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Instrument Design

Three primary sections:
- Demographics
- Scale-based Questions
- Written Comments

Nine satisfaction themes:
- University of Louisville
- Work Environment
- Communications
- Pay and Benefits
- Leadership
- University’s Mission
- Job Opportunity
- Job Satisfaction
- Overall Impression

Participants express their opinions by marking the level of “agreement” held for each survey question. The top two survey responses (4+5) combine for the “percent satisfied” with an issue.
Survey Participation

Combined University Totals

Eligible Employees
Surveys Returned

OVERALL RATE
44.4%

Faculty Rate: 44.0%
Staff Rate: 44.8%
Respondent Demographics (Overall)

**GENDER**
- Male: 41%
- Female: 59%

**ETHNICITY**
- White: 86%
- African American: 8%
- American Indian: < 1%
- Asian / Pacific Islander: 4%
- Hispanic Surname: 1%
- Other: 1%

**LENGTH OF SERVICE**
- < 1 Year: 7%
- 1-3 Yrs.: 32%
- 4-5 Yrs.: 12%
- 6-10 Yrs.: 16%
- 11-15 Yrs.: 13%

**LONG-TERM COMMITMENT**
- < 1 Year: 2%
- 1-3 Yrs.: 9%
- 4-10 Yrs.: 24%
- 11-15 Yrs.: 9%
- > 15 Yrs.: 7%
- Until Retirement: 49%
Overall Satisfaction – Key Indicator

Would recommend U of L for employment:

- **Agree**: 51%
- **Strongly Agree**: 12%
- **Disagree**: 11%
- **Strongly Disagree**: 6%
- **Neither**: 20%

University Overall:
- **Avg. Score = 3.51**
- **Top 2 (4+5)% = 62.4%**

*Significant improvement over 2000 (3.40)*

Both Faculty and Staff overall satisfaction have increased significantly in 2003.

Overall satisfaction, as indicated by willingness to recommend U of L as an employer, continues to demonstrate improvement opportunity.

**Faculty Performance**
- **2000 Score**: 3.16
- **2003 Score**: 3.34

**Staff Performance**
- **2000 Score**: 3.52
- **2003 Score**: 3.62
**Overall Satisfaction – Other Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Faculty Results</th>
<th>Top 2 (4+5)</th>
<th>Overall Results</th>
<th>Staff Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You like your job at this university</td>
<td>3.23 **</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.04 **</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would recommend university for education</td>
<td>3.08 **</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, welcomed and encouraged at university</td>
<td>3.47 **</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.72 **</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ** Indicates statistically significant improvement in 2003 vs. 2000.

- Both faculty and staff have experienced increased satisfaction in key areas.
- The feeling that employees are “welcomed and encouraged at U of L” has increased significantly in 2003 for both groups.
Significant Improvements (Overall)

Items showing strongest statistically significant improvements in average score.

- Adequately informed about university
- Paid fairly, relative to responsibilities
- Receive info from "Inside U of L" / website
- Paid fairly, relative to experience
- Employees' attitude to university is positive
- Admin. gives high priority to employee satisf.
- University supports diverse needs of employees
- Athletics brings positive exposure
- Good comm. between acad. & non-acad. emps.
- There is support of faculty at U of L

- Of 66 survey questions, 43 show significant improvement in 2003 versus 2000; two questions have decreased significantly.
- The greatest improvements include information provided about the university, rewards for effort, general employee attitudes, and leadership supportiveness.
- Overall university scores continue demonstrating strong improvement opportunity.
## High Performance Areas (Overall)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Top 2 (4+5)%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged to behave ethically in job</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair/Dean/Sprvsr respects you as a person</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-workers respect diversity</strong></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees allowed to serve on committees</strong></td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You like your job at this university</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are challenged by your job</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free to share ideas with Chair/Dean/Sprvrs</strong></td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand university's benefits package</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workspace/equipment is free from hazards</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chair/Dean/Supervisor evaluates work fairly</strong></td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indicates statistically significant improvement in 2003 vs. 2000.**

- High-ranking scores indicate U of L supports a favorable degree of professionalism.
- Responding employees seem reasonably satisfied with their jobs at this university.
- A number of higher-ranked questions show significant improvement since 2000.
Low Performance Areas (Overall)

- Fairness in salary levels and determination represent the lowest satisfaction area.
- Scores suggest a feeling of skepticism that U of L prioritizes employee satisfaction.
- Several low-ranking questions show significant improvement since 2000.
Satisfaction Differences: Gender

Items showing strongest statistically significant differences in average score.

- 24 (of 66) questions rate significantly higher for females; 8 rate significantly lower.
- Females show significantly higher levels of overall support for U of L than males.
- Females are significantly less satisfied with workplace fairness practices at U of L.
14 (of 66) questions rate significantly higher for Whites; 5 rate significantly lower.

Results indicate a difference in how races view U of L’s attention to diversity.

