

**Santa Barbara City College  
College Planning Council  
Tuesday, April 14, 2009  
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm  
A218C  
Minutes**

PRESENT: A. Serban (Chair), I. Alarcon, O. Arellano, L. Auchincloss, P. Bishop, S. Broderick, S. Ehrlich, J. Friedlander, T. Garey, M. Guillen, J. Meyer, K. Molloy, C. Ramirez, J. Sullivan

GUESTS: M. Lin (for C. Avendano), S. Coffield, B. Partee, K. O'Connor

ABSENT: C. Avendano, S. Knotts

**Call to Order**

Superintendent/President Serban called the meeting to order.

**Information Items**

1. Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDMP) (attached) – VP Sullivan reported from this document. He pointed to the core of this plan on page 4, TDM 1, which includes modifications and updates on what the Coastal Commission had SBCC agree to when the Long-Range Development Plan was submitted. This section includes what SBCC is currently committed to. At Superintendent/President Serban's request, VP Sullivan explained the history of this document and why we cannot change it.
  - a. The history, current status and proposed modifications to the Long Range Development Plan are in the document that was provided in advance to each member. There was further discussion concerning this issue and the document.
2. Status of Foundation funds supporting scholarships – Superintendent/President Serban reported that the Foundation for Santa Barbara City College has lost a significant amount of money from various funds that support scholarships. At this point many scholarships will not be able to be funded because there is a shortfall of about \$150,000 in scholarship money that normally would have been there and is not. Next week we will have the final numbers on what can be funded. These shortfalls are now actually starting to hurt students.

**Discussion Items**

3. Implementation of parking permits for Continuing Education at the Wake & Schott Centers (attached) – VP Sullivan reported that the desire is to implement parking fees for Continuing Ed starting in January 2010. There are many reasons for this: it will give

more time to get more feedback from the students, get the word out, and get it into the schedule. When implemented, it will enable SBCC 1) to provide two full time security guards, one for each of the two centers which we have been requested long ago, 2) to maintain the lots from allocated money since there is no State money to cover this. We will not depending on ending balances to keep up the parking lots.

- a. There was further discussion regarding various aspects of implementing the buying of parking permits for Continuing Ed.
  - i. CSEA President Liz Auchincloss brought up the fact that the Facilities Personnel at the two centers have “providing security” in their job descriptions. VP Sullivan said that is true, however they do not have as yet appropriate training and/ or support. That they will be additional security to the two full time security guards.
  - ii. CSEA President Liz Auchincloss expressed concern about the loss of goodwill in the community and the bad PR problems that could be caused by this action.
  - iii. CSEA Member Ramirez questioned the cost of the project. VP Sullivan explained the situation in regards to the electricity, the wiring and that the parking machines on the main campus recouped their total cost very quickly.
  - iv. Academic Senate Member O’Connor asked if it might be possible to have lower fees for Senior Citizens. VP Sullivan reported that every exception costs money, time and effort plus the situation has to be policed. The fee will be \$20 for a 6 month period, from Jan 1 – June 10<sup>th</sup> because that is the first two quarters in Cont Ed, then it would be from June 20<sup>th</sup> until the end of the year. The reason we would have to do it that way is because we wanted it to coincide with the credit semesters because we do have Continuing Ed students who take classes on the Main campus at night. The Main campus now has an “Evening Only” permit which is going to be \$20. This would mean that they would not have to buy both of those.
  - v. VP Arellano asked if we have a “forgiveness week” at the beginning of the semester. VP Sullivan stated that we forgive first time offenders and figure that was their lesson, after that they need to pay. .
  - vi. Superintendent/President Serban stated that CSEA President Auchincloss’ point about community good will is a good one. There will be an Open Forum for the Community on April 22<sup>nd</sup> at the Schott Center where it will be discussed and on May 21<sup>st</sup> there will be a meeting o the Continuing Education Advisory Committee.
  - vii. VP Sullivan pointed out that we might not sell very many parking spots for the Schott. We will evaluate as the process takes place. At the Wake, there is ample parking, so there is a benefit there. At the Schott, we will have to see what the response is.
  - viii. Academic Senate member O’Connor mentioned that what if you pay for your permit and there is no parking.
  - ix. CSEA President Auchincloss said some people may not attend any longer.

It was mentioned that the cost of going to other community college continuing ed courses it is much more expensive, ie. Ventura there wasn't a course below \$75. VP Friedlander pointed out that if you charge a fee you cannot get FTES. Ventura Adult Ed is part of their K-12 School System. Superintendent/President Serban said that CE can only collect material fees for something that the student can take home.

