

# Faculty-Staff Climate Survey

AY 2021-22: Initial Findings



# Involved:

- > Faculty Senate (oversight):
  - Dave Westenberg (Personnel Cmte, Chair)
  - Kelly Homan (President)
- > Institutional Research:
  - R. Wayne Jones – data collection, data cleaning, and initial data summaries
- > Psychological Science:
  - Clair Kueny – data analyses, interpretation, & reporting
  - Devin Burns – assist with data management & analyses

# Data Overview

- > After data cleaning (removing missing data, short duration responders, potential repeat/careless responders) usable data from 582 participants
  - 164 Faculty, 346 Staff, 72 did not report role
  - 63 CASB faculty, 64 CEC faculty, 35 preferred not to respond (PNR)
  - 253 identify as Female, 172 identify as Male, 61 did not report, 96 preferred not to respond (PNR)

# Overall Concerns

- > Organizational justice: *critically low perception.*
  - How pay/raises/etc. are distributed (m = 1.14, 0-5)
  - How procedures are followed (m = 2.14, 0-5)
  - Treated with respect from upper administration (m = 2.76, 0-5)
    - > Compared to direct supervisor (m = 4.02, 0-5)
  - Communication from upper administration (m = 1.95, 0-5)
    - > Compared to direct supervisor (m = 3.48, 0-5)
  - Terminology: perception of fairness in the workplace.

# Overall Concerns

- > *Organizational support and commitment: less than ideal.*
  - Organizational support ( $m = 3.15$ , scale = 1-7)
    - > Score translates to slight disagreement [4=neutral, 3=slight disagreement]
    - > Terminology: belief the organization values one's contributions and cares for employee well-being
  - Affective commitment ( $m = 3.93$ , 1-7)
    - > Score translates to slight disagreement side of neutral
    - > Terminology: committed due to strong emotional attachment to organization
  - Continuance commitment ( $m = 4.03$ , 1-7)
    - > Score translates to neutral
    - > Terminology: need to stay committed because there are no better alternatives

# Differences: Faculty vs Staff

- > Faculty report greater exhaustion and greater constraints
  - Faculty/Staff:  $m=4.01/3.49$  [3=sometimes, 4=often]
- > Faculty report greater procedural justice
  - Faculty/Staff:  $m = 2.55/2.03$
  - Terminology: fairness of decision-making processes
- > Staff report greater interpersonal justice
  - Staff: supervisor and upper administration ( $m = 4.15/3.83$ )
  - Faculty: supervisor and upper administration ( $m = 3.83/2.44$ )
  - Terminology: how an employee is treated - with politeness, dignity, and respect - by those executing procedures or determining outcomes.

# Differences: College (Faculty)

- > CASB vs CEC Faculty
  - higher in continuance commitment (CASB/CEC:  $m = 4.58/3.32$ )
  - lower in affective commitment (CASB/CEC:  $m = 3.47/4.18$ )
  - Commitment terminology: continuance = need to stay, affective = want to stay
- > CASB Faculty higher in perceptions of organizational justice
  - Distributive justice (CASB/CEC/PNR:  $m = 1.69/1.00/0.69$ )
  - Interpersonal justice from upper administration ( $m = 3.51/1.74/1.90$ )
  - Informational justice from upper administration ( $m = 2.70/1.13/1.06$ )
  - Categories of organizational justice (perception of fairness)
    - > Distributive = fairness of outcomes for effort
    - > Interpersonal = fairness of interpersonal interactions and treatment
    - > Informational = timeliness, specificity and truthfulness of explanations for decisions

# Differences: Gender

## Gender (Faculty & Staff): Male vs. Female vs. PNR

- > PNR significantly lower in:
  - Perceived organizational support
  - Affective organizational commitment
  - Engagement
  - Distributive justice
  - Interpersonal and informational justice from upper administration
- > PNR significantly higher in:
  - Exhaustion
  - Depersonalization/cynicism
  - Constraints



# Other Key Findings

- > Perceptions of interpersonal and informational justice
  - significantly higher for direct supervisor ( $m = 4.02/3.48$ )
  - lower for upper administration ( $m = 2.76/1.95$ )
- > Heavy workload, conflicting job demands, and interruptions by other people most frequent constraints
- > Correspondence between scores follows generally-observed (i.e., meta-analytic) trends

# Qualitative Feedback Overview

- > Randomly selected 25% (n = 75) open-ended responses to:
  - “What additional comments (positive or negative) do you have for Missouri S&T leadership to consider?”
  - 63 (84%) were negative, 7 (9%) were neutral, 2 (3%) were positive
  - Negative comments balanced across college and faculty/staff
- > When asked to list 3-5 supportive actions S&T has taken, **809** responses were given
- > When asked to list 3-5 actions one wished S&T would do, **1171** responses were given

# Next Steps

- > More thoroughly analyze qualitative data for specific themes
- > Design specific, evidence-based recommendations based on trends in data
- > Send requests to Personnel Committee for other analyses of interest (Dave Westenberg, Chair)
- > Summary report at October Faculty Senate Mtg