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Central Connecticut State University administered the Noel-Levitz College Employee Satisfaction Survey to all employees. The survey was administered online, and additional paper copies were distributed to employees who do not have access to computers to complete the survey. The survey ran from October 17, 2007 through November 6, 2007, and was completed by 712 of the approximately 1,659 employees for an overall response rate of 43%.

Responses were anonymous. For those 617 employees who indicated their position, the responses by employee position were:

- Part-time AAUP instructional faculty: 61
- Full-time AAUP instructional faculty: 240
- SUOAF-AFSCME administrative faculty: 140
- Management/confidential staff: 29
- Classified staff: 89
- University Assistant or other part-time staff: 32
- Other: 26

The survey includes five sections of questions:

- Campus culture and policies – respondents rate the importance to them of a list of statements regarding the campus culture and policies at the university and then rate their satisfaction with those statements.
- Institutional goals – respondents rate the importance to them of a set of institutional goals and then identify three goals they regard as the highest priority.
- Involvement in decision-making – respondents rate the involvement of various constituencies in institutional decision-making.
- Work environment – respondents rate the importance to them of a list of statements regarding the work environment and then rate their satisfaction with those statements.
- Demographic questions – In addition to rating their overall satisfaction with their employment at the university, respondents were asked to provide the following information:
  - Length of employment
  - Employee position
- Race / ethnicity
- Gender

This report provides a summary of selected results from this survey. Each section corresponds to a section of the survey. Within the section there is a selection of key overall results from the items in the section. This is followed by a review of statistically significant differences by subpopulation. In identifying the significant differences, we have concentrated on those items included in the key overall results. Unless mentioned otherwise, the differences among subpopulations for these key items are not statistically significant.

In the final section, we review the overall satisfaction rating. We identify the specific items that account for overall satisfaction at CCSU, and then discuss the differences in overall satisfaction among the various subpopulations.

A complete set of summary tables of overall results as well as a set of tables that break down the results by the demographic variables is provided separately.
Campus culture and policies

Using the method of “quadrant analysis” where items are grouped into one of four quadrants based on their mean importance rating and mean satisfaction ratings we classify items that are institutional strengths (mean importance above average for all items and mean satisfaction also above average for all items). These are items that generally are regarded as among the most important for CCSU employees and are also those where they report the highest levels of satisfaction. (For purposes of this analysis, the median importance rating is 4.35 and the median satisfaction rating is 2.79.)

The following items are institutional strengths, based on the overall responses from all CCSU employees (in descending satisfaction scores):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Importance</th>
<th>Mean Satisfaction</th>
<th>“GAP”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty take pride in their work</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff take pride in their work</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators take pride in their work</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution promotes excellent employee-student relations</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution strives to create a respectful work environment free of discrimination</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution treats students as its top priority</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities are inviting, clean, and comfortable</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of students</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution provides resources for research/creative activity</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution is well-respected in the community</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences among subpopulations

Gender

All of the items above were more important to women than they were to men. However, nearly all items in this entire section of the survey were also rated higher in importance by female employees than they were by male employees.

With the exception of “facilities are inviting, clean, and comfortable” all of the items above were rated higher in satisfaction by women than they were by men. However, nearly all items in this entire section of the survey also received higher satisfaction ratings from female employees than they did from male employees.
Race / ethnicity

There are no statistically significant differences in the ratings of the importance of these items by employees of different races / ethnicities.

“This institution strives to create a respectful work environment free of discrimination” is rated significantly lower in satisfaction by Black / African-American employees and by Hispanic / Latino employees.

There are no other significant differences by race/ethnicity from this section of the survey.

Employee position

“This institution treats students as its top priority” is much less important to University Assistant / other part-time staff than to other employees.

“This institution provides resources for research/creative activity” is much more important to Full-time AAUP instructional faculty than to other employees.

With regard to satisfaction ratings, there is a fairly consistent pattern where Full-time AAUP instructional faculty tend to report the lowest satisfaction ratings, while Management/confidential staff tend to report the highest satisfaction ratings.

“This institution treats students as its top priority” is rated lower in satisfaction by Full-time AAUP instructional faculty and by SUOAF-AFSCME administrative faculty than by other employees.