- x. VP Ehrlich stated that she thought this would encourage people to carpool and that instituting parking fees seems like an ideal time to remind people that another way to save is to carpool.
4. Process for allocating funds for program reviews resource requests (handout) – Superintendent/President Serban stated that by the last CPC Meeting, May 19<sup>th</sup>, CPC would have discussed, considered and agreed on the concept presented here on the Sources and Allocation of Funding. She presented and discussed the information from both handouts she passed around to everyone.
- a. Sources of Funding for Program Review Resource Requests:
    - i. Growth Funding: Superintendent/President Serban reported that we get growth funding almost every year. Growth is one of the few resources of funding that becomes part of our on-going funding, part of our base. That is what we use to pay for new faculty positions and some increases in costs associated with growth, such as hourly adjunct instructors. There is usually a certain amount of money left over. Should we get the growth money we are entitled to this year, and assuming that the deficit factor is not too high, which we will not know until later, we are entitled to 1.7 million. Let's say with we have to hire 12 new faculty positions for Fall 2010,  $12 \times \$80,000 = \$960,000$ ; we are still left with about \$700,000 after we pay for these positions. Then, we can decide collectively here at CPC, come July or August when we first meet in the next fiscal year how to use the remaining amount. We will know what growth funding for 2008-09 we have received and we will know by then how many new faculty positions we need to fund and we will have a sense of the allowable growth rate for 2009 – 10. So we are left with several hundred thousand, then, the idea would be to allocate this 700,000 between these categories: #1 Revert budget cuts that we have already put in place. #2 A percentage will go to setting money aside so that we can actually hire some of those new classified staff positions that have been identified through the Program Reviews. #3 Some would go to the Equipment Fund. #4 Some to the Construction, and #5 some to a miscellaneous fund, because there have been other resource requests identified through Program Reviews such as marketing, other needs that are not Equipment, Construction nor positions. In normal years, year after year we had this growth money, of course the amount would vary and assuming that we don't get cut further, this would be the mechanism to deal with the growth money.
    - ii. There was a question about the Basic Skills Initiative- for one time expenses within established guidelines: Superintendent/President Serban

- pointed out that Basic Skills money was never assumed to be for on-going expenses. If we don't get that money, then positions hired using this money are no longer available.
- iii. Growth Funding was discussed in further detail. Superintendent/President Serban clarified that part of the Growth Money from this year needs to be set aside to pay for those faculty whom we will hire for Fall 2010 because this will be the cumulative faculty positions that were waived, that were supposed to be hired for Fall 09, plus the Faculty positions that are the result of Growth in 08-09 as well as positions that resulted from the mistake the Chancellor's Office made for the Fall 2008 FTFO.
  - iv. Student Senate Member Lin asked about the prospects of receiving Federal Stimulus money. Superintendent/President Serban clarified that there are very few categories that Community Colleges in California actually can apply for. One is Work Force Training and there will be some money available through the Workforce investment Act and the local Workforce Investment Boards. Both credit and non-credit will try to get some of that. In terms of money going directly to students, there is an increase of Pell Grants, but many of our students don't qualify for Pell Grants because our tuition is so low. Vice President Friedlander stated that there will be an increase in Federal Work Study Funds to Community Colleges. Student Senate Member Lin asked about the possibility of receiving funding for sustainability measures taken on campus. Superintendent/President Serban stated that the funding does not come to Community Colleges. That money goes to the State for overall State Allocations. VP Bishop stated that Growth Funding being used for ongoing expenses makes a lot of sense. The issue is how it gets operational. How it actually works
  - v. VP Friedlander stated that it heightens the importance of our capacity to continue to grow and something we have to stay focused on because it is our only source of new ongoing money. Growth becomes extremely important. He went on to report that we have not gone about this in a systematic way in terms of how we think about growth and what it costs to support growth. He thinks that we need to do an analysis of what are our costs associated with growth. Academic Senate Member Kathy O'Connor agreed with VP Friedlander that we have never had a process on campus where we had a systematic way to add staff, to add equipment costs for new programs. We approve these programs at curriculum, but there is no guarantee that those new programs are going to get any money and so then they start up and they have no money. She thinks this is a coordinated approach as to how we can actually support what we are growing. If we don't do that, then these programs just struggle and our staffing situation just gets worse. So as long as we are coordinating growth in programming etc. with growth funding, that is a logical way to go. Academic Senate Member Garey stated that he agreed with that, particularly in the cost element that needs to be included in the curriculum consideration process. They discussed further more specific details of looking at costs to support

new programs concluding that if the funds aren't there, then you don't move forward. Superintendent/President Serban noted that many grants start programs without setting aside the money from the General Fund to continue these programs once the grants end. MESA is a good example. We need to discuss implications for General Fund budgeting before creating programs and hiring individuals through grants, if we want these programs to continue after the grants end. CSEA President Auchincloss said that we may have to turn down a grant because we don't have ongoing money to support it.

