32	4.42	3.12	1.30	NS	NS
Faculty take pride in their work	4.61	3.96	0.65	4.63	3.93	0.70	NS	NS
Staff take pride in their work	4.62	3.85	0.77	4.61	3.83	0.78	NS	NS

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	OSUIT Importance Mean	OSUIT Satisfaction Mean	OSUIT Gap	Comparison Group Importance Mean	Comparison Group Satisfaction Mean	Comparison Group Gap	Importance Significant difference	Satisfaction Significant Difference
Administrators take pride in their work	4.57	3.74	0.83	4.58	3.86	0.72	NS	NS
There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution	4.47	3.05	1.42	4.52	3.23	1.29	NS	NS
The reputation of this institution continues to improve	4.62	3.39	1.23	4.58	3.51	1.07	NS	NS
This institution is well-respected in the community	4.51	3.64	0.87	4.61	3.71	0.90	*	NS
Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution	4.50	3.36	1.14	4.51	3.56	0.95	NS	*
Employee suggestions are used to improve our institution	4.33	2.87	1.46	4.34	3.05	1.29	NS	NS
This institution consistently follows clear processes for selecting new employees	4.37	3.04	1.33	4.39	3.26	1.13	NS	*
This institution consistently follows clear processes for orienting and training new employees	4.47	3.32	1.15	4.43	3.15	1.28	NS	NS
This institution consistently follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievements	4.32	3.17	1.15	4.31	3.20	1.11	NS	NS
This institution has written procedures that clearly define who is responsible for each operation and service	4.43	3.25	1.18	4.36	3.22	1.14	NS	NS

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

Section 2: Institutional Goals

RATE: IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all / 5 = "Very important")	OSUIT Mean Importance	Comparison group Mean Importance	Significant difference
Increase the enrollment of new students	4.75	4.56	***
Retain more of its current students to graduation	4.76	4.74	NS
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	4.30	4.44	*
Recruit students from new geographic markets	4.18	3.86	***
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	3.89	3.90	NS
Develop new academic programs	3.89	4.01	NS
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	4.63	4.54	NS
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	4.30	3.87	***
Improve employee morale	4.76	4.63	*

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
Increase the enrollment of new students	59	36.6%	579	25.0%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	32	19.9%	773	33.4%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	5	3.1%	165	7.1%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	4	2.5%	16	0.7%
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	5	3.1%	31	1.3%
Develop new academic programs	5	3.1%	97	4.2%
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	28	17.4%	254	11.0%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	3	1.9%	16	0.7%
Improve employee morale	20	12.4%	384	16.6%
All responses	161	100.0%	2,315	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
Increase the enrollment of new students	37	23.1%	543	23.5%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	51	31.9%	643	27.8%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	8	5.0%	179	7.8%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	3	1.9%	37	1.6%
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	2	1.3%	62	2.7%
Develop new academic programs	12	7.5%	166	7.2%
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	16	10.0%	348	15.1%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	11	6.9%	45	1.9%
Improve employee morale	20	12.5%	286	12.4%
All responses	160	100.0%	2,309	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
Increase the enrollment of new students	25	15.9%	390	17.2%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	20	12.7%	329	14.5%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	11	7.0%	237	10.5%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	12	7.6%	103	4.5%
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	12	7.6%	87	3.8%
Develop new academic programs	9	5.7%	271	12.0%
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	28	17.8%	366	16.2%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	11	7.0%	84	3.7%
Improve employee morale	29	18.5%	398	17.6%
All responses	157	100.0%	2,265	100.0%

TOTAL "VOTES" FOR EACH GOAL	OSUIT TOTAL	OSUIT Percent	Comparison group Total	Comparison group Percent
Increase the enrollment of new students	121	25.3%	1,512	21.9%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	103	21.5%	1,745	25.3%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	24	5.0%	581	8.4%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	19	4.0%	156	2.3%
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	19	4.0%	180	2.6%
Develop new academic programs	26	5.4%	534	7.8%
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	72	15.1%	968	14.1%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	25	5.2%	145	2.1%
Improve employee morale	69	14.4%	1,068	15.5%
All responses	478	100.0%	6,889	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")	OSUIT Mean Involvement	Comparison group Mean Involvement	Significant difference
How involved are: Faculty	2.39	2.69	***
How involved are: Staff	2.26	2.30	NS
How involved are: Deans or directors of administrative units	3.27	3.29	NS
How involved are: Deans or chairs of academic units	3.18	3.21	NS
How involved are: Senior administrators (VP, Provost level or above)	3.92	3.68	***
How involved are: Students	2.22	2.36	*
How involved are: Regents	3.32	3.48	*
How involved are: Alumni	2.53	2.57	NS

