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Faculty/Staff Survey

- Occurrences – every few years (over the past 20)
- Current process
  - On-line
  - One Senate eligible person, one vote
- Frequency – will increase (bi-annual or annual)
  - Approximately 100 questions (about 15-20 minutes to complete)
- Comments field
- Concerns with legal constraints, data integrity, and performance
2013 Survey

- Administered by the Center for Survey Research (funded by Stony Brook administration)
- Revised question set and screening questions
- Format of scores
  - Previously - used grading similar to a GPA calculation
  - Currently – use 5, 4, or 2 choices (plus No Opinion)

Question Style

- Based on historical question set
- Somewhat subjective
- Mostly not outcome-based
- Measures perception more than results
Report

• Available on-line at the Senate Web site
• Contents
  • Scores (some scores not published where number of responses was below a threshold of 30)
  • Listing of positive and negative areas
  • Comment analysis
    • Filtered to remove identifying information
    • Critical component of the analysis of survey results
    • Comments selected for report to align with survey results

Responses

• 793 responses
  • 334 faculty
  • 377 staff
  • 82 hospital staff
• More responses than previous surveys
• Response categories
  • Excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor
  • Yes or No
  • A great deal, some, a little, and not at all
• ARC
  • Categorized response scores as either positive or negative
  • Computed ratio of positive to negative
  • Identified negative scores (under 1.0) as a focus of attention
Comments

• Comment option for every question
• Extraordinary number of comments provided
• Comment analysis
  • Remove identifying information
  • Select comments consistent with results
  • Publish representative comments
  • Identify underlying themes not associated with a given question

Results

• Overall positive results
• Some areas of concern
• Comments
  • Very specific in many cases
  • More negative than survey scores
  • Consistent with results in some questions
Results - Administration

- Key question
  - “Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the job that ______ is doing as _______?”
- Positive results
  - President – 2.37
  - SVP, Health Sciences – 2.58
  - Provost – 1.66

Administration - Areas for Improvement

- President
  - Involvement of faculty/staff in policy decisions
  - Administrative management
- Senior Vice President of Health Sciences and Dean of Medicine
  - Involvement of faculty/staff in policy decisions
- Provost
  - Involvement of faculty/staff in policy decisions
  - Administrative management
High Overall Scores

1. Child care services  8. Athletic facilities & programs
2. Campus grounds    9. SINC sites
3. Library services   10. Career Center
4. Library electronic 11. DSS
    resources         12. University communications
5. Campus police     13. VP, Finance
    Event planning
7. EOP/AIM

Areas of Concern

• Involvement of appropriate faculty/staff members in making decisions that affect them
• Maintenance of buildings
• Campus parking (including handicapped)
• Faculty/staff dining
• COEUS
Selected General Results

- Religious holiday policy – 1.34
- Libraries/print collection – 2.02 / 2.89
- Undergraduate colleges – 3.70
- Academic advising services – 3.34
- Involvement of faculty and staff in departmental policies and decisions – 2.43
- University Senate – 1.25 (41.5% had no opinion of the University Senate)

General Issues in Comments

- Not quantified
- Issues
  - Perceived favoritism
    - Humanities/soft sciences vs. science/engineering
    - East campus vs. west campus
  - Inadequate staffing levels in administration service areas
  - Cluster hires
  - MOOCs
Evaluation of Deans

- Faculty asked to evaluate their own Dean
- Results not published for units with fewer than 30 respondents (per Survey Center recommendation)
- Results concerning other units provided to EC for possible distribution to administration
- Published results
  - Dean – College of Arts & Sciences
  - Dean – School of Medicine

Dean Scores

- College of Arts & Sciences
  - Outstanding overall positive rating (5.66)
  - Excellent rating in all categories (over 3.9)
- School of Medicine
  - Overall positive (1.94)
  - Concern with involvement of faculty, staff, and students in decisions (.35)
2014 Plans

- Details on any subject available to administration (after comment filtering)
- Document
  - Faculty/staff eligible for survey and
  - Total population counts
- 2014 survey?
  - New questions on issue areas
  - Shift to more outcome data
  - Include faculty and staff for Deans’ questions

Questions