



## **SACS Self-Study Faculty Survey Comparisons**

*January, 2002*

### **Executive Summary**

#### **Purpose**

The purpose of the 1992 SACS Self-study Faculty Survey was to obtain faculty opinions pertaining to interaction and communication with administration and identify problem areas within the faculty/administration organizational and communication structure and in the processes that support those structures. The purpose of the 2002 SACS Faculty Survey was to compare changes in faculty opinions over the ten year period from 1992 to 2002.

#### **Methodology**

This survey was developed by the Brevard Community College SACS Self-Study Steering Committee and distributed by Dr. Rosemary Layne, SACS Self-Study Director. Results of the survey were compiled by the Office of Data Systems and analyzed by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Strategic Management. A CHI distribution test was used to perform a comparative analysis of the Brevard Community College Self-study Faculty Survey distributed to 233 full-time faculty members in Nov. 1991\* and 220 full-time faculty members in Jan. 2002. 154 of the 1992 faculty responded with a response rate of 66.09%. 137 of the 2002 faculty responded with a 62.27% response rate. A 95% confidence level was used. Some faculty members participated in both studies but this variable was not addressed in the comparison.

#### **Survey Population**

Close to 50% of the 154 respondents in 1992 were from the Cocoa campus, decreasing to approximately 38% in 2002 (137). Melbourne's % of respondents stayed somewhat consistent, around 32%, with Titusville's percentage declining slightly from 10.4% in 1992 to 9.49% in 2002; the percentage of respondents from Palm Bay campus increased significantly, from 5.2% in 1992 to 18.25% in 2002. The largest % of respondents came from the Communications, Allied Health and Science departments. The department categories were not included in the 1992 survey. Slightly more than 1/4 of the respondents were from the 0-5 year group, slightly less than 1/5 from the 6-10 year old group and the remaining 1/2 from the 10+ year group for both years.

#### **Survey Measurements**

The satisfaction levels were categorized in a range beginning with very dissatisfied 1...2..3..4..5..6..7 to very satisfied. The categories of missing and NA was collapsed into one category. Questions 13, 34, and 35 were included in the 1992 survey but eliminated in the 2002 survey. Questions 5, 16, 21, 22 and 34 were added to the 2002 survey but were not included in the 1992 survey.

#### **Survey Summary**

The overall survey comparative results show a significant improvement in the satisfaction levels of faculty when dealing with administration/faculty issues, and the policies and procedures that affect these issues, even though faculty members still voiced continued dissatisfaction with salaries and benefits, along with dissatisfaction with the administration's sensitivity to community needs. Counter to the dissatisfaction expressed in these limited areas, the faculty survey comparisons reveal continued satisfaction with clarity of class scheduling and adequate bookstore inventory. Specific areas of satisfaction improvement since 1992 include:

- Faculty channels of input and their ability to affect policy-making at the college and Board of Trustee levels.
- All areas of communication: its lines, its organizational and committee structure and administrative responsibilities designed to assure cooperation in decision-making.

- The degree of cooperation between faculty and administration in meeting college goals.
- The role of the faculty union.
- Faculty morale.
- Safeguards for academic freedom provided by the termination and non-renewal procedures of the College.
- The employment of adjunct faculty.
- Library resources, services, facilities, holding of books/magazines needed for research and instruction, and library staff size with the exception of library staff assistance.
- Computer resources.
- Staff duplicating services.
- The accuracy and clarity of the college catalog.
- The lack of participation in the evaluation of administration by faculty and staff.

As a result of apparent gains in the relationship between faculty and administration, faculty satisfaction and morale appear to have improved significantly during the ten year period from 1992-2002.