

INTRODUCTION

This report presents results from the April 2005 Hillsborough Community College Faculty and Staff Satisfaction Survey. The report has two parts. The first provides a summary of the survey ratings. The second contains comments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is extended to each staff, faculty and administrator who completed the survey and encouraged others to participate. Ensuring the quality and availability of useful information is a basic function of Institutional Research. Your participation in the HCC Faculty and Staff Survey contributed to the value of this report, and its utility to the College.

The Institutional Research staff acknowledges the comments offered by our colleagues. We recognize that it required your investment of time to make this contribution to our knowledge base. It is our privilege to advance your comments so we may build on our collective strengths, and address proactively our challenges.

HCC Institutional Research Staff
Newton Beardsley, Special Projects Manager
Katherine Blount, Testing Assistant
Jan Schwartz, Director

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview The Faculty and Staff Satisfaction Survey is part of the ongoing College assessment plan. The purpose of the survey is to examine employee satisfaction with 40 College qualities and services.

Highlights The survey assessed satisfaction at four levels of service: College; centralized district services; campus services including academic support, student services, and non-academic support; and major instructional programs. Services with relatively high levels of satisfaction are recognized as strengths, and services with relatively low levels of satisfaction provide challenges and suggest improvement opportunities.

Employee satisfaction provides information to inform planning and support decisions. It is suggested that these findings be applied prudently, in the context of collateral measures, and in the spirit of empowering students to excel.

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

PURPOSE

The Hillsborough Community College Faculty and Staff Satisfaction Survey is one institutional assessment. Assessments are conducted on an ongoing schedule to support planning and decision-making. The assessments are linked to planning and review processes to promote institutional effectiveness.

METHOD

Population and Respondents. The full-time faculty and staff population were defined by a list of active employees as of April 6, 2005, as provided by the payroll department. The part-time faculty employee population included those who provided instruction in Fall 2004 and Spring 2005. Administrators were included with staff. Table 1 shows the number of surveys respondents.

Table 1: Survey respondents

Respondents	Location					Total
	BR	DM	PC	YC	DAO*	
Distributed	231	433	54	250	152	1,120
Returned	123	230	47	117	105	622
Return as % Distributed	53%	53%	87%	47%	73%	55%
Location as % Total	20%	37%	8%	19%	17%	100%

*Other locations (N = 8) were included with DAO.

In addition to location, respondents provided three other descriptors: position type, primary service area, and employment length. These descriptors will be used for future subgroup analyses.

Survey Content. The survey content was selected to support the diverse and decentralized learning environment of the College. The survey assesses employee satisfaction at four levels of management: the College, district offices, campuses, and major instructional programs. This was done to enable results to be useful at each management level while reinforcing a sense of collective responsibility for operational improvements.

The survey items were constructed from a review of surveys developed by comparable colleges and national companies. Table 2 shows the survey content distribution. The survey is Appendix A.

Table 2: Survey content

Content	Organizational Level				Total
	College	District	Campus	Program	
Items	5	8	23	4	40
% Items	12%	20%	58%	10%	100%

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

The 40 item survey addressed employee satisfaction with five College qualities, eight District services, 23 campus services, and four instructional program qualities. Using national satisfaction surveys as a guide, campus services were classified into three groups for ease of interpretation as shown in Table 3. Academic support and student services constituted 56 percent of the campus survey items with non-academic services represented by 43 percent of the items.

Table 3: Campus service groups

Campus Service Groups	Number of Services	% of Items	Services
Academic Support	6	26%	Course scheduling Grades & transcripts Libraries Mathematics labs Reading/writing Tutoring services
Student Services	7	30%	Academic advising & counseling Admissions & records Financial aid services Registration process Services for disabled students Student activities Test center
Non-Academic Support	10	43%	Bookstore Bursar office Classroom equipment Computer labs for students Facilities & maintenance Food services Mail service Parking Printing/duplication Security

Survey items had a five-point scale with directions asking the respondent to 'rate your level of satisfaction'. Satisfaction was rated on a four-point scale Likert scale. In processing results, the rating scale was reversed as follows: *1= very dissatisfied, 2= dissatisfied, 3= satisfied, and 4=very satisfied* so higher scores corresponded with a more favorable response. The fifth point on the scale allowed the respondent to indicate uncertainty or non-use. Level of use indicates customer demand on the service. Level of use was used to qualify high use services. Both use and satisfaction were applied to evaluate ratings.