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

Section 4: Work Environment

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	OSUIT Mean Importance	OSUIT Mean Satisfaction	OSUIT Gap	Comparison Group Mean Importance	Comparison Group Mean Satisfaction	Comparison Group Gap	Importance Significant Difference	Satisfaction Significant Difference
It is easy for me to get information at this institution	4.44	3.38	1.06	4.49	3.34	1.15	NS	NS
I learn about important campus events in a timely manner	4.25	3.64	0.61	4.23	3.54	0.69	NS	NS
I am empowered to resolve problems quickly	4.50	3.58	0.92	4.44	3.47	0.97	NS	NS
I am comfortable answering student questions about institutional policies and procedures	4.30	3.82	0.48	4.28	3.61	0.67	NS	*
I have the information I need to do my job well	4.53	3.76	0.77	4.61	3.75	0.86	NS	NS
My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me	4.53	3.69	0.84	4.60	3.83	0.77	NS	NS
My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say	4.58	4.10	0.48	4.63	4.08	0.55	NS	NS
My supervisor helps me improve my job performance	4.54	3.97	0.57	4.52	3.96	0.56	NS	NS
My department or work unit has written, up-to-date objectives	4.36	3.75	0.61	4.32	3.71	0.61	NS	NS
My department meets as a team to plan and coordinate work	4.44	3.96	0.48	4.40	3.80	0.60	NS	NS
My department has the budget needed to do its job well	4.56	3.32	1.24	4.54	3.17	1.37	NS	NS
My department has the staff needed to do its job well	4.59	3.21	1.38	4.60	3.11	1.49	NS	NS
I am paid fairly for the work I do	4.62	3.06	1.56	4.61	3.01	1.60	NS	NS
The employee benefits available to me are valuable	4.58	4.03	0.55	4.63	3.98	0.65	NS	NS
I have adequate opportunities for advancement	4.28	2.93	1.35	4.33	3.12	1.21	NS	NS

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	OSUIT Mean Importance	OSUIT Mean Satisfaction	OSUIT Gap	Comparison Group Mean Importance	Comparison Group Mean Satisfaction	Comparison Group Gap	Importance Significant Difference	Satisfaction Significant Difference
I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills	4.47	3.80	0.67	4.44	3.45	0.99	NS	***
I have adequate opportunities for professional development	4.41	3.83	0.58	4.40	3.49	0.91	NS	***
The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding	4.56	4.19	0.37	4.60	4.07	0.53	NS	NS
The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor	4.51	4.03	0.48	4.53	4.06	0.47	NS	NS
The work I do is valuable to the institution	4.55	3.95	0.60	4.58	3.97	0.61	NS	NS
I am proud to work at this institution	4.57	4.20	0.37	4.61	4.20	0.41	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:	3.86	3.91	NS

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

Section 5: Demographics

How long have you worked at this institution?	OSUIT Count	OSUIT Percent	Comparison group Count	Comparison group Percent
Less than 1 year	21	13.4%	193	8.4%
1 to 5 years	54	34.4%	703	30.5%
6 to 10 years	43	27.4%	547	23.8%
11 to 20 years	28	17.8%	534	23.2%
More than 20 years	11	7.0%	325	14.1%
All responses	157	100.0%	2,302	100.0%

Is your position:	OSUIT Count	OSUIT Percent	Comparison group Count	Comparison group Percent
Faculty	65	42.8%	679	35.6%
Staff	66	43.4%	1,054	55.2%
Administrator	21	13.8%	175	9.2%
All responses	152	100.0%	1,908	100.0%

Is your position:	OSUIT Count	OSUIT Percent	Comparison group Count	Comparison group Percent
Full-time	156	78.4%	2,147	93.1%
Part-time	43	21.6%	158	6.9%
All responses	199	100.0%	2,305	100.0%