Whites are significantly less satisfied with U of L’s attention to workplace satisfaction.
Satisfaction Differences: Faculty vs. Staff

Items showing strongest statistically significant differences in average score.

- 26 (of 66) questions rate significantly *higher* for staff; 12 rate significantly *lower*.
- Staff are significantly *more* satisfied with factors involving U of L’s general quality.
- Staff are significantly *less* satisfied with U of L’s recognition of worker performance.
Performance Overview: Faculty Results
Significant Improvements (Faculty)

- There is support of faculty at U of L: 3.17 (2000) vs 2.87 (2003)
- ++University has a good image: 3.26 (2000) vs 3.02 (2003)
- Employees' attitude to university is positive: 3.20 (2000) vs 2.94 (2003)

Items showing strongest statistically significant improvements in average score.

++ Indicates item is a Key Satisfaction Driver for faculty results.

- Of 66 survey questions, 43 show significant improvement in 2003 versus 2000.
- Many chair/dean/supervisor assessment questions score significantly higher in 2003.
- Improvement areas reflect need for additional attention; over half score below 3.50.
High Performance Areas (Faculty)

- Faculty members are most satisfied with their ability to participate on committees.
- Results suggest U of L maintains an environment that supports workplace ethics.

** Indicates statistically significant improvement in 2003 vs. 2000.
++ Indicates item is a Key Satisfaction Driver for faculty results.
Faculty members are least satisfied with salary fairness issues.

Faculty return a low rating regarding improvements at U of L over the past five years.

Nevertheless, many factors shown here have increased significantly since 2000.
Satisfaction Differences: Faculty Type

Items showing strongest statistically significant differences in average score.
++ Indicates item is a Key Satisfaction Driver for faculty results.

- 6 (of 66) questions rate significantly *higher* for full-time faculty; 15 rate sig. *lower*.
- FT-Faculty are sig. *more* satisfied with benefits and advancement opportunities.
- FT-Faculty are sig. *less* satisfied their workloads and the general quality of U of L.
Satisfaction Differences: Gender

Items showing strongest statistically significant differences in average score.
++ Indicates item is a Key Satisfaction Driver for faculty results.

- 9 (of 66) questions rate significantly higher for females; 5 rate significantly lower.
- Females show significantly higher satisfaction levels with leader’s attention to quality.
- Females are significantly less satisfied with workplace fairness practices at U of L.
Many differences identified in this comparison are similar to overall findings.

Results indicate a difference in how races view U of L’s attention to diversity.

Whites are sig. less satisfied with U of L’s attention to employee satisfaction.

Items showing strongest statistically significant differences in average score.

++ Indicates item is a Key Satisfaction Driver for faculty results.
Performance Overview: Staff Results
Significant Improvements (Staff)

Items showing strongest statistically significant improvements in average score.
++ Indicates item is a Key Satisfaction Driver for staff results.

- Adequately informed about university
- Athletics bring positive exposure to U of L
- ++Paid fairly, relative to responsibilities
- Receive info from "Inside U of L" / website
- University supports diverse needs of employees
- Admin. provides strong leadership
- ++Admin. gives high priority to employee satisf.
- Paid fairly, relative to experience
- Employees' attitude to university is positive
- Dept. staffed to cover regular workloads

- Of 66 survey questions, 28 show significant improvement in 2003 versus 2000.
- Compensation, administrative leadership, and workload stress all improved sig. in 2003.
- Improvement areas reflect need for additional attention; only two exceed 4.00 (“Agree”).
**Staff report favorable satisfaction with respect they receive from supervisors.**

**Co-worker attention to workplace diversity is encouraging among staff.**

**A strong majority of staff agree that they like their jobs at this university.**
Low Performance Areas (Staff)

- Staff members are least satisfied with salary fairness and advancement opportunities.
- Perceptions of administrative priority on employee satisfaction are unfavorable.
- Despite low scores, many items shown here have increased sig. since 2000.
## Satisfaction Differences: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of benefits better than elsewhere</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would recommend U of L for emplmnt.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receive info from &quot;Inside U of L&quot; / website</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of university for learning</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand U of L's benefits package</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid fairly, relative to experience</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment well-maintained</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significantly higher for females:

- Value of benefits better than elsewhere
- Would recommend U of L for emplmnt.
- Overall quality of university for learning
- Understand U of L's benefits package
- Work environment well-maintained

Significantly lower for females:

- Paid fairly, relative to experience

All identified differences in order of strength of statistical significance.

- 6 (of 66) questions rate significantly *higher* for females; 1 rates significantly *lower*.
- Limited differences suggests relatively balanced levels between males and females.
- Satisfaction performance on most factors is unremarkable for both staff genders.
Many differences identified in this staff comparison are similar to overall findings.

Very strong significant differences are found for issues involving attention to diversity.

There are notably fewer examples where whites are less satisfied than other races.