Administration. The survey is part of the College assessment plan as shown in Appendix B. was administered in April 2005 to College employees, and will be administered again in 2007. The survey was introduced to the College community in an e-mail from the office of the President. The scantron survey was distributed through intercampus mail on April 19, with directions for return by April 29.

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

To encourage high return rates, two follow-up notes were e-mailed to College administrators. Respondents were assured anonymity in their responses in keeping with good practices in assessment protocol for affective, self-reported surveys.

Limitations. A single assessment from an internal group has limitations. Survey results are most valuable when applied with collateral assessments, and considered in the context of the unifying College mission to empower students to excel. The Community College for Student Engagement allows for student input.

Analysis. Survey findings are presented sequentially for each service level. Three summaries are provided and are detailed below.

1. Ratings. Descriptive results include the number of respondents, level of use, and the percent of satisfied ratings.
2. Strengths and improvements. A contrast of percentages was used to identify relative strengths and opportunities for improved service.

Ratings were used to identify strengths and challenges. The average percent of use was applied to identify services as low (below average) or high (above average). Similarly, the percent of satisfied and very satisfied ratings was used to identify services as low (below average) or high (above average) in employee satisfaction. **Strengths** were services with high use and satisfaction ratings. Services with above average satisfaction ratings and low use may benefit from a review of efficiency in resource allocation. **Challenges** were services with low use and satisfaction ratings. Services with high use and low satisfaction should also be considered for opportunities to improve.

Services were evaluated to consider satisfaction and use. Satisfaction ratings offer an index of the degree to which the service met the expectations of employees. Level of use indexes the proportion of employees making use the service. Low service use may be based in a number of factors including limited awareness, or services targeting an employee subgroup. Service demand, as indexed by use, brings a second dimension to the satisfaction ratings and encourages discussion of resource allocation in relation to resource use.

3. Ratings by location. Ratings are summarized according to employee workplace.

Ratings by location were included to encourage a more targeted application of survey findings. Dialogues across locations may include consideration of service strengths, and shared practices.

Employee comments were invited for survey items rated "very satisfied", "very dissatisfied" and for ideas "...to improve service quality". The comments are provided as they were written. They were edited only to delete reference to an individual or person specific position. Comments may best be applied by first examining them for recurring content.

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

COLLEGE QUALITIES. Across the five College qualities, 83.2 percent of the employees indicating satisfaction. Table 4 shows the number of respondents (respond), the number of percent rating satisfaction (certain), and the number and percent of respondents indicating their favorable satisfaction (satisfied or very satisfied).

Table 4: Ratings for College qualities

College qualities	N Respond	Certain		Satisfied or Very Satisfied	
		N	%	N	%
Academic standards	612	511	83.5	447	87.5
Financial resources	611	501	82.0	333	66.5
Quality of instruction	609	506	83.1	473	93.5
Responsiveness to diverse populations	611	515	84.3	460	89.3
Student learning outcomes	610	482	79.0	382	79.3
Overall	611	503	82.4	419	83.2

Strengths. Services were noted as a strength when employee ratings had both a higher level of certainty (>82.4 percent), and satisfaction (>83.2 percent) when compared to the overall College percentages for qualities in this group. Strengths were found in College academic standards, the quality of instruction, and responsiveness to diverse populations.

Challenges. Improvement opportunities were indicated for financial resources and student learning outcomes.

College findings are useful benchmarks; however, location specific results allow findings to be considered for more targeted operational improvements. On the next page, Table 5 shows the findings for College qualities by location.

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

Table 5 displays ratings by location and indexes comments. The right column identifies the page number in the second section of this report for employee comments. Comments are labeled strengths (S), challenges (C), and improvements (I). Strengths were employee comments for services rated 'very satisfied'. Challenges were employee comments about the weaknesses of services rated as 'very dissatisfied'. Improvements were employee comments about how to improve services. To read comments about academic standards, use page one in the comment section.

