The Chronicle 2015 *Great Colleges to Work For*

Salisbury University

Results Summary

Presented by SU Human Resources Office

Based on Modern Think Higher Education Insight Survey©

November 6, 2015

Contents

Program Background....3
Dimensions Overview....3
Dimensions....3
Open-Ended Questions....4
Definitions....4
Report Overviews....4
Survey Period....5
Salisbury University Response Rate....5
Response Distribution....5
SU's Survey Results Summary....6
Topline Report Highlights....6
Year-to-Year Scorecard Report Highlights....6
Job Category Benchmark Report Highlights....7
Employee Comments Report Theme Highlights....7
General Demographics Highlights....7
SU's Survey Results Summary Detail....9
Job Category Benchmark Report....9
General Demographics by Job Category for Years at Institution Report....12
General Demographics by Job Category for Years at Institution Report (continued)....13
General Demographics by Job Category for Years at Institution Report (continued)....14
Detail by Job Category....15
Conclusions....17

Program Background

The Chronicle *Great Colleges to Work For* program is designed to recognize colleges and universities that have been successful in creating great workplaces and to further research and understand the factors, dynamics and influences that have the most impact on organizational culture at higher education institutions.

The core of the program is a two-part assessment process, comprised of a Faculty/Staff survey and an institutional audit.

The Faculty/Staff survey (The Modern Think Higher Education Insight Survey©) was sent to almost 114,000 faculty and staff nationwide. About 44,000 responses were received: 16,347 faculty; 12,911 exempt professionals; 6,261 non-exempt staff; 1,149 adjunct faculty; and 7,308 administrators.

The institutional audit (The Modern Think Institution Questionnaire© or IQ) captures information detailing various institution demographics, policies and practices.

Recognition is primarily determined through the feedback provided by Faculty/Staff and collected from the survey. For analysis and recognition purposes, participating schools are segmented into four-year and two-year categories. Schools within each of these categories are further classified into three groups based on student enrollment.

Dimensions Overview

The survey is comprised of 60 statements in 15 Dimensions designed to assess key dynamics and relationships that are influencing Salisbury University's culture and performance. In the survey, Faculty and Staff were asked to respond to each statement using a five-point rating scale:

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Sometimes Agree/Sometimes Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Additionally, there is a Not Applicable response option.

The survey instrument also includes an 18-item benefits satisfaction component, 15 optional demographics and two open-ended questions.

Dimensions

- Job Satisfaction/Support
- Teaching Environment
- Professional Development
- Compensation, Benefits & Work/Life Balance
- Facilities
- Policies, Resources & Efficiency
- Shared Governance

- Pride
- Supervisors/Department Chairs
- Senior Leadership
- Faculty, Administration & Staff Relations
- Communication
- Collaboration
- Fairness
- Respect & Appreciation

Open-Ended Questions

1. What do you appreciate most about working at this institution?
2. What would make this institution a better place to work?

Definitions

Institution refers to the entire Salisbury University.

SU's Survey Category as a four-year school, based on enrollment is Medium (3,000 to 9,999 students).

Department refers to your most immediate workgroup or team.

Senior Leadership refers to the most senior members of the institution (e.g. President, Provost, Vice Presidents, and Deans).

Supervisors/Department Chair refers to the individual to whom you directly report.

A percent Positive response is the percentage of Faculty and Staff who responded by "Strongly Agree" or "Agree." A percent Negative response is the percentage who responded with "Disagree" or "Strongly Disagree." Based on the survey benchmarks, the percent Positive and Negative results can be interpreted as follows:

Percent Positive Score	**Percent Negative Score**
65%-75%+ = Good	< 10-14% = Good
55%-64% = Fair	15%-19% = Fair
< 54% = Poor	20%+ = Poor

Report Overviews

Topline Report - Color coded report shows at a glance how your institution scored overall, where your strengths lay, where barriers exist, and how you compare with your peers.

Topline by Job Category Report - Shows both the overall Positive responses (percent who Strongly Agree or Agree) and the date broken out by each job category.

Job Category Benchmark Report - Provides overall Positive/Negative response rates for each survey statement and overall benchmark columns for Honor Roll and Carnegie Classification. From there, you can compare the percent Positive data for each job category against the two columns of benchmark data.