OSUIT Comparison Group for Benchmarking

Comparison Group List	Location	Type	Enrollment
Cascadia Community College	Bothell, WA	4-year, primarily associate's, Public	3,387 (all undergraduate)
Daytona State College	Daytona Beach, FL	4-year, primarily associate's, Public	13,430 (all undergraduate)
Gulf Coast State College	Panama City, FL	4-year, primarily associate's, Public	4,797 (all undergraduate)
Midland College	Midland, TX	4-year, primarily associate's, Public	5,115 (all undergraduate)
Vincennes University	Vincennes, IN	4-year, primarily associate's, Public	17,239 (all undergraduate)
West Virginia University at Parkersburg	Parkersburg, WV	4-year, primarily associate's, Public	2,818 (all undergraduate)

Notes: Includes data collected over the last five years; Refer to College Navigator for additional details - http://nces.ed.gov/collegenavigator/

APPENDIX C:

OSUIT Results for 2016, 2019, and 2020

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")	2016 Mean Importance	2016 Mean Satisfaction	2016 GAP	2019 Mean Importance	2019 Mean Satisfaction	2019 GAP	2020 Mean Importance	2020 Mean Satisfaction	2020 Gap
This institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships	4.56	3.61	0.95	4.56	3.69	0.87	4.57	3.87	0.70
This institution treats students as its top priority	4.71	3.37	1.34	4.64	3.53	1.12	4.65	3.51	1.14
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students	4.63	3.36	1.27	4.57	3.43	1.13	4.63	3.55	1.08
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	4.33	3.56	0.77
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	4.41	3.63	0.78
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	4.44	3.68	0.76
This institution involves its employees in planning for the future	4.27	3.04	1.23	4.36	2.80	1.56	4.38	2.85	1.53
This institution plans carefully	4.43	3.13	1.30	4.46	3.03	1.43	4.43	3.12	1.31
The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose	4.56	3.35	1.22	4.52	3.08	1.44	4.55	3.21	1.34
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	4.39	3.13	1.26
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of staff	4.39	2.89	1.49	4.45	3.10	1.35	4.44	3.14	1.30
This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of administrators	4.20	3.68	0.53	4.28	3.53	0.75	4.24	3.69	0.55
This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives	4.43	3.12	1.30	4.44	3.18	1.26	4.48	3.35	1.13
This institution makes sufficient staff resources available to achieve important objectives	4.30	3.03	1.27	4.31	3.18	1.12	4.39	3.33	1.06
There are effective lines of communication between departments	4.38	2.57	1.81	4.39	2.69	1.70	4.44	2.82	1.62
Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff	4.37	3.05	1.32	4.44	2.94	1.50	4.44	3.07	1.37
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	4.52	2.99	1.53
There is good communication between staff and the administration at this institution	4.38	2.86	1.52	4.45	2.99	1.46	4.45	3.13	1.32
Faculty take pride in their work	4.61	3.80	0.81	4.57	3.86	0.71	4.61	3.96	0.65

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	2016 Mean Importance	2016 Mean Satisfaction	2016 GAP	2019 Mean Importance	2019 Mean Satisfaction	2019 GAP	2020 Mean Importance	2020 Mean Satisfaction	2020 Gap
Staff take pride in their work	4.58	3.75	0.83	4.57	3.92	0.65	4.62	3.85	0.77
Administrators take pride in their work	4.53	3.79	0.74	4.51	3.71	0.80	4.57	3.74	0.83
There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution	4.46	2.93	1.53	4.47	2.95	1.52	4.47	3.05	1.42
The reputation of this institution continues to improve	4.62	3.47	1.15	4.59	3.20	1.38	4.62	3.39	1.23
This institution is well-respected in the community	4.58	3.53	1.06	4.56	3.56	1.00	4.51	3.64	0.87
Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution	4.48	3.34	1.14	4.48	3.26	1.22	4.50	3.36	1.14
Employee suggestions are used to improve our institution	4.29	2.89	1.40	4.28	2.74	1.54	4.33	2.87	1.46
This institution consistently follows clear processes for selecting new employees	4.35	3.15	1.21	4.39	3.31	1.08	4.37	3.04	1.33
This institution consistently follows clear processes for orienting and training new employees	4.43	3.06	1.37	4.39	3.29	1.11	4.47	3.32	1.15
This institution consistently follows clear processes for recognizing employee achievements	4.20	3.00	1.20	4.23	3.24	0.99	4.32	3.17	1.15
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	4.42	3.25	1.17