Table 5: Results for College qualities by location

College Qualities	Location	N Respond	% Certain	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied	Comment Pages		
					S	C	I
Academic standards	BR	122	90.2	84.5	1	1	1
	DM	224	90.2	89.6			
	PC	46	87.0	90.0			
	YC	122	84.2	82.3			
	DAO	94	57.4	94.4			
Financial resources	BR	122	83.6	70.6	2	2	2
	DM	224	87.5	63.8			
	PC	46	82.6	63.2			
	YC	114	82.5	67.0			
	DAO	93	67.7	71.4			
Quality of instruction	BR	121	90.1	89.0	3	3	3
	DM	223	87.9	94.4			
	PC	46	89.1	98.1			
	YC	114	86.0	96.9			
	DAO	93	57.0	98.1			
Responsive to diverse populations	BR	122	90.2	88.2	4	4	4
	DM	224	89.3	88.0			
	PC	46	89.1	90.2			
	YC	113	82.3	91.4			
	DAO	93	65.6	90.2			
Student learning outcomes	BR	122	80.3	78.6	5	5	5
	DM	224	87.1	82.1			
	PC	45	88.9	77.5			
	YC	114	81.6	79.6			
	DAO	92	53.3	73.5			

Quality of instruction and responsiveness to diverse populations were strengths across campuses. Financial resources and student learning outcomes were challenges for employees in all locations. For DAO employees, their percent of certainty is low when compared to campus-based employees. Opportunities to learn more about College qualities may benefit DAO employees.

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

DISTRICT SERVICES. Across the eight district services, 80.5 percent of the employees noted their satisfaction with services. Table 6 summarizes the findings and shows the number of respondents (N Respond), the number and percent of employee use (Level of Use), and the number and percent of respondents indicating their satisfaction (Satisfied or Very Satisfied).

Table 6: Ratings for District services

District services	N Respond	Level of Use		Satisfied or Very Satisfied	
		N	%	N	%
Administration & Finances	617	536	86.9	413	77.1
Education & Student Development	610	435	71.3	377	86.7
External Affairs	614	302	49.2	254	84.1
HCC Foundation	614	310	50.5	250	80.6
Human Resources	613	524	85.5	416	79.4
Information Technology	613	550	89.7	423	76.9
TCTC	613	190	31.0	144	75.8
Planning/MIS/Research	615	248	40.3	207	83.5
Overall	614	387	63.1	311	80.5

Strengths. These services had both a higher level of use (>63.1 percent), and percentage of employee satisfaction ratings (>80.5 percent) when compared to the College overall for all services in this group. A strength in district services was found in Education and Student Development services. Relatively high percentages of satisfaction ratings and low use were found for External Affairs, the HCC Foundation, and Planning.

Challenges. The survey findings suggested there were improvement opportunities for The Corporate Training Center @ HCC (TCTC). Based on its relatively low use and satisfaction among employees, this service was classified as a challenge. It must be noted that College employees are not the primary customer group for the Center. Rather, the customer base is among local businesses. Employee satisfaction with this corporate outreach may not be as pertinent as assessments of satisfaction with their local business customers.

On the next page, Table 7 displays ratings by location and indexes comments for each service. These comments are found on pages 6 – 15.

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

Table 7: Results for district services by location

District services	Location	N Respond	% Use	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied	Comment Pages		
					S	C	I
Administration & Finances	BR	121	89.3	70.4	6	6	7
	DM	227	83.7	75.3			
	PC	46	87.0	77.5			
	YC	116	85.3	69.7			
	DAO	95	94.7	96.7			
Education & Student Development	BR	122	81.1	84.8	8	8	8
	DM	226	74.8	88.2			
	PC	45	82.2	78.4			
	YC	113	73.5	88.0			
	DAO	91	46.2	92.9			
External Affairs	BR	122	52.5	75.0	9	9	9
	DM	227	45.4	83.5			
	PC	45	51.1	82.6			
	YC	115	54.8	92.1			
	DAO	93	48.4	88.9			
HCC Foundation	BR	121	45.5	92.7	10	10	10
	DM	227	49.8	69.0			
	PC	46	51.6	82.1			
	YC	115	53.9	85.5			
	DAO	93	51.6	87.5			
Human Resources	BR	120	86.7	78.8	11	11	12
	DM	225	84.9	80.6			
	PC	46	87.0	77.5			
	YC	116	81.9	76.8			
	DAO	94	93.6	81.8			
Information Technology	BR	121	94.2	77.2	13	13	13
	DM	227	89.0	79.2			
	PC	46	91.3	69.0			
	YC	113	83.2	76.6			
	DAO	94	94.7	77.5			
TCTC	BR	120	35.8	79.1	14	14	14
	DM	226	22.6	88.2			
	PC	46	28.3	92.3			
	YC	115	32.2	73.0			
	DAO	94	45.7	55.8			
Planning/MIS/Research	BR	121	40.5	71.4	15	15	15
	DM	227	37.4	81.2			
	PC	46	43.5	75.0			
	YC	115	37.4	90.7			
	DAO	93	52.7	98.0			

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

CAMPUS SERVICES, ACADEMIC SUPPORT. As shown in Table 8, 85.8 percent of the employees provided ratings of satisfied or very satisfied for academic support services.