“This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its students” is rated lower in satisfaction by Full-time AAUP instructional faculty and by SUOAF-AFSCME administrative faculty than by other employees.

“Administrators take pride in their work” is rated lower in satisfaction by Full-time AAUP instructional faculty than by other employees.

“This institution is well-respected in the community” received the highest satisfaction rating from Management/confidential staff. It also received high ratings from University Assistant / other part-time staff.

“This institution strives to create a respectful work environment free of discrimination” was rated significantly higher in satisfaction by Management/confidential staff than by other employees. It was rated significantly lower in satisfaction by Full-time AAUP instructional faculty.

“Facilities are inviting, clean and comfortable” is rated lower in satisfaction by Full-time AAUP instructional faculty than by other employees.

“This institution provides resources for research/creative activity” is rated significantly lower in satisfaction by Part-time and Full-time AAUP instructional faculty.
Length of service

“This institution provides resources for research / creative activity” is more important for employees with one to five years of service, and least important for employees with more than twenty years of experience.

“This institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships” decreases in satisfaction the longer employee worked at the university.

“This institution treats students as its top priority” generally decreases in satisfaction the longer the employee has worked at the university.

“Facilities are inviting, clean, and comfortable” generally decreases in satisfaction the longer the employee has worked at the university.

The other category of items are those with above average importance ratings but below average satisfaction ratings, or with “gaps” (mean satisfaction score subtracted from mean importance score) in the top quartile. (The top quartile for “gap” scores is 1.78.) These are items that are among the most important to employees but where they register below average levels of satisfaction, or where the gap between importance and satisfaction is well above average. As in the preceding discussion of strengths, we used the median importance rating of 4.35 and the median satisfaction rating of 2.79.

The items on the following page are institutional weaknesses, based on the overall responses from all CCSU employees (in descending “gap” scores):
## Items identified as weaknesses, all employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Importance</th>
<th>Mean Satisfaction</th>
<th>“GAP”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution has a method of receiving feedback from its employees about the quality of managerial leadership</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The leadership of this institution has a clear sense of purpose</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reputation of this institution continues to improve</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution plans carefully</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load responsibilities are consistent with institutional expectations for research/creative activity</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution involves its employees in planning for the future</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in institutional policies are based on input from all affected units</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution seeks input from faculty and staff about how to improve service to students</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of academic advising is clearly articulated and understood</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution makes sufficient staff resources available to achieve important objectives</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences among subpopulations

Gender

All of the items above were more important to women than they were to men. However, nearly all items in this entire section of the survey were also rated higher in importance by female employees than they were by male employees.

All of the items above were rated higher in satisfaction by women than they were by men. However, nearly all items in this entire section of the survey also received higher satisfaction ratings from female employees than they did from male employees.

Race / ethnicity

There are no significant differences by race / ethnicity in ratings of importance for any of these items.

“Efforts to improve quality are paying off at this institution” is rated significantly lower in satisfaction by white and Hispanic/Latino employees than by employees of other races or ethnicities.

There are no other significant differences by race/ethnicity in ratings of satisfaction from this section of the survey.

Employee position

“This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty” is significantly lower in importance to University Assistant or other part-time staff than to other.

“There is good communication between the faculty and the administration at this institution” is lower in importance to classified staff than to other employees.

“The role of academic advising is clearly articulated and understood” is lower in importance to Part-time and Full-time AAUP instructional faculty than it is to other employees at the university.

“This institution seeks input from faculty and staff about how to improve service to students” is lower in importance to University Assistant or other part-time staff than to other employees.

“Teaching load responsibilities are consistent with institutional expectations for research/creative activity” is rated highest in importance by Full-time AAUP instructional faculty. This item received the lowest importance ratings from University Assistant or other part-time staff.

With the exception of the item “The role of academic advising is clearly articulated and understood” there are statistically significant differences by employee position for all of the items that register as weaknesses. In general, Full-time AAUP instructional faculty register the lowest levels of satisfaction while Management/confidential staff register the highest levels of satisfaction.
There is one exception to this pattern. The item “this institution involves its employees in planning for the future” is rated lowest in satisfaction by Classified staff, and highest in satisfaction by Management/confidential staff.