Section 2: Institutional Goals

RATE: IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all / 5 = "Very important")	2016 Mean	2016 Standard Deviation	2016 Valid Count	2019 Mean	2019 Standard Deviation	2019 Valid Count	2020 Mean	2020 Standard Deviation	2020 Valid Count
Increase the enrollment of new students	4.72	0.53	236	4.82	0.43	188	4.75	0.49	161
Retain more of its current students to graduation	4.72	0.54	236	4.81	0.44	188	4.76	0.51	161
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	4.44	0.72	236	4.38	0.81	187	4.30	0.95	161
Recruit students from new geographic markets	3.94	1.06	236	4.20	1.02	188	4.18	0.95	161
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	3.66	1.17	236	3.95	1.15	187	3.89	1.14	159
Develop new academic programs	3.76	1.06	236	3.89	1.04	188	3.89	0.99	161
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	4.64	0.57	236	4.65	0.66	187	4.63	0.58	160
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	4.27	0.91	234	4.35	0.82	188	4.30	0.82	161
Improve employee morale	4.70	0.61	236	4.76	0.63	187	4.76	0.47	160
Some other goal	3.67	1.26	175	3.73	1.22	135	3.39	1.26	111

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) First priority goal:	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Increase the enrollment of new students	68	29.3%	52	27.5%	59	36.6%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	59	25.4%	41	21.7%	32	19.9%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	9	3.9%	5	2.6%	5	3.1%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	4	1.7%	1	0.5%	4	2.5%
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	4	1.7%	2	1.1%	5	3.1%
Develop new academic programs	9	3.9%	5	2.6%	5	3.1%
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	34	14.7%	30	15.9%	28	17.4%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	9	3.9%	7	3.7%	3	1.9%
Improve employee morale	35	15.1%	45	23.8%	20	12.4%

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) First priority goal:	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Some other goal	1	0.4%	1	0.5%	0	0.0%
All responses	232	100.0%	189	100.0%	161	100.0%

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) Second priority goal:	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Increase the enrollment of new students	56	24.1%	55	29.1%	37	23.0%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	66	28.4%	54	28.6%	51	31.7%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	11	4.7%	7	3.7%	8	5.0%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	2	0.9%	6	3.2%	3	1.9%
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	4	1.7%	8	4.2%	2	1.2%
Develop new academic programs	13	5.6%	6	3.2%	12	7.5%
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	36	15.5%	26	13.8%	16	9.9%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	11	4.7%	9	4.8%	11	6.8%
Improve employee morale	30	12.9%	17	9.0%	20	12.4%
Some other goal	3	1.3%	1	0.5%	1	0.6%
All responses	232	100.0%	189	100.0%	161	100.0%

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) Third priority goal:	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Increase the enrollment of new students	38	16.5%	35	18.6%	25	15.7%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	26	11.3%	32	17.0%	20	12.6%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	18	7.8%	13	6.9%	11	6.9%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	14	6.1%	7	3.7%	12	7.5%
Increase the diversity of racial and ethnic groups represented among the student body	12	5.2%	6	3.2%	12	7.5%
Develop new academic programs	19	8.2%	12	6.4%	9	5.7%

(Choose three goals that you believe should be this institution's top priorities) Third priority goal:	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	36	15.6%	32	17.0%	28	17.6%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	22	9.5%	17	9.0%	11	6.9%
Improve employee morale	45	19.5%	32	17.0%	29	18.2%
Some other goal	1	0.4%	2	1.1%	2	1.3%
All responses	231	100.0%	188	100.0%	159	100.0%