- vi. CSEA President Auchincloss asked the cost of computers, supplies, etc... if it is taken into account when hiring new faculty or staff. Superintendent/President Serban agreed that we need to start doing that again, as we used to.
- vii. VP Ehrlich spoke in support of potential for a portion of the remaining Growth Funding to be allocated to new Classified Staff and Management positions. She reported that she can speak with more experience dealing on a daily basis with the multiple consequences of the lack of adequate staffing whether it be in a Faculty Department, for providing necessary support for the education of work there, or whether it be in one of the non academic areas in the college. There is a huge cost to us to have inadequate staffing. Management is impacted because if you don't have staff properly supervised and properly evaluated you have lost some of the value of your investment.
- viii. VP Ehrlich would like to discuss at an earlier level some of the issues around hiring staff that will be processed through HR and paid with grant money. As well as the cost of the Administration of the Grant.
- ix. VP Arellano requested clarification on new requests and initiatives. CSEA Member Guillen stated that all these other items that are reverting budget cuts and the new staffing are all in the program review. Superintendent/President Serban said that the staff, new equipment and other resource requests identified in the program reviews are guiding us through the budget allocation process.
- x. The Block Grants were discussed and clarified.
- xi. Process for allocation of funds for routine, non-routine and new equipment draft for discussion was the second handout from Superintendent/President Serban. This handout reflects discussions with VP Friedlander and Academic President Alarcon. a) 2009-10 There is some money to fund some things in new equipment requests that can be funded from existing money that departments have in the 41000 accounts. B) 2010 – 11 and beyond. Superintendent/President Serban explained that the concept was that the money needed for Routine Equipment Needs, equipment needed on a routine basis, will become part of the base budget for each department. We need to estimate what is needed to be spent per year; no one expects 100 % accuracy. In Fall 2009, departments will estimate their routine needs. Of course, the issue is when we do not have money. In

case of a revenue shortfall in any given year, the VPs, in consultation with deans, department chairs and managers will make decisions about the distribution of available funds. For now, departments can carry forward unspent routine funds. The process will be evaluated in Spring 2010 and again in Spring 2011 to see how is working and whether adjustments are necessary.

- b. The two years will give us time to calibrate the routine needs, to understand what it is that they truly spend for routine expenses. Discussion continued about equipment costing \$5,000 or more which is Non-routine and what is inventoried and what is under \$5,000 is bought on a regular routine basis. The idea is to avoid carrying forward large amounts of money. The money needed to replace non routine equipment should be set aside in the Equipment Fund.
- c. VP Friedlander stated that what Superintendent/President is presenting takes into account all the feedback we have gotten. Ignacio and I have been working with the President and they all have taken into consideration the Senate Resolution and the conversations heard in multiple places. VP Friedlander thinks this is an excellent resolution. I believe this will work much better than what we have ever had before if it works according to plan. What is nice, you don't know until you do something, but I think going out the gate, this is a solid shot. It has a great chance of succeeding and it makes a lot of sense to me. It does reflect all the dialog we have had and I think we have come up with a better method.
- d. Academic Senate Member Garey said he is inclined to agree. He thinks it is a reasonable middle ground to what was proposed at the Senate and with the evaluation, which I think is perfectly reasonable. The one question he had was about what criteria will be used for evaluating this process in Spring 2010 and Spring 2011. Superintendent/President Serban noted that we will develop the criteria together in CPC. Academic Senate Member Kathy Molloy asked for clarification of the last sentence in the handout. Academic Senate Member Kathy O'Connor noted that this proposed new process is much better than what we had before.

**Meeting was adjourned.**

**Next meeting:** Tuesday, April 21, 2009; 3:00-4:30pm; A218C

**SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**09/10 BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS**  
**(Tentative Budget)**

**GENERAL**

1. These are the assumptions used to develop the tentative budget to be taken to the Board for approval in June 2009.
2. The assumptions listed below do not reflect the results of the May 19, 2009 election which may result in a reduction of \$4.4 million dollars to the General Fund Allocation from the state if Proposition 1A fails.
3. Ending balances will be reduced by over \$6 million due to the deferred payments that are in place. This is not reflected in the ending balances due to the accrual method of accounting: but are shown for illustration purposes.
4. CPC will receive and discuss the estimated tentative budget at the May 5, 2009 meeting.