Length of service

“There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution” is more important to employees who have worked at the university five years or less than it is to employees who have worked at the university for more than five years.

“The reputation of this institution continues to improve” is significantly less important to employees who have worked at the university for more than 20 years than it is to all other employees.

Three items in this section register essentially equal satisfaction ratings from employees, regardless of their length of service:

- This institution makes sufficient budgetary resources available to achieve important objectives
- There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation at this institution
- The role of academic advising is clearly articulated and understood

“This institution involves its employees in planning for the future” is higher in satisfaction for employees who have worked at the university for five years or less than it is for employees who have worked at the university for more than five years.

For the rest of the items, satisfaction ratings generally decline the longer the employee has worked at the university.
Institutional goals

Employees were presented with a list of 14 goals and asked to rate their importance. Following the rating exercise they were also asked to rate which of the listed goals was their first, second and third choice as priority goals. By assigning a goal selected as a first priority with 3 votes, a goal selected as a second priority with 2 votes and a goal selected as third priority with 1 vote we can summarize the priority ranking of all goals along with reviewing the importance rating. The following four goals received the most “votes” and also received the highest important ratings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>“Votes”</th>
<th>Mean Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain more of its current students to graduation</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve employee morale</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the graduation rate</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the quality of existing academic programs</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employees could also write in other goals besides those selected for rating. We have provided a complete set of comments from this section of the survey and they should be reviewed and tabulated to determine if any other goals not on the selected list should be included among the top priority goals for CCSU.

Differences among subpopulations

Gender

All four of the goals above were rated higher in importance by women than they were by men. However, all goals in this entire section of the survey also received higher importance ratings from female employees than they did from male employees.

Race/ethnicity

There were no statistically significant differences by race/ethnicity in the importance ratings of these top four goals.

Employee position

“Retain more of its current students to graduation” is less important to Full-time AAUP instructional faculty than it is to other employees.

“Improve employee morale” is less important to Management/confidential staff than it is to other employees.

“Increase the graduation rate” is much more important to Management/confidential staff and to SUOAF-AFSCME administrative staff than it is to other employees.
Regardless of position, all employees gave “improve the quality of existing academic programs” similar importance ratings.

*Length of service*

“Retain more of its current students to graduation” is more important to employees who have worked at the university for between one and five years than it is to other groups of employees.

“Improve the quality of existing academic programs” is more important to employees who have worked at the university for between one and five years than it is to other groups of employees.

The importance assigned to “improve employee morale” increases with length of service.

“Increase the graduation rate is more important to employees who have worked at the university for between one and five years than it is to other groups of employees.
Involvement in planning and decision-making

Employees were asked to rate the level of involvement of selected constituencies in planning and decision-making at CCSU. They were instructed to use the following five-point scale:

- too much involvement
- more than enough involvement
- just the right involvement
- not quite enough involvement
- not enough involvement

For purposes of analysis we re-coded these descriptions so that a rating of “too much involvement” was assigned the value of “5”; “more than enough involvement” was assigned the value of “4”; and so on, with “not enough involvement” assigned the value of “1”. Calculating a mean involvement “rating” for each constituency provides a summary of the relative level of involvement of each constituency compared to the others. (The higher the average rating, the more involved the constituency relative to others.)

The following table displays all constituencies rated and the mean involvement “rating” in descending order of involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constituency</th>
<th>Mean involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional faculty</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified staff</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program or unit directors</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic department chairs</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University Senate</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic deans</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative faculty</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior administrators (VP, Provost level or above)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences among subpopulations

Gender

Male employees found alumni, administrative faculty, and classified staff to be more involved than the female employees did.

Race/ethnicity

The level of involvement of alumni, academic department chairs and the University Senate is rated differently by different race/ethnic subgroups.

Alumni are rated as less involved by Asian / Pacific Islander employees and by Black / African American employees than by other employees.

Academic department chairs are rated as less involved by white employees than they are by other employees.

The University Senate is rated as more involved by Asian / Pacific Islander employees and by Black / African American employees than they are by other employees.