TOTAL "VOTES" FOR EACH GOAL	2016 First Priority	2016 Second Priority	2016 Third Priority	2016 Total	2016 Total Percent	2019 First Priority	2019 Second Priority	2019 Third Priority	2019 Total	2019 Total Percent	2020 First Priority	2020 Second Priority	2020 Third Priority	2020 Total	2020 Total Percent
Increase the enrollment of new students	68	56	38	162	23.3%	52	55	35	142	25.1%	59	37	25	121	25.2%
Retain more of its current students to graduation	59	66	26	151	21.7%	41	54	32	127	22.4%	32	51	20	103	21.4%
Improve the academic ability of entering student classes	9	11	18	38	5.5%	5	7	13	25	4.4%	5	8	11	24	5.0%
Recruit students from new geographic markets	4	2	14	20	2.9%	1	6	7	14	2.5%	4	3	12	19	4.0%
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%	5	2	12	19	4.0%
Develop new academic programs	9	13	19	41	5.9%	5	6	12	23	4.1%	5	12	9	26	5.4%
Improve the quality of existing academic programs	34	36	36	106	15.3%	30	26	32	88	15.5%	28	16	28	72	15.0%
Improve the appearance of campus buildings and grounds	9	11	22	42	6.0%	7	9	17	33	5.8%	3	11	11	25	5.2%
Improve employee morale	35	30	45	110	15.8%	45	17	32	94	16.6%	20	20	29	69	14.3%
Some other goal	1	3	1	5	0.7%	1	1	2	4	0.7%	0	1	2	3	0.6%
All responses	232	232	231	695	100.0%	189	189	188	566	100.0%	161	161	159	481	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")	2016 Mean	2016 Standard Deviation	2016 Valid Count	2016 Mean	2019 Standard Deviation	2019 Valid Count	2020 Mean	2020 Standard Deviation	2020 Valid Count
How involved are: Faculty	2.51	0.93	229	2.32	0.92	183	2.39	0.93	159
How involved are: Staff	2.29	0.86	228	2.13	0.84	181	2.26	0.84	157
How involved are: Deans or directors of administrative units	3.30	0.84	225	2.98	0.96	186	3.27	0.89	156
How involved are: Deans or chairs of academic units	3.20	0.91	226	2.94	0.95	185	3.18	0.84	156
How involved are: Senior administrators (VP, Provost level or above)	3.65	0.81	226	3.82	0.89	187	3.92	0.86	158
How involved are: Students	2.25	0.88	227	2.26	0.88	186	2.22	0.82	158
How involved are: Trustees	3.34	0.81	219	3.24	0.91	181	3.32	0.81	155
How involved are: Alumni	2.44	0.85	225	2.53	0.88	178	2.53	0.77	156
How involved are: Local government/Chamber of Commerce	2.95	0.82	222	2.98	0.90	178	3.08	0.85	155
How involved are: Industry Partners/Advisory Committee Members	2.84	0.72	225	2.75	0.82	181	2.76	0.74	158
How involved are: OSU-Stillwater	3.36	1.05	226	3.33	1.04	184	3.40	1.00	158