Year-to-Year Scorecard - See your current and previous year's Positive and Negative survey results side-by-side. This color-coded ScoreCard helps identify the areas where you are moving in the right direction as well as those in which there is still room for improvement. This comparison is for Overall Results only.

General Demographics by Job Category - Individual General Demographic Spreadsheets provided for each job category surveyed at your school. Each spreadsheet contains data by: Gender, Age, Ethnicity/Race, Relationship Status, Annual Salary, Job Status, Years at Institution, Supervisory Status.

Employee Comments Report – Faculty and Staff are asked two open-ended questions. This report provides their responses exactly as written. To enhance analysis, the comments are sorted by job category.

Survey Period

The Great Colleges to Work For reports were generated from the data collected during the survey period of March 16 - April 13, 2015. All survey responses were submitted directly to Modern Think who analyzed the data and then provided these reports to Salisbury University.

Salisbury University Response Rate

The response rate for the Faculty and Staff survey:

- Surveys Distributed (Random sampling of staff/faculty): 600
- Survey Responses: 302
- Response Rate: 50.3%

A 50.3% response was well above the average response rate of 39% for participating institutions.

Response Distribution

Please note that survey respondents self-selected their job category, therefore, the respondents for a particular survey job category may not match SU's formal definition for that job category.

Job Category	Respondent Percentage	Number of Respondents
Administration	14%	45
Faculty	47%	144
Exempt Professional Staff	23%	71
Non-Exempt Staff	10%	31
Unspecified	3%	11

SU's Survey Results Summary

Topline Report Highlights

Scoring chart:

Poor	Warrants Attention	Fair to Mediocre	Good	Very Good to Excellent
0%-44%	45%-54%	55%-64%	65%-74%	75%-100%

- Overall survey average of 70% as compared with:
  - Honor Roll institutions at 78%
  - Carnegie Master's at 67%
- Overall survey average of 70% by Job Category:
  - 80% Administration
  - 65% Faculty
  - 74% Exempt
  - 73% Non-exempt
- Strongest dimensions:
  - 81% Supervisors/Department Chairs
  - 79% Facilities
  - 78% Pride
  - 75% Teaching Environment
  - 75% Professional Development
- Greatest opportunities for improvement:
  - 62% Senior Leadership
  - 62% Faculty/Administration/Staff Relations
  - 62% Communication
  - 64% Collaboration

Year-to-Year Scorecard Report Highlights

- 2015 compared to 2014 overall shows relatively no changes
- 3% increases in average Positive responses for:
  - Teaching environment
  - Comp/benefits & work/life balance
  - Supervisors/Department Chairs
- 2% decreases in average Positive responses for:
  - Fairness
  - Collaboration
  - Faculty/Administration/Staff relations

Job Category Benchmark Report Highlights

- Overall results as compared to other Carnegie Master's Institutions:
  - On par or better than the comparison group
- Overall results as compared to Honor Roll Institutions:
  - Strongest Positive comparative Dimensions
    - Supervisors/Department Chairs
    - Facilities
    - Shared governance
  - Greatest opportunities for improvement in Dimensions
    - Senior Leadership
    - Faculty/Administration/Staff relations
  - Greatest opportunity for improvement in a job category
    - Faculty

Employee Comments Report Theme Highlights

Administration	**Exempt Professional Staff**
+ Colleagues	+ Benefits
- Funding and staffing	+ Students
	+ Professionalism
	+ Respect
Faculty Themes	- Staffing
+ Work-life balance	- Salaries
+ Colleagues	
+ Academic freedom	**Non-Exempt Staff**
- Senior Leadership	+ Benefits
- Salaries	- Flexibility with work schedules
- Staffing	- Opportunity for advancement
	- Staffing

General Demographics Highlights

With respect to the additional detail data purchased for 2015, the statistical value of this data is dependent on the participant's willingness to self-disclose. Within the 4 job categories with respect to declination to disclose:

- Nonexempt participants were more likely to self-disclose
- Administration declination averaged 20%
- Exempt Professional staff declination averaged 15%
- Nonexempt staff declination averaged 10%
- Faculty declination averaged 20%

The one exception to this was for the Years at Institution factor for which the highest job category declination was 7%.