**REVENUE**

1. COLA - COLA for State Apportionment is estimated at 0.0%.
2. Deficit factor – The 2008-09 deficit factor of 1.3% is assumed to reoccur in fiscal year 2009-10 as property tax shortfall and state structural deficit continue.
3. FTES – Growth is not budgeted in the tentative budget. Growth revenue will be added as FTES growth materializes and is funded in 2009-10. **THE PRELIMINARY ALLOWABLE GROWTH FOR SBCC FOR 2009/10 IS ONLY 0.7%.**
4. Enrollment fees – No enrollment fee rate increase is anticipated for 2009-10.
5. Nonresident student fees from international and out-of-state students will increase by \$539,100 and \$161,600 respectively due to increases in per unit rates. The number of international and out-of-state students is expected to remain at the 2008-09 levels.
6. Interest revenue is conservatively estimated based on declining interest rates and earning cash balances.
7. Lottery revenue is assumed to decline by 5%.

**EXPENSE**

1. Expenditure reductions of \$4.2 million put into effect in 2008-09 will be maintained in the tentative budget.
2. Salaries and wages are budgeted for the year at pay rates that were effective 1-1-08.
3. The budget for salaries and wages are based on expected spending patterns.
4. **FULL-TIME FACULTY OBLIGATION** – The Fall 2009 full-time tenure-track faculty requirement of 6 additional faculty for Fall 2009 has been waived and deferred to Fall 2010. In addition, there are 3 positions that will need to be added as a result of an error made by the Chancellor's office in calculating the FTFO for Fall 2008. Also 4 to 5 new faculty positions will need to be added as a result of the 2.24% growth in 2008-09. The 3 faculty combined with Fall 2009 and Fall 2010 obligation will result in 13 or 14 new full time faculty to be hired to start in Fall 2010.
5. The increase for fixed and mandated expenses is based on actual or trends. Fixed and mandated expenses consist of \$XXX,XXX in increases in maintenance agreements, utilities, postage, rent etc.

**SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**09/10 BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS**  
**(Tentative Budget)**

6. Other areas of concern which may result in increases are: School of Culinary Arts, Adult Education classified hourly, Cosmetology, Professional Development contracts, Citizenship Center, GED and adult high school.
7. Workers comp is projected to increase 24%.

**TRANSFERS**

**These are the transfer of funds from the General Fund Ending Balances.**

1. Transfer to the Children's Center Fund is estimated to be \$240,000.
2. Transfer to the Construction Fund is estimated to be \$640,000 plus the amount of anticipated loan payments to the California Energy Commission for the photovoltaic system loan.
3. Transfer to the Equipment Fund is estimated to be \$100,000 to purchase furniture and equipment for the new faculty.

**FUND BALANCE**

1. Board Operating Contingency = 5%.
2. Other Post Retirement Benefits – The District will be paying for early retiree medical insurance on a pay-as-you-go basis. The cost of medical insurance allowances for early retirees will be budgeted as an operating expense.
3. The liability for banked TLU's is estimated and reserved for approximately \$1 million.
4. Ending balances will be reduced over \$6 million due to the deferred state payments that are in place. This is not reflected in the ending balances due to the accrual method of accounting: but are shown for illustration purposes.

**RISKS**

1. The State will not reach a budget by June 30. A delay in state funding beyond the end of August 2009 may create additional cash flow problems and lost interest income.
2. The property tax shortfall is continuing to grow at a statewide level.
3. Uncertainty at the state level imperils our assumption that the property tax shortfall will be backfilled.
4. There is 0% COLA eliminating any flexibility in meeting our obligations.
5. Rising costs will increase the cost of goods and services.
6. The budget reductions of 2008-09 may not be continued in 2009-10.
7. The Tentative budget does not reflect the results of the May 19 election which may result in a reduction of \$4.4 million dollars to the General Fund Allocation from the state.



**SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT**  
**09/10 BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS**  
**(Tentative Budget)**

<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>2006/07 ACTUAL</b>	<b>2007/08 ACTUAL</b>	<b>2008/09 ASSUMPTION</b>	<b>2009/10 ASSUMPTION</b>
Negotiated Mid-Year Increase-Sch 10	5.92%	4.53%	0.00%	0.00%
Negotiated Mid-Year Increase-Adjunct	12.14%	4.53%	0.00%	0.00%
Negotiated Mid-Year Increase-Overload	12.14%	4.53%	0.00%	0.00%
Negotiated Mid-Year Increase-Sch 20,29 (CSEA)	5.92%	4.53%	0.00%	0.00%
Negotiated Mid-Year Increase-Sch 28,30 (MSC)	5.92%	4.53%	0.00%	0.00%
STRS	8.25%	8.25%	8.25%	8.25%
PERS	9.124%	9.306%	9.428%	9.428%
Social Security	6.20%	6.20%	6.20%	6.20%
Social Security Max	\$94,200	\$97,500	\$97,500	\$97,500
Unemployment Insurance	0.05%	0.05%	0.30%	0.30%
Workers Comp Insurance	1.61%	1.61%	1.36%	1.36%
Medicare	1.45%	1.45%	1.45%	1.45%
Dr. Degree	\$2,299	\$2,522	\$2,683	\$2,683
IA - Health & Welfare – Single	\$6,054	\$6,424	\$6,424	\$6,468
IA - Health & Welfare – 2-Party	\$10,652	\$11,356	\$11,356	\$11,433
IA - Health & Welfare – Family	\$15,248	\$16,146	\$16,146	\$16,256
IA – Health & Welfare - Retiree	\$5,200	\$5,200	\$5,200	\$5,200
CSEA & MSC - Health & Welfare – Single	\$5,694	\$6,042	\$6,042	\$6,083
CSEA & MSC- Health & Welfare – 2-Party	\$10,042	\$10,706	\$10,706	\$10,779
CSEA & MSC- Health & Welfare – Family	\$14,382	\$15,229	\$15,229	\$15,333
CSEA & MSC - Health & Welfare – Retiree	\$5,755	\$5,755	\$5,755	\$5,755
Adjunct TLU ave. rate	\$1,238	\$1,457	\$1,498	TBD
Overload TLU ave. rate	\$1,416	\$1,639	\$1,708	TBD
Summer TLU ave. rate	\$1,311	\$1,493	\$1,636	TBD

**SANTA BARBARA COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT  
09/10 BUDGET ASSUMPTIONS  
(Tentative Budget)**

**Fixed and Mandated Costs  
2009-10**

Liability Insurance  
Utilities  
Credit Card Processing Fees  
Postage  
Telephone  
Election  
Supplies  
Maintenance Contracts  
Rent  
Other Contracts

To be determined
------------------

Total



# **Workplace Environment Assessment Fall 2008**

**Institutional Assessment, Research and Planning**

**Melanie Rogers, M.A.  
Research Analyst**

**March 2009**

## *Table of Contents*

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Research Design and Method.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Survey Results.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Demographic Characteristics.....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Campus Climate .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Campus Work Environment .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>SBCC Employment Relationship.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Professional Growth.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Campus Interactions .....</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Implications for the College .....</b>	<b>33</b>

## *Executive Summary*

In November 2008, the College conducted a Workplace Environment Assessment. This survey is intended to determine employees' levels of satisfaction with various aspects of the College, including the work environment, the campus climate, opportunities for professional growth, and interactions with campus constituencies – colleagues, supervisors, and students. The survey also aims to gauge employees' knowledge of institutional governance structures, their representatives in College committees, involvement in work area and institutional decision making and feedback on the performance evaluation process. The results of this survey are used to identify areas with which employees are satisfied and those that need improvement.

Using the campus email system, all faculty, classified staff and managers/supervisors/confidential employees were sent a link to the Workplace Environment Assessment on Survey Monkey. The survey questions were reviewed with various employee groups and discussed at the College Planning Council in October 2008 before the survey was finalized. The survey was set up in Survey Monkey and administered by Human Resources & Legal Affairs. Several follow-up emails were sent as reminders to encourage employees to complete the survey. Responses were obtained from 158 classified staff (50% response rate), 110 regular credit faculty (41% response rate), 54 management/supervisory/confidential (72% response rate), 26 credit adjunct faculty (5% response rate) and 22 adjunct faculty in continuing education (5% response rate). Because the response rates for adjunct faculty on both the credit side and in Continuing Education were low, analyses by employee group were limited to regular faculty, classified staff and management/supervisory/confidential employees. It should be noted that such surveys are normally administered to regular employees. However, the College wanted to give an opportunity to adjunct credit and Continuing Education instructors to respond as well. A very low response rate from adjunct instructors was expected as they are much less affected by or involved in issues explored in such a survey and their time spent at the College is limited. Respondents were generally representative of the employee population.