Table 8: Ratings for Academic Support Services

Academic Support	N Respond	Level of Use		% Satisfied or Very Satisfied	
		N	%	N	%
Course scheduling	612	438	71.6%	368	84.0
Grades & transcripts	622	409	65.8%	350	85.6
Libraries	611	426	69.7%	400	93.9
Mathematics labs	612	165	27.0%	139	84.2
Reading/writing labs	611	216	35.4%	188	87.0
Tutoring services	613	271	44.2%	217	80.1
Overall	614	321	52.3%	277	85.8

Strengths. High percentages of use and satisfaction ratings distinguished libraries as a strength. Strengths were defined as services with both higher use levels (>52.3 percent) and satisfaction ratings (>85.8 percent) when compared to the overall College. High percentages of satisfaction ratings were also found for the reading/writing laboratories. However, the service had relatively low levels of use among employees. The relatively low use of mathematics labs, reading/writing labs, and tutoring services may be applied to discussions of service efficiency.

Challenges. The survey findings suggested there were improvement opportunities for tutoring services and mathematics labs.

On the next page, Table 9 shows the findings for academic support services based on employees at each campus. District office (DAO) employee ratings were not included for academic support since level of use was low. Across campuses, libraries were a strength while tutoring services appear to be a challenge. Mathematics labs, also a challenge, did receive above average ratings from Dale Mabry campus employees.

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

The comments were organized by campus, and then by service, in alphabetical order. This allowed each location to view comments across services. However, it does not easily point out comments for a specific service. To read employee comments, use the Comment Pages reference in Table 9. For example, comments about course scheduling from Brandon employees is found on page 16 (strengths), and 20 (challenges). No improvement suggestions were made. 'NA' appears when no employee comments were offered.

Table 9: Results for academic support by location

Academic Support	Location	N Respond	% Use	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied	Comment Pages		
					S	C	I
Course scheduling	BR	121	82.6	89.0	16	20	NA
	DM	225	82.2	84.3	29	35	40
	PC	46	91.3	71.4	45	NA	NA
	YC	115	73.0	85.7	52	56	NA
Grades & transcripts	BR	123	70.7	87.4	17	21	NA
	DM	229	78.2	83.2	29	36	41
	PC	46	69.6	90.6	45	48	NA
	YC	115	66.1	89.5	53	57	NA
Libraries	BR	121	83.5	94.1	17	NA	24
	DM	225	76.0	93.0	29	37	41
	PC	46	80.4	89.2	45	NA	NA
	YC	112	69.6	97.4	53	NA	NA
Mathematics labs	BR	120	31.7	81.6	17	NA	NA
	DM	226	26.1	93.2	NA	NA	NA
	PC	46	34.8	75.0	NA	NA	NA
	YC	113	33.6	84.2	46	48	NA
Reading/writing labs	BR	120	46.7	89.3	17	NA	NA
	DM	227	37.4	91.8	30	NA	NA
	PC	46	37.0	76.5	46	48	NA
	YC	112	42.0	85.1	53	NA	NA
Tutoring services	BR	120	46.7	75.0	18	22	NA
	DM	228	50.9	83.6	32	38	NA
	PC	46	63.0	82.8	46	49	NA
	YC	114	50.0	78.9	NA	58	NA

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

CAMPUS SERVICES, STUDENT SERVICES. Table 10 summarizes ratings for student services, and shows 74.5 percent of the employees reporting service satisfaction.

Table 10: Ratings for student services

Student services	N Respond	Level of Use		Satisfied or Very Satisfied	
		N	%	N	%
Academic advising & counseling	611	405	66.3%	298	73.6%
Admissions & records	617	408	66.1%	290	71.1%
Financial aid services	617	282	45.7%	182	64.5%
Registration process	613	374	61.0%	245	65.5%
Services for disabled students	612	351	57.4%	270	76.9%
Student activities	611	327	53.5%	285	87.2%
Test center	615	372	60.5%	308	82.8%
Overall	614	360	58.6%	268	74.5%

Strengths. Strengths had both higher use levels (>58.6 percent) and favorable ratings (>74.5 percent) when compared to the College overall. District employee ratings were not included for academic support since level of use was low. Employee high levels of use and satisfaction distinguished the test centers as strengths.