Poor (0%-44%); Warrants Attention (45%-54%); Fair to Mediocre (55%-64%); Good (65%-75%); Very Good to Excellent (75%-100%)

	Years at Institution								
Overall Survey Score	**< 2 yrs**	**2-4 yrs**	**5-7 yrs**	**8-10 yrs**	**11-15 yrs**	**16-20 yrs**	**21-25 yrs**	**> 25 yrs**	**Declined**
Adminstration	80%	79%	83%			75%		82%	
Exempt	70%	83%	76%	76%	**64%**	68%			
Nonexempt	79%			**60%**				78%	
Faculty	73%	75%	71%	**58%**	**58%**	70%	**50%**	74%	**51%**

General Demographics by Job Category Chart for Years at Institution

SU's Survey Results Summary Detail

Scoring chart:

Poor	Warrants Attention	Fair to Mediocre	Good	Very Good to Excellent
0%-44%	45%-54%	55%-64%	65%-74%	75%-100%

Job Category Benchmark Report

For the most part, SU's results by Dimension were not derived from compelling overall question and/or job category responses. There are two exceptions:

- Overall Very Good to Excellent Score and no individual question or job category scored Below Good:
    - Facilities
    - Supervisors/Department Chairs

Although the next few Dimensions resulted in an overall Good or Above score, and no individual question scored Below Good, one or more job categories scored Below Good:

- Teaching Environment
    - Overall Very Good to Excellent
    - Faculty scored 2/3 questions as Fair to Mediocre
- Professional Development
    - Overall Very Good to Excellent
    - Nonexempt scored one question as Fair to Mediocre
- Shared Governance
    - Overall Good
    - Faculty and Nonexempt staff scored one question as Fair to Mediocre

The below Dimensions resulted in an overall Good or Above score; however, one or more questions scored Mediocre or Below:

- Job Satisfaction/Support
    - Overall Good (73%)
    - Resources – Warrants Attention (52%)
- Compensation, Benefits & Work/Life Balance
    - Overall Good (74%)
    - Pay – Warrants Attention (47%)
- Policies, Resources & Efficiency
    - Overall Good (66%)
    - Adequate faculty/staff – Poor (28%)

- Pride
    - Overall Very Good to Excellent (78%)
    - Institution's culture is special – Fair to Mediocre (64%)
- Fairness
    - Overall Good (68%)
    - Promotions based on ability (64%)
    - Low performance is addressed – Fair to Mediocre (55%)
- Respect & Appreciation
    - Overall Good (68%)
    - Regularly Recognized – Fair to Mediocre (58%)
    - Meaningful recognition and rewards program – Warrants Attention (47%)

The final group of Dimensions resulted in a Less than overall Good score, and nearly all or all questions, as well as multiple Job Categories scored Below Good:

- Senior Leadership (62%)
    - 2 of 6 questions had Good scores
    - 4 of 6 questions had Fair to Mediocre scores
    - Faculty scored all questions Below Mediocre
    - Exempt and Nonexempt had a few Fair to Mediocre scores
- Faculty, Administration & Staff Relations (62%)
    - 2 of 2 questions scored Fair to Mediocre
    - Faculty scored both as Fair to Mediocre
    - Exempt staff scored one Fair to Mediocre
- Communication (62%)
    - 1 of 4 questions scored Good
    - 3 of 4 questions scored Fair to Mediocre
    - Faculty scored all questions below Mediocre
    - Administration, Exempt, and Nonexempt had a few below Mediocre scores
- Collaboration (64%)
    - 2 of 4 questions scored Good
    - 2 of 4 questions scored Warrants Attention to Mediocre
    - Administration, Exempt, Nonexempt and Faculty each had one or more scores below Mediocre

Below is a quick reference view of the low scoring questions by job category:

The Chronicle Great Colleges to Work For 2015				
Job Category Low Positive Chart				
Poor (0%-44%); Warrants Attention (45%-54%); Fair to Mediocre (55%-64%); Good (65%-75%); Very Good to Excellent (75%-100%)				
Survey Questions	**Admin**	**Exempt**	**Nonexempt**	**Faculty**
My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals	37%	28%	25%	25%
Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me	61%	59%	56%	36%
Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented	62%	50%	58%	54%
There is a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution	64%	63%	61%	45%
I am paid fairly for my work		41%	58%	40%
I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job	60%	50%		46%
I am regularly recognized for my contributions		59%	51%	53%
Issues of low performance are addressed in my department		60%	51%	50%
Senior leadership provides a clear direction for this institution's future		61%	61%	45%
When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered		63%	64%	56%
Promotions in my department are based on a person's ability		62%	37%	
There is regular and open communication among faculty, administration and staff		64%		52%
I can count on people to cooperate across departments			56%	53%
Our orientation program prepares new faculty, administration and staff to be effective	61%		58%	
I can speak up or challenge a traditional way of doing something without fear of harming my career		60%		59%
Senior leadership communicates openly about important matters		64%		55%
Faculty, administration and staff are meaningfully involved in institutional planning			62%	58%
Our review process accurately measures my job performance			54%	
Senior leadership shows a genuine interest in the well-being of faculty, administration and staff				46%
I believe what I am told by senior leadership				49%
This institution is well run				54%
This institution's culture is special –something you don't find just anywhere				54%
I understand the necessary requirements to advance my career			58%	
We have opportunities to contribute to important decisions in my department			58%	
Senior leadership regularly models this institution's values				55%
At this institution, we discuss and debate issues respectfully to get better results				56%
Our senior leadership has the knowledge, skills and experience necessary for institutional success				57%
Faculty, administration and staff work together to ensure the success of institution programs and initiatives				58%
There is a good balance of teaching, service and research at this institution				61%
There is appropriate recognition of innovative and high quality teaching				62%
This institution's policies and practices ensure fair treatment for faculty, administration and staff				62%
In my department, we communicate openly about issues that impact each other's work				63%

General Demographics by Job Category for Years at Institution Report

Below is a quick reference view of the low scoring questions by job category and years at institution.

Poor (0%-44%); Warrants Attention (45%-54%); Fair to Mediocre (55%-64%); Good (65%-75%); Very Good to Excellent (75%-100%)

		Years at Institution								
Areas of Interest		**< 2 yrs**	**2-4 yrs**	**5-7 yrs**	**8-10 yrs**	**11-15 yrs**	**16-20 yrs**	**21-25 yrs**	**> 25 yrs**	**Declined**
My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals.	Admin	42%	50%	20%			44%		0%	
	Exempt	33%	41%	33%	14%	14%	28%			
	NonEx	40%			33%				16%	
	Faculty	43%	42%	20%	13%	21%	29%	18%	30%	0%
Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me.	Admin	66%	75%	80%			66%		33%	
	Exempt	56%	81%	50%	42%	42%	57%			
	NonEx	60%			40%				66%	
	Faculty	50%	42%	40%	18%	36%	56%	18%	35%	12%
Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented.	Admin	57%	62%	60%			55%		83%	
	Exempt	38%	58%	58%	71%	28%	42%			
	NonEx	80%			16%				83%	
	Faculty	68%	71%	70%	45%	47%	41%	54%	70%	12%
There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution.	Admin	71%	62%	60%			55%		66%	
	Exempt	55%	91%	50%	57%	57%	71%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	62%	50%	40%	31%	42%	64%	18%	50%	25%

Poor (0%-44%); Warrants Attention (45%-54%); Fair to Mediocre (55%-64%); Good (65%-75%); Very Good to Excellent (75%-100%)