Overall, the results of the survey indicate a high degree of satisfaction with many aspects of the College. Several areas should be further explored to identify possible ways to improve current processes and the knowledge about existing programs or structures. The main findings of the survey are as follows:

- 86% of respondents indicated that they would choose to work for SBCC if they had to do it over again; classified staff have the highest percentage at 89%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 87% and regular faculty at 84%
- A majority of respondents (85%-96%) indicated that their interactions with most faculty, staff, students and administrators/managers are positive
- 82% of respondents agree that there are opportunities for them to expand their skills at SBCC; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 86%, followed closely by classified staff at 85% and by management/supervisory/confidential at 77%
- 80% of respondents believe that they are valued as employees of the college; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 84%, followed closely by classified staff at 81% and by management/supervisory/confidential at 76%
- 91% of respondents know what is expected of them in their job; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 94%, followed by classified staff at 90% and management/supervisory/confidential at 87%
- 82% of respondents believe that they are adequately informed about what is going on at the college; management/supervisory/confidential and classified staff have equal high percentages at 85%, followed closely by regular faculty at 82%
- 78% of respondents agree that their supervisor supports a team environment of collaboration, cooperation and contributing to the success of others; management/supervisory/confidential have the highest percentage at 85%; followed closely by classified staff at 84%, followed by regular faculty at 73%

- 78% of respondents agree that their supervisor encourages and supports their professional growth and development; classified staff have the highest percentage at 82%; followed by regular faculty at 79%; followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 77%
- The professional growth program (stipend) is available to classified staff and management/supervisory/confidential; 44% of classified staff have taken advantage of this program and only 35% of management/supervisory/confidential
- 76% of respondents agree that the College takes active steps to support and promote diversity; classified staff have the highest percentage at 81%, followed by regular faculty at 79% and management/supervisory/confidential at 72%
- 74% of respondents agree that the College encourages employees in their area to take initiative in improving practices, programs and services; management/supervisory/confidential have the highest percentage at 85% followed by classified staff at 73%, followed by regular faculty at 72%
- 73% of respondents agree that there are processes in place for them to be involved in decision making and problem solving within their work groups; management/supervisory/confidential have the highest percentage at 85%; followed closely by regular faculty at 84%, followed by classified staff at 69%
- 72% of respondents agree that they receive recognition for doing a good job; classified staff have the highest percentage at 78%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 74% and regular faculty at 70%
- 71% of respondents agree that the College is making a good effort to support practices that move the institution towards sustainability; management/supervisory/confidential have the highest percentage at 85%, followed by classified staff at 77% and regular faculty at 61%
- 71% of respondents agree that the activities that the College offers such as faculty and classified in-service, retreats, lectures and orientations are effective in creating a sense of community for employees; management/supervisory/confidential have the highest percentage at 83%, followed by regular faculty at 74% and classified staff at 67%
- 68% of respondents agree that the College is making a good effort to inform them about opportunities to improve their health and well being; classified staff have the highest percentage at 77%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 70% and regular faculty at 65%
- 68% of respondents agree that campus facilities are maintained to ensure a physically safe working environment; management/supervisory/confidential have the highest percentage at 80% followed by classified staff at 75%, followed by regular faculty at only 51%
- 67% of respondents agree that campus security measures currently in place are sufficient; management/supervisory/confidential have the highest percentage at 72% followed by classified staff at 69%, followed by regular faculty at 64%
- 65% of respondents think that evaluation processes at SBCC improves the quality of their job performance; classified staff and regular faculty have equal percentages at 66%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 63%
- 65% of respondents feel that their representatives in governance committees adequately inform them about important committee issues and recommendations; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 77%, followed by classified staff at 65%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at only 54%
- 61% of respondents know who their representatives are in college committees; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 84%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 59% and classified staff at only 51%
- 52% of respondents feel that they are adequately represented in college-wide decision making; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 62%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 52% and classified staff at only 48%. Given that about half of the classified staff and 41% of management/supervisory/confidential do not know who their representatives are in college committees, it is expected that there will be a fairly high percentage of individuals in each group who feels they are not adequately represented.

Based on the findings, below are a number of suggested implications. The results of this survey will be discussed with all employee groups to identify additional ways for improving some of the areas which were not rated as highly as many others.