Employee position

The level of involvement assigned to nearly all constituencies differs by employee position. The four constituencies that exhibited the largest variation are:

• Instructional faculty: Full-time and Part-time AAUP instructional faculty assigned this group low levels of involvement while Management/confidential staff and Classified staff assigned them relatively higher levels of involvement.

• Administrative faculty: SUOAF-AFSCME administrative staff assigned this group lower levels of involvement than did other employees.

• Classified staff: Classified staff assigned this group lower levels of involvement than did other employees.

• The University Senate: Management/confidential staff assigned this group higher levels of involvement than did other employees.

Length of service

The levels of involvement assigned to the following constituencies varied by the employee’s length of service:

• Senior administrators: The greater the employee’s length of service, the higher the level of involvement assigned to this group.

• Trustees: The greater the employee’s length of service, the higher the level of involvement assigned to this group. (Although employees with more than 20 years of service assigned
somewhat lower levels of involvement to this group than did employees with 11 – 20 years of service.)

- Instructional faculty: Employees with six to ten years of service assigned this group lower levels of involvement than did other employees.

- Classified staff: The greater the employee’s length of service, the lower the level of involvement assigned to this group. (Although employees with less than one year of service assigned this group lower levels of involvement than did employees with one to five years of service.)

- Academic department chairs: Employees with five years of service or less assigned this group higher levels of involvement than did employees with more than five years of service.

- The University Senate: Employees with five years of service or less assigned this group higher levels of involvement than did employees with more than five years of service.
**Work environment**

We used a similar “quadrant analysis” to identify institutional strengths and weaknesses from the work environment section of the survey. For purposes of this analysis the median importance rating is 4.39 and the median satisfaction rating is 3.50. In addition, the top quartile for “gap” scores is .80.)

The following table lists the work environment items that register as strengths for CCSU employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Importance</th>
<th>Mean Satisfaction</th>
<th>“GAP”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The employee benefits available to me are valuable</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic integrity and professional ethics are important</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe on campus</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work I do is valuable to the institution</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to work at this institution</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the information I need to do my job well</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differences among subpopulations**

**Gender**

All of the items above were more important to women than they were to men. However, nearly all of the items in this entire section of the survey were also rated higher in importance by female employees than they were by male employees.

All but one of these items above were rated higher in satisfaction by women than they were by men. However, nearly all items in this entire section of the survey also received higher satisfaction ratings from female employees than they did from male employees. Women were somewhat less satisfied than men with the item “The work I do is valuable to the institution.”

**Race/ethnicity**

“I have the information I need to do my job well” is less important to white employees than to other employees.

There are no statistically significant differences by race/ethnicity in the satisfaction ratings of these items.
Employee position

“My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say” is rated higher in importance by SUOAF-AFSCME administrative staff and by Management/confidential staff than it is by other employees.

“The employee benefits available to me are valuable” is rated higher in importance by Classified staff than by other employees.

“The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding” is rated higher in importance by Classified staff and by University Assistant or other part-time staff than by other employees.

The following items received significantly different satisfaction ratings by employees in different positions:

- I have the information I need to do my job well: Lowest satisfaction ratings from Full-time AAUP instructional faculty and from Classified staff
- My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say: Lowest satisfaction ratings from SUOAF-AFSCME administrative staff and from Classified staff
- The employee benefits available to me are valuable: Significantly lower ratings from Part-time AAUP Instructional faculty than from other employee groups
- The type of work I do on most days is personally rewarding: Lowest satisfaction ratings from Classified staff
- The work I do is valuable to the institution: Significantly higher satisfaction ratings from Management/classified staff than from other employees
- I am proud to work at this institution: Lowest satisfaction ratings from Full-time AAUP Instructional faculty

Length of service

The following items received significantly different importance ratings by employees based on length of service:

- I have the information I need to do my job well: Employees with eleven or more years of service rated this item lower in importance than employees with ten years of service or less
- My job responsibilities are communicated clearly to me: Employees with eleven or more years of service rated this item lower in importance than employees with ten years of service or less
- My supervisor pays attention to what I have to say: Employees with eleven to twenty years of service rated this item lower in importance than did other employees.