Challenges. Employee ratings suggested improvement opportunities for financial aid services.

Table 11 displays ratings and comment pages for student services for each location.

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

Table 11 shows results for each service by location, and points to the page numbers for comments. To read employee comments, reference the comment pages in the far right column.

Table 11: Results for student services by location

Student services	Location	N Respond	% Use	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied	Comment Pages		
					S	C	I
Academic advising and counseling	BR	122	74.6	69.2	16	20	NA
	DM	223	73.1	81.0	28	34	40
	PC	46	82.6	71.1	45	47	49
	YC	113	67.3	64.5	52	55	NA
Admissions & records	BR	121	73.6	67.4	16	20	NA
	DM	223	67.7	67.1	28	34	40
	PC	46	84.8	74.4	45	47	NA
	YC	114	69.3	84.8	52	55	NA
Financial aid services	BR	122	45.1	80.0	16	NA	NA
	DM	229	46.7	61.7	29	36	41
	PC	46	56.5	76.9	NA	47	NA
	YC	114	53.5	65.6	NA	56	60
Registration process	BR	119	66.4	68.4	17	21	24
	DM	228	65.4	57.0	NA	37	41
	PC	46	67.4	77.4	46	NA	NA
	YC	112	67.9	75.0	NA	57	60
Services for disabled students	BR	119	61.3	93.2	18	NA	NA
	DM	227	67.8	65.6	31	38	41
	PC	46	67.4	83.9	46	NA	NA
	YC	114	63.2	86.1	NA	58	NA
Student activities	BR	120	66.7	93.8	18	NA	NA
	DM	228	61.4	92.1	31	38	NA
	PC	45	60.0	74.1	NA	48	NA
	YC	113	56.6	78.1	54	58	NA
Test center	BR	121	70.2	92.9	18	NA	NA
	DM	228	68.9	82.2	32	38	41
	PC	46	71.7	60.6	NA	48	NA
	YC	114	65.8	88.0	54	58	NA

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

CAMPUS SERVICES, NON-ACADEMIC SUPPORT. Non-academic support is the third category of campus services. Table 12 shows 80 percent of employees reporting satisfaction with this service group.

Table 12: Ratings for non-academic services

Non-academic services	N Respond	Level of Use		Satisfied or Very Satisfied	
		N	%	N	%
Bookstore	616	449	72.9	403	89.8
Bursar office	615	463	75.3	412	89.0
Classroom equipment	616	428	69.5	274	64.0
Computer labs for students	619	357	57.7	272	76.2
Facilities & maintenance	617	563	91.2	390	69.3
Food services	620	407	65.6	281	69.0
Mail service	616	584	94.8	542	92.8
Parking	616	600	97.4	387	64.5
Printing/duplication	614	537	87.5	514	95.7
Security	617	590	95.6	493	83.6
Overall	617	490	79.4	393	80.0

Strengths. Strengths had both higher use levels (>79.4 percent) and favorable ratings (>80.0 percent) when compared to the College overall. Three services were recognized as strengths by employee ratings: mail service, printing and duplication, and security.

Challenges. The three challenges were classroom equipment, computer labs and food service.

It is noteworthy that facilities and maintenance, and parking both had high use and low satisfaction among employees. This suggests the need to plan discussions of improvement opportunities for the College's physical infrastructure.

Campus ratings for non-academic services follow in Table 13. Some non-academic services are also relevant to DAO employees. Their ratings were included selectively when level of use met or exceeded the College average of 79.4 percent.

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

Campus ratings for non-academic services follow in Table 13. Some non-academic services are also relevant to DAO employees. Their ratings were included selectively when level of use met or exceeded the College overall of 79 percent. To read employee comments, reference the comment pages in the far right column.