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Implication</b>
65% of respondents think that evaluation processes at SBCC improves the quality of their job performance; classified staff and regular faculty have equal percentages at 66%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 63%	The College will examine the evaluation process in order to increase its efficacy.
<p>65% of respondents feel that their representatives in governance committees adequately inform them about important committee issues and recommendations; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 77%, followed by classified staff at 65%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at only 54%</p> <p>61% of respondents know who their representatives are in college committees; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 84%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 59% and classified staff at only 51%</p> <p>52% of respondents feel that they are adequately represented in college-wide decision making; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 62%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 52% and classified staff at only 48%.</p>	The College will explore and implement enhanced avenues to ensure that classified staff and management/supervisory/confidential know who their representatives in various College committees are. The communication from the representatives of employee groups to their constituency will need to be enhanced.
68% of respondents agree that the College is making a good effort to inform them about opportunities to improve their health and well being; classified staff have the highest percentage at 77%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 70% and regular faculty at 65%	The College will seek ways to increase the awareness of all employee groups but particularly faculty about what the College offers for improvement of health and well being
68% of respondents agree that campus facilities are maintained to ensure a physically safe working environment; management/supervisory/confidential have the highest percentage at 80% followed by classified staff at 75%, followed by regular faculty at only 51%	The College will discuss with faculty to find out their concerns regarding campus facilities and take corrective actions, as appropriate.
78% of respondents agree that their supervisor supports their professional growth, but only 36.5% have taken advantage of the professional growth stipend program.	The College will continue to inform employees about the value of the professional development program, and to show how employees can benefit from participating.

The findings of the survey provide support for the directions the College is taking regarding efforts to improve campus sustainability, increase the flow of information to all members of the campus and community, and provide opportunities for professional growth for its employees. Some areas of concern do exist, including the efficacy of the performance evaluation process and the knowledge of who the representatives of classified staff and management/supervisory/confidential employees are in various College committees along with the communication of the representatives back to their constituencies.

Overall, the results of the survey re-affirm the efforts of the College to maintain an academic, physical and psychological environment that facilitates a safe and rewarding work environment for all employees.



## *Introduction*

In November-December 2008, the College conducted a Workplace Environment Assessment. This survey is intended to determine employees' levels of satisfaction with various aspects of the College, including the work environment, the campus climate, and opportunities for professional growth. The survey also aims to determine employee characteristics that are not available from the data collected through human resources, such as involvement in decision making, and feedback on the performance evaluation process. The results of this survey are used to identify areas with which employees are satisfied and those that need improvement.

## **Research Design and Method**

Using the campus email system, all faculty, staff and administrators/managers were sent a link to the Workplace Environment Assessment on Survey Monkey. The survey questions were reviewed with various employee groups and discussed at the College Planning Council before the survey was finalized. The survey was set up in Survey Monkey and administered by Human Resources & Legal Affairs. Several follow-up emails were sent as reminders to encourage individuals to complete the survey. Responses were obtained from 158 classified staff (50% response rate), 110 regular faculty (41% response rate), 54 management/supervisory/confidential (72% response rate), 26 credit adjunct faculty (5% response rate) and 22 adjunct faculty in continuing education (5% response rate). **The response rates for adjunct faculty on both the credit side and in continuing education were low, thus further analyses by employee group was limited to regular faculty, classified staff and management/ supervisory/confidential employees.** It should be noted that such surveys are normally administered to regular and full-time employees. The College wanted to give an opportunity to adjunct credit and Continuing Education instructors to respond as well. A very low response rate from adjunct instructors was expected as they are much less affected by issues explored in such a survey and their time spent at the College is limited.

Employees responded to 13 questions capturing information regarding basic demographics, work schedule, location, and expected career longevity. Employees additionally responded to questions regarding: 1) interactions with supervisors, other employees and students; 2) campus climate; 3) representation in college committees and involvement in decision making; and 4) expectations and recognition for job performance. The survey instrument is available in Appendix 1.

## **Survey Results Demographic Characteristics**

Respondents were generally representative of SBCC employees on most demographic characteristics, such as age. Employees who are 18 to 40 are very slightly under-represented, while 51-60 year olds are somewhat over-represented (see Tables 1a & 1b).

<b>Table 1a. Age</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Survey Respondents</b>	<b>All SBCC Employees</b>
18 – 30	4.1%	5.6%
31 – 40	15.9%	18.0%
41 – 50	24.9%	24.8%
51 – 60	38.4%	33.8%
over 60	16.8%	17.7%
<i>answered question</i>		<b>370</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>32</b>

Table 1b. Age by Employee Type			
Answer Options	Classified Staff	Regular Faculty	Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf
18 – 30	7.7%	1.8%	0.0%
31 – 40	19.2%	15.6%	13.2%
41 – 50	24.4%	23.9%	30.2%
51 – 60	35.9%	36.7%	39.6%
over 60	12.8%	22.0%	17.0%

While SBCC has a slightly larger female employee population, the survey sample includes even more female respondents (see Table 2a). This is especially true of the classified staff and management/supervisory/confidential employees groups (see Table 2b).