“The employee benefits available to me are valuable” generally increases in satisfaction with length of service, although employees with eleven to twenty years of service are somewhat less satisfied than employees with six to ten years of service.
**Items identified as weaknesses, all employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean Importance</th>
<th>Mean Satisfaction</th>
<th>“GAP”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My department has the budget needed to do its job well</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department has the staff needed to do its job well</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have adequate opportunities for advancement</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am paid fairly for the work I do</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy for me to get information at this institution</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am empowered to resolve problems quickly</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differences among subpopulations**

**Gender**

All of the items above were more important to women than they were to men. However, nearly all items in this entire section of the survey were also rated higher in importance by female employees than they were by male employees.

All but one of the items above were rated higher in satisfaction by women than they were by men. However, nearly all items in this entire section of the survey also received higher satisfaction ratings from female employees than they did from male employees. Women were less satisfied than men with “I have adequate opportunities for advancement.”

**Race/ethnicity**

“I am empowered to resolve problems quickly” is less important by Asian/Pacific Islander employees than by other employees.

There are no statistically significant differences by race/ethnicity in the satisfaction ratings of these items.

**Employee position**

“My department has the budget needed to do its job well” is rated lower in importance by Management/confidential staff than by other employees.

“I have adequate opportunities for advancement” is rated lower in importance by Management/confidential staff than by other employees. It is also more important to Classified staff than it is to other employees.

All of these items received significantly different satisfaction ratings by employees in different positions:
• I am empowered to resolve problems quickly: Lowest satisfaction ratings from Full-time AAUP instructional faculty

• My department has the budget needed to do its job well: Lowest satisfaction ratings from Full-time AAUP instructional faculty

• My department has the staff needed to do its job well: Lower satisfaction ratings from Full-time AAUP instructional faculty and from Classified staff than from other employees

• I am paid fairly for the work I do: Lower satisfaction ratings from Part-time AAUP instructional faculty and from Full-time AAUP instructional faculty than from other employees

• I have adequate opportunities for advancement: Lower satisfaction ratings from Part-time AAUP instructional faculty and from Classified staff than from other employees

Length of service

“I am empowered to resolve problems quickly” is rated lower in importance by employees with eleven to twenty years of experience than it is by other employees.

“I am empowered to resolve problems quickly” is rated higher in satisfaction by employees with five years of experience or less than it is by employees with more than five years of experience.

“My department has the staff needed to do its job well” is rated higher in satisfaction by employees with less than one year of service than it is by all other employees.
Overall satisfaction

Employees were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with their employment so far. The average satisfaction rating for all employees is 3.63 (between “somewhat satisfied” and “satisfied”).

Satisfaction with specific items is correlated with overall satisfaction. Using a regression analysis, we identified those specific items whose satisfaction ratings explain the greatest variation in the variation in the ratings of overall satisfaction by CCSU employees.

The variable with the single greatest impact on overall satisfaction is the item “I am proud to work at this institution.” Satisfaction ratings of this variable account for 43% of the variation in the overall satisfaction rating. When all significant variables are entered in the model, the entire set of (eight) variables account for 64% of the variation in overall satisfaction.

The complete model is represented in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific item (Satisfaction rating)</th>
<th>Unstandardized coefficient</th>
<th>Standardized coefficient</th>
<th>T statistic</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to work at this institution</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>7.080</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the information I need to do my job well</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>4.639</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution does a good job of meeting the needs of its faculty</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>3.294</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have adequate opportunities for training to improve my skills</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>2.776</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution consistently follows clear processes for evaluating employee achievements</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>2.301</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty take pride in their work</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>2.745</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor pays attention to what I say</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>2.859</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This institution involves its employees in planning for the future</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1.997</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences among subpopulations

Overall satisfaction was statistically the same for both men and women. It varied by race/ethnicity, with Hispanic/Latino and Native American employees registering the lowest levels of overall satisfaction. It varied by employee position, with Full-time AAUP instructional faculty and Classified staff registering the lowest levels of overall satisfaction. It varied by length of service, with individuals employed from one to ten years registering the lowest levels of overall satisfaction, while employees with less than one year of service and employees with more than 20 years of service had the highest levels of overall satisfaction.