Table 13: Results for non-academic services by location

Non-academic services	Location	N Respond	% Use	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied	Comment Pages		
					S	C	I
Bookstore	BR	121	74.4	83.3	16	20	NA
	DM	228	82.0	93.0	28	NA	NA
	PC	46	84.8	82.1	45	NA	NA
	YC	116	77.6	94.4	52	55	NA
Bursar office	BR	121	76.0	90.2	16	20	NA
	DM	227	78.0	86.4	28	35	NA
	PC	45	82.2	94.6	45	47	NA
	YC	116	80.2	89.2	52	55	NA
Classroom equipment	BR	120	79.2	68.4	16	20	NA
	DM	228	78.1	66.9	28	35	40
	PC	46	78.3	66.7	NA	47	49
	YC	114	84.2	52.1	52	55	60
Computer labs	BR	123	68.3	83.3	16	20	NA
	DM	229	64.2	78.2	28	35	NA
	PC	46	69.6	75.0	NA	47	NA
	YC	115	61.7	69.0	52	56	NA
Facilities & maintenance	BR	122	95.9	63.2	16	21	24
	DM	226	96.5	68.3	29	35	40
	PC	46	89.1	68.3	45	47	NA
	YC	115	93.0	70.1	52	56	NA
	DAO	94	73.4	60.6	63	65	66
Food services	BR	123	78.0	63.5	17	21	24
	DM	229	75.1	65.1	29	36	41
	PC	46	39.1	16.7	NA	47	NA
	YC	116	71.6	88.0	52	57	NA
Mail service	BR	121	93.4	89.4	17	21	24
	DM	226	94.7	95.8	29	37	41
	PC	46	95.7	86.4	NA	48	NA
	YC	114	96.5	90.9	53	57	NA
	DAO	94	96.8	94.7	63	NA	NA

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

Table 13: Results for non-academic services by location, con'd.

Non-academic services	Locations	N Respond	% Use	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied	Comments		
					S	C	I
Parking	BR	121	98.3	74.8	17	22	NA
	DM	225	98.7	67.6	NA	37	41
	PC	46	93.5	86.0	NA	NA	NA
	YC	115	99.1	41.2	NA	57	NA
	DAO	95	94.7	64.4	63	65	NA
Printing/duplication	BR	120	90.8	93.6	17	22	NA
	DM	228	89.9	97.1	30	NA	NA
	PC	46	82.6	84.2	46	NA	NA
	YC	113	92.0	97.1	53	58	NA
Security	BR	121	96.7	70.9	18	22	24
	DM	225	97.8	89.5	31	NA	41
	PC	46	91.3	85.7	46	NA	41
	YC	115	97.4	76.8	54	58	NA
	DAO	95	91.6	87.4	64	65	NA

INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS. Instructional programs were the focus for this portion of the satisfaction assessment. Faculty were asked to rate four qualities. Table 14 shows the overall ratings. Across program qualities, 76.4 percent of the faculty rated qualities on their satisfaction (level of certainty). Overall, satisfaction was reported by 88.2 percent of responding faculty.

Table 14: Ratings for instructional program qualities

Instructional program qualities	N Respond	Level of Certainty		Satisfied or Very Satisfied	
		N	%	N	%
Class size	461	355	77.0%	332	93.5%
Course content	459	350	76.3%	332	94.9%
Instructional materials	456	349	76.5%	311	89.1%
Resources to ensure quality of program	457	347	75.9%	262	75.5%
Overall	458	350	76.4%	309	88.2%

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

Instructional program ratings may be considered for program review. The following three tables support this process. Respondents were faculty who self-identified their primary instructional program as: University Transfer (A.A.), Technical Programs: Health Specify, or other Technical Programs.

Table 15 displays faculty satisfaction ratings for the university transfer program. For this program, faculty satisfaction was greater than 90 percent for three of the four qualities assessed. Program resources were rated satisfied or very satisfied by 73.5 percent of faculty respondents.

Table 15: Ratings for program qualities for the university transfer program

Program qualities	Locations	N Respond	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied
Class size	BR	29	92.9
	DM	45	95.6
	PC	12	100.0
	YC	30	93.1
Overall		116	94.7
Course content	BR	29	89.3
	DM	45	91.1
	PC	12	100.0
	YC	30	100.0
Overall		116	93.9
Instructional materials	BR	29	96.4
	DM	45	91.1
	PC	12	75.0
	YC	30	90.0
Overall		116	90.5
Resources to ensure quality of program	BR	29	73.1
	DM	45	84.1
	PC	12	63.6
	YC	30	62.1
Overall		116	73.5

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

Table 16 shows ratings for the health programs. Across the programs, faculty satisfaction was greater than 90 percent for two of the four qualities assessed. Instructional materials were rated favorably by 76.5 percent of the responding faculty, and program resources were rated favorably by 73.6 percent.