Table 2a. Gender		
Answer Options	Survey Respondents	All SBCC Employees
Female	67.1%	58.2%
Male	32.9%	41.8%
<i>answered question</i>		365
<i>skipped question</i>		37

Table 2b. Gender by Employee Type			
Answer Options	Classified Staff	Regular Faculty	Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf
Female	73.1%	54.3%	67.9%
Male	26.9%	45.7%	32.1%

Classified staff and management/supervisory/confidential are slightly over-represented, while regular faculty are somewhat under-represented and adjunct faculty are significantly under-represented (see Table 3). It should be noted that such surveys are normally administered to regular and full-time employees. The College wanted to give an opportunity to adjunct credit and Continuing Education instructors to respond as well. A very low response rate from adjunct instructors was expected as they are much less affected by issues explored in such a survey and their time spent at the College is limited.

Table 3. My primary position at SBCC is:		
Answer Options	Regular Survey Respondents	All regular SBCC Employees
Classified staff	49%	50%
Regular faculty	34%	40%
Management/Supervisory/Confidential	17%	10%

Minority racial/ethnic groups appear to be slightly under-represented in the respondent group and white employees are slightly over-represented (see Tables 4a & 4b).

Table 4a. Race/Ethnicity		
Answer Options	Survey Respondents	All SBCC Employees
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.3%	0.8%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.9%	3.0%
Black or African American	0.6%	2.6%
Latino	18.0%	24.1%
White	79.1%	69.6%

Table 4b. Race/Ethnicity by Employee Type			
Answer Options	Classified Staff	Regular Faculty	Mgmt/Supervis/Conf
American Indian or Alaska Native	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.5%	1.1%	2.2%
Black or African American	0.0%	2.2%	0.0%
Latino	23.1%	16.7%	15.2%
White	74.6%	80.0%	82.6%

Forty-four percent of respondents have been employed by SBCC in their permanent position for ten or more years, and 49% have been employed for one to nine years (see Tables 5a & 5b).

Table 5a. Years Employed by SBCC in Permanent Position		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Less than one year	7.6%	28
One to four years	24.4%	90
Five to nine years	24.4%	90
Ten to fourteen years	13.6%	50
Fifteen to nineteen years	14.9%	55
Twenty years or more	15.2%	56
<i>answered question</i>		<b>369</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>33</b>

Table 5b. Years in Permanent Position by Employee Type			
Answer Options	Classified Staff	Regular Faculty	Mgmt/Supervis/Conf
Less than one year	7.6%	4.6%	3.7%
One to four years	29.1%	18.3%	20.4%
Five to nine years	29.7%	18.3%	27.8%
Ten to fourteen years	9.5%	14.7%	20.4%
Fifteen to nineteen years	12.0%	22.0%	11.1%
Twenty years or more	12.0%	22.0%	16.7%

Only 4% of respondents indicated that they have any kind of disability (see Tables 6a & 6b).

<b>Table 6a. Disability Status. Defined as: Physical or mental impairment which substantially limits communication, ambulation, self-care, socialization, education, vocational training, employment, transportation, adapting to housing, etc.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Yes	4.1%	15
No	95.9%	349
<i>answered question</i>		<b>364</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>38</b>

<b>Table 6b. Disability Status by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/Supervis/Conf</b>
Yes	4.5%	5.7%	0.0%
No	95.5%	94.3%	100.0%

A majority (84%) of respondents indicated that they work on the main campus, with 10% at the Wake and Schott centers, and 6% at other locations (see Tables 7a & 7b).

<b>Table 7a. Primary Work Location</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Main campus	84.0%	309
Wake/Schott	9.8%	36
Other location	6.3%	23
<i>answered question</i>		<b>368</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>34</b>

<b>Table 7b. Primary Work Location by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/Supervis/Conf</b>
Main campus	87.7%	93.5%	81.1%
Wake/Schott	9.0%	0.9%	15.1%
Other location	3.2%	5.6%	3.8%

A slightly greater majority (86%) of respondents indicated that they work during daytime hours, with only 8% working evening hours and 6% working swing shift hours (see Tables 8a & 8b).

<b>Table 8a. Primary Work Schedule</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Daytime hours	86.2%	319
Evening hours	7.6%	28
Swing shift hours	6