Section 4: Work Environment

RATE IMPORTANCE (1 = "Not important at all" / 5 = "Very important") AND SATISFACTION (1 = "Not satisfied at all" / 5 = "Very satisfied")	2016 Mean Importance	2016 Mean Satisfaction	2016 Gap	2019 Mean Importance	2019 Mean Satisfaction	2019 Gap	2020 Mean Importance	2020 Mean Satisfaction	2020 Gap
It is easy for me to get information at this institution	4.51	3.30	1.21	4.40	3.34	1.06	4.44	3.38	1.06
I learn about important campus events in a timely manner	4.28	3.45	0.82	4.19	3.61	0.58	4.25	3.64	0.61
I am empowered to resolve problems quickly	4.45	3.51	0.94	4.38	3.52	0.85	4.50	3.58	0.92
I am comfortable answering student questions about institutional policies and procedures	4.37	3.65	0.72	4.29	3.66	0.63	4.30	3.82	0.48
I have the information I need to do my job well	4.59	3.71	0.88	4.58	3.87	0.71	4.53	3.76	0.77
My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me	4.60	3.81	0.79	4.58	3.97	0.61	4.53	3.69	0.84
My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say	4.59	3.92	0.67	4.60	4.16	0.43	4.58	4.10	0.48
My supervisor helps me improve my job performance	4.53	3.81	0.72	4.56	4.08	0.48	4.54	3.97	0.57
My department or work unit has written, up-to-date objectives	4.29	3.62	0.67	4.28	3.82	0.46	4.36	3.75	0.61
My department meets as a team to plan and coordinate work	4.36	3.74	0.62	4.36	4.08	0.28	4.44	3.96	0.48
My department has the budget needed to do its job well	4.60	2.80	1.80	4.54	3.17	1.37	4.56	3.32	1.24
My department has the staff needed to do its job well	4.57	3.28	1.29	4.62	3.06	1.56	4.59	3.21	1.38
I am paid fairly for the work I do	4.57	2.97	1.60	4.58	3.11	1.47	4.62	3.06	1.56
The employee benefits available to me are valuable	4.69	4.03	0.66	4.66	4.18	0.48	4.58	4.03	0.55
I have adequate opportunities for advancement	4.30	2.92	1.39	4.30	3.20	1.10	4.28	2.93	1.35
I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills	4.40	3.38	1.02	4.44	3.77	0.67	4.47	3.80	0.67
I have adequate opportunities for professional development	4.36	3.41	0.95	4.43	3.82	0.61	4.41	3.83	0.58
The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding	4.51	4.06	0.46	4.55	4.16	0.39	4.56	4.19	0.37
The work I do is appreciated by my supervisor	4.52	3.96	0.56	4.53	4.17	0.36	4.51	4.03	0.48
The work I do is valuable to the institution	4.57	4.03	0.54	4.62	3.98	0.63	4.55	3.95	0.60
I am proud to work at this institution	4.62	4.30	0.33	4.61	4.22	0.40	4.57	4.20	0.37
My supervisor evaluates my performance formally on a yearly basis	4.34	4.27	0.07	4.42	4.34	0.08	4.31	4.21	0.10
My supervisor discusses my performance evaluation with me	4.36	4.21	0.15	4.44	4.32	0.12	4.37	4.18	0.19

Overall Satisfaction	2016 Mean	2016 Standard Deviation	2016 Valid Count	2019 Mean	2019 Standard Deviation	2019 Valid Count	2020 Mean	2020 Standard Deviation	2020 Valid Count
Rate your overall satisfaction with your employment here so far:	3.88	0.92	227	3.90	0.96	186	3.86	0.94	158

Section 5: Demographics

How long have you worked at this institution?	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Less than 1 year	22	9.8%	21	11.9%	21	13.4%
1 to 5 years	98	43.8%	59	33.3%	54	34.4%
6 to 10 years	39	17.4%	46	26.0%	43	27.4%
11 to 20 years	44	19.6%	35	19.8%	28	17.8%
More than 20 years	21	9.4%	16	9.0%	11	7.0%
All responses	224	100.0%	177	100.0%	157	100.0%

Is your position:	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Faculty	85	38.5%	65	36.9%	65	42.8%
Staff	116	52.5%	91	51.7%	66	43.4%
Administrator (Director-level or above)	20	9.0%	20	11.4%	21	13.8%
All responses	221	100.0%	176	100.0%	152	100.0%

Is your position:	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Full-time	223	98.7%	178	98.9%	156	100.0%
Part-time	3	1.3%	2	1.1%	0	0.0%
All responses	226	100.0%	180	100.0%	156	100.0%

I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great place to work:	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Strongly agree	102	45.1%	75	40.8%	72	45.3%
Somewhat agree	80	35.4%	77	41.8%	60	37.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	19	8.4%	17	9.2%	15	9.4%
Somewhat disagree	15	6.6%	11	6.0%	7	4.4%
Strongly disagree	10	4.4%	4	2.2%	5	3.1%
All responses	226	100.0%	184	100.0%	159	100.0%

I would recommend OSUIT to my family and friends as a great college:	2016 Count	2016 Percent	2019 Count	2019 Percent	2020 Count	2020 Percent
Strongly agree	150	65.8%	115	62.2%	100	62.9%
Somewhat agree	56	24.6%	55	29.7%	44	27.7%
Neither agree nor disagree	15	6.6%	9	4.9%	11	6.9%
Somewhat disagree	2	0.9%	6	3.2%	3	1.9%
Strongly disagree	5	2.2%	0	0.0%	1	0.6%
All responses	228	100.0%	185	100.0%	159	100.0%