Table 16: Ratings for program qualities for health programs

Program qualities	Location	N Respond	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied
Class size	BR	NA	
	DM	29	92.9
	PC	3	66.7
	YC	2	100.0
Overall		34	91.0
Course content	BR	NA	
	DM	30	100.0
	PC	3	100.0
	YC	2	50.0
Overall		35	97.1
Instructional materials	BR	NA	
	DM	30	75.9
	PC	3	66.7
	YC	2	100.0
Overall		35	76.5
Resources to ensure quality of program	BR	NA	
	DM	30	75.9
	PC	3	33.3
	YC	2	100.0
Overall		35	73.6

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

Table 17 focuses on the other technical programs. Faculty satisfaction was greater than 90 percent for the four qualities assessed.

Table 17: Program qualities for technical programs (not health)

Program qualities	Location	N Respond	% Satisfied or Very Satisfied
Class size	BR	5	100.0
	DM	21	95.0
	PC	2	100.0
	YC	5	100.0
Overall		33	96.8
Course content	BR	5	100.0
	DM	21	100.0
	PC	2	100.0
	YC	5	100.0
Overall		33	100.0
Instructional materials	BR	5	100.0
	DM	21	100.0
	PC	2	100.0
	YC	5	100.0
Overall		33	100.0
Resources to ensure quality of program	BR	5	100.0
	DM	21	89.5
	PC	2	100.0
	YC	5	100.0
Overall		33	93.3

Employee comments about program qualities were organized by campus. Comments on program qualities from Brandon employees begin on page 18; Dale Mabry comments start on page 32; Plant City comments begin on page 46; and Ybor City comments begin on page 54.

Some employee comments did not specify the service or quality of reference. This group of comments, titled Unspecified, are provided in the comments section. The first page number for these comments: Brandon, page 19; Dale Mabry, page 33; Plant City, page 47; and DAO, page 64.

FACULTY AND STAFF SATISFACTION SURVEY, 2005

CONCLUSIONS

When the satisfaction ratings were examined in aggregate, the four instructional program qualities reflected a high level of satisfaction among faculty with overall satisfaction ratings of 88.2 percent. In support of student learning, the academic support services emerged with the highest ratings of satisfaction (85.8 percent). Employee satisfaction with College qualities also produced high ratings (83.2 percent). District services and non-academic support earned satisfaction ratings of 80.5 percent and 80.0 percent, respectively. Student services, with satisfaction ratings of 74.5 percent, were relatively low.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ACTION

The intention of this report is to contribute information to recurring processes in support of planned improvement focused on student learning. Employee satisfaction with College services provides one source of information to support decisions. It is suggested that these findings be applied prudently, in the context of collateral measures, and in the spirit of empowering students to excel.

APPENDIX B

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS SURVEY PROGRAM

Hillsborough Community College administers a survey program to support assessment of its planning processes and academic/non-academic program review. Hallmarks of the program include:

1. Client satisfaction: Every college unit provides a service to clients – how satisfied are they with the services provided.
2. Triangulation: Common core questions among *four* client groups reveal the extent to which there is a convergence in satisfaction. *
3. Stability: Regular administrations of the same surveys permit trend analysis to demonstrate improvement in client satisfaction.
4. Benchmarking: How satisfied are clients (i.e. students) at this institution compared with those across a region (e.g. nation, southeast United States, Florida).

The table below displays the survey schedule in a biennial format. **Note:** the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) will be administered annually at least until 2008-09 to support implementation of the Achieving the Dream Grant and a state-sponsored triennial (2007-08) administration to support assessment of the FCCCS Strategic Plan. Questions will be appended to CCSSE to allow triangulation among the surveys with regard to client satisfaction.

Academic Year	Term	Survey Focus	Respondent Group	Instrument Source
Odd years (2005/2006)	Fall	Satisfaction (IE)	Former Students (graduates/non-completers)	HCC
	Spring	Engagement (IE)	Enrolled Students	CCSSE
Even years (2006/2007)	Fall	Satisfaction (IE)	Local Employers of Graduates (tech programs)	HCC
		Anticipated needs	Entering Students	HCC
	Spring	Satisfaction (IE)	Faculty/staff	HCC
		Engagement (IE)	Enrolled Students	CCSSE **
Continuous	Both	Satisfaction with course	Enrolled Students	HCC

* Client or survey respondent groups are 1) current students, 2) former students, 3) employers of graduates, and 4) faculty/staff.

** Triennial administration in concert with the state consortium.

- Approved by Cabinet 8/2/05