		Years at Institution								
Areas of Interest		**< 2 yrs**	**2-4 yrs**	**5-7 yrs**	**8-10 yrs**	**11-15 yrs**	**16-20 yrs**	**21-25 yrs**	**> 25 yrs**	**Declined**
I am paid fairly for my work.	Admin	85%	87%	80%			33%		50%	
	Exempt	61%	33%	41%	28%	28%	0%			
	NonEx	60%			66%				83%	
	Faculty	75%	64%	50%	22%	10%	52%	36%	45%	12%
I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job.	Admin	71%	62%	60%			44%		83%	
	Exempt	38%	66%	66%	57%	42%	42%			
	Faculty	56%	42%	50%	40%	36%	52%	36%	55%	37%
I am regularly recognized for my contributions.	Admin	100%	75%	80%			55%		66%	
	Exempt	55%	50%	66%	85%	42%	57%			
	NonEx	60%			66%				33%	
	Faculty	62%	71%	60%	40%	42%	58%	54%	55%	37%
Issues of low performance are addressed in my department.	Admin	42%	62%	80%			75%		66%	
	Exempt	50%	58%	66%	71%	33%	71%			
	NonEx	75%			33%				60%	
	Faculty	53%	78%	70%	27%	42%	37%	20%	70%	50%
Senior leadership provides a clear direction for this institution's future.	Admin	57%	62%	60%			77%		66%	
	Exempt	61%	75%	75%	57%	28%	57%			
	Faculty	62%	50%	50%	31%	21%	47%	45%	65%	25%
When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered.	Admin	100%	87%	80%			55%		100%	
	Exempt	61%	83%	75%	71%	42%	42%			
	NonEx	60%			33%				66%	
	Faculty	68%	78%	70%	50%	42%	58%	54%	55%	37%

General Demographics by Job Category for Years at Institution Report (continued)

Poor (0%-44%); Warrants Attention (45%-54%); Fair to Mediocre (55%-64%); Good (65%-75%); Very Good to Excellent (75%-100%)

		Years at Institution								
Areas of Interest		**< 2 yrs**	**2-4 yrs**	**5-7 yrs**	**8-10 yrs**	**11-15 yrs**	**16-20 yrs**	**21-25 yrs**	**> 25 yrs**	**Declined**
Promotions in my department are based on a person's ability.	Admin	71%	100%	100%			88%		50%	
	Exempt	42%	70%	77%	50%	50%	66%			
	NonEx	50%			50%				80%	
	Faculty	56%	78%	80%	54%	73%	70%	36%	85%	50%
There is regular and open communication among faculty, administration and staff.	Admin	71%	57%	80%			50%		83%	
	Exempt	52%	75%	58%	71%	42%	71%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	68%	85%	70%	36%	42%	52%	27%	55%	37%
I can count on people to cooperate across departments.	Admin	71%	62%	100%			44%		66%	
	Exempt	58%	75%	50%	42%	57%	57%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				50%	
	Faculty	62%	71%	60%	40%	42%	58%	50%	75%	25%
Our orientation program prepares new faculty, administration and staff to be effective.	Admin	66%	60%	80%			33%		0%	
	Exempt	58%	63%	100%	28%	75%	80%			
	NonEx	50%			60%				66%	
	Faculty	56%	85%	60%	72%	70%	73%	37%	81%	50%
I can speak up or challenge a traditional way of doing something without fear.	Exempt	61%	75%	66%	71%	28%	57%			
	NonEx	60%			66%				66%	
	Faculty	50%	57%	60%	63%	57%	64%	36%	80%	37%
Senior leadership communicates openly about important matters.	Admin	71%	62%	60%			66%		83%	
	Exempt	50%	75%	66%	57%	57%	71%			
	NonEx	60%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	68%	78%	40%	45%	42%	58%	45%	60%	50%
Faculty, administration and staff are meaningfully involved in institutional planning.	Exempt	52%	100%	83%	85%	42%	71%			
	NonEx	75%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	68%	78%	60%	40%	47%	70%	45%	65%	37%

General Demographics by Job Category for Years at Institution Report (continued)

Poor (0%-44%); Warrants Attention (45%-54%); Fair to Mediocre (55%-64%); Good (65%-75%); Very Good to Excellent (75%-100%)

		Years at Institution								
Areas of Interest		**< 2 yrs**	**2-4 yrs**	**5-7 yrs**	**8-10 yrs**	**11-15 yrs**	**16-20 yrs**	**21-25 yrs**	**> 25 yrs**	**Declined**
Our review process accurately measures my job performance.	Admin	50%	87%	100%			55%		50%	
	Exempt	76%	58%	66%	100%	42%	71%			
	NonEx	60%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	68%	71%	70%	72%	73%	64%	54%	80%	50%
Sr leadership shows a genuine interest in the well-being of faculty, admin. & staff.	Admin	71%	75%	80%			66%		50%	
	Exempt	72%	80%	83%	57%	57%	57%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	75%	57%	30%	31%	36%	47%	36%	55%	25%
I believe what I am told by senior leadership.	Admin	57%	62%	80%			77%		100%	
	NonEx	60%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	62%	71%	40%	31%	42%	52%	27%	63%	37%
This institution is well run.	Admin	71%	62%	80%			66%		100%	
	Exempt	66%	91%	66%	57%	71%	85%			
	Faculty	75%	57%	40%	31%	52%	70%	36%	70%	37%
This institution's culture is special - something you don't find just anywhere.	Admin	71%	62%	40%			75%		100%	
	Exempt	58%	75%	75%	85%	42%	71%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	80%	71%	60%	27%	33%	76%	27%	70%	37%
I understand the necessary requirements to advance my career.	Admin	57%	87%	100%			66%		50%	
	Exempt	61%	83%	72%	71%	57%	57%			
	NonEx	40%			50%				100%	
	Faculty	87%	78%	90%	90%	84%	100%	81%	95%	37%
We have opportunities to contribute to important decisions in my department.	Exempt	44%	91%	66%	100%	42%	71%			
	NonEx	60%			33%				66%	
	Faculty	62%	85%	90%	72%	78%	82%	63%	80%	75%
Senior leadership regularly models this institution's values.	Exempt	83%	100%	91%	71%	71%	57%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				83%	
	Faculty	81%	64%	60%	50%	33%	52%	36%	60%	50%
At this institution, we discuss and debate issues respectfully to get better results.	Admin	71%	62%	60%			77%		50%	
	Exempt	50%	81%	75%	71%	28%	71%			
	NonEx	80%			40%				83%	
	Faculty	62%	64%	50%	50%	52%	70%	27%	60%	62%
Our Sr leadership has the knowledge, skills and experience necessary for success.	Admin	85%	62%	80%			100%		66%	
	NonEx	100%			50%				100%	
	Faculty	75%	71%	50%	45%	47%	52%	45%	70%	50%
Faculty, admin. & staff work together to ensure success of institution pgms & initiatives.	Admin	85%	87%	80%			55%		83%	
	Exempt	55%	91%	66%	71%	57%	71%			
	Faculty	81%	78%	50%	50%	52%	58%	36%	70%	25%
There is a good balance of teaching, service and research at this institution.	NonEx	100%			60%				80%	
	Faculty	62%	57%	70%	59%	57%	70%	36%	70%	75%
There is appropriate recognition of innovative and high quality teaching.	NonEx	100%			80%				0%	
	Faculty	87%	64%	90%	45%	63%	76%	36%	65%	25%
This institution's policies & practices ensure fair treatment for faculty, admin. and staff.	Admin	100%	87%	80%			55%		100%	
	Exempt	88%	91%	75%	71%	57%	71%			
	Faculty	81%	92%	80%	54%	57%	70%	18%	60%	25%
In my department, we communicate openly about issues that impact each other's work.	Admin	57%	100%	100%			88%		100%	
	Exempt	55%	75%	83%	100%	28%	57%			
	NonEx	80%			50%				100%	
	Faculty	62%	71%	80%	50%	68%	64%	27%	75%	75%

Detail by Job Category

Scoring chart:

Poor	Warrants Attention	Fair to Mediocre	Good	Very Good to Excellent
0%-44%	45%-54%	55%-64%	65%-74%	75%-100%

Following is an analysis of individual questions scoring Mediocre (64%) or lower is provided by job category:

Administration – 6 points of interest

- I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job (60%)
- My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals (37%)
- Our orientation program prepares new faculty, administration and staff to be effective (61%)
- Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented (62%)
- There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution (64%)
- Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me (61%)

Exempt Professional Staff – 14 points of interest

- I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job (50%)
- I am paid fairly for my work (41%)
- My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals (28%)
- Senior leadership provides a clear direction for this institution's future (61%)
- Senior leadership communicates openly about important matters (64%)
- There is regular and open communication among faculty, administration and staff (64%)
- Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented (50%)
- I can speak up or challenge a traditional way of doing something without fear of harming my career (60%)
- There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution (63%)
- When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered (63%)
- Promotions in my department are based on a person's ability (62%)
- Issues of low performance are addressed in my department (60%)
- I am regularly recognized for my contributions (59%)
- Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me (59%)

Non-exempt Staff – 16 points of interest

- I understand the necessary requirements to advance my career (58%)
- I am paid fairly for my work (58%)
- Our review process accurately measures my job performance (54%)
- My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals (25%)
- Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented (58%)
- Our orientation program prepares new faculty, administration and staff to be effective (58%)
- Faculty, administration and staff are meaningfully involved in institutional planning (62%)

- Senior leadership provides a clear direction for this institution's future (61%)
- We have opportunities to contribute to important decisions in my department (58%)
- I can count on people to cooperate across departments (56%)
- There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution (61%)
- When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered (64%)
- Promotions in my department are based on a person's ability (37%)
- Issues of low performance are addressed in my department (51%)
- I am regularly recognized for my contributions (51%)
- Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me (56%)

Faculty - 27 points of interest

- I am provided the resources I need to be effective in my job (46%)
- There is a good balance of teaching, service and research at this institution (61%)
- There is appropriate recognition of innovative and high quality teaching (62%)
- I am paid fairly for my work (40%)
- My department has adequate faculty/staff to achieve our goals (25%)
- This institution is well run (54%)
- Faculty, administration and staff are meaningfully involved in institutional planning (58%)
- This institution's culture is special –something you don't find just anywhere (54%)
- Senior leadership provides a clear direction for this institution's future (45%)
- Our senior leadership has the knowledge, skills and experience necessary for institutional success (57%)
- Senior leadership shows a genuine interest in the well-being of faculty, administration and staff (46%)
- Senior leadership communicates openly about important matters (55%)
- Senior leadership regularly models this institution's values (55%)
- I believe what I am told by senior leadership (49%)
- Faculty, administration and staff work together to ensure the success of institution programs and initiatives (58%)
- There is regular and open communication among faculty, administration and staff (52%)
- When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered (56%)
- In my department, we communicate openly about issues that impact each other's work (63%)
- Changes that affect me are discussed prior to being implemented (54%)
- At this institution, we discuss and debate issues respectfully to get better results (56%)
- I can count on people to cooperate across departments (53%)
- There's a sense that we're all on the same team at this institution (45%)
- I can speak up or challenge a traditional way of doing something without fear of harming my career (59%)
- Issues of low performance are addressed in my department (50%)

- This institution's policies and practices ensure fair treatment for faculty, administration and staff (62%)
- I am regularly recognized for my contributions (53%)
- Our recognition and awards programs are meaningful to me (36%)

Conclusions

The response rate was higher than average for this survey which assists in the value of the information reported. The campus, particularly the Faculty, want to make their voices heard. This year's data reflects improvement in a few areas and decline in a few other areas.

Facilities and Supervisor/Department Chairs are the strongest Positive Dimensions. With respect to Facilities, the respondents view the campus as safe and secure while meeting their needs. Supervisor/Department Chairs shine with ensuring expectations are clear, requesting and providing feedback, being trustworthy and a role model, fairness, consistency, and overall maintaining good working relationships.

Collaboration and collegiality from the Employee Comments Report were very good, particularly within Administration and Faculty. However, when reviewing broadly across Faculty, Administration and Staff relations, interdepartmental working relationships were viewed as Fair to Mediocre.

With respect to Compensation, Benefits & Work/Life, the result overall was positive. There was an underlying dissatisfaction with pay. Additionally, there is an overwhelming dissatisfaction with adequate staffing and resources, resulting in additional workload with no recognition. The lack of recognition spreads beyond compensation as SU's recognition and awards programs scored low nearly across all job categories.

Finally, Senior Leadership's genuine interest in campus well-being, open communication, and clear direction was the primary focus of the Faculty voice resulting in a Fair to Mediocre score. Clear direction and open communication about important matters also elicited low scores from Exempt and Nonexempt staff.

Faculty feedback was overwhelmingly a low Positive throughout the survey and presents the greatest opportunity for a job group engagement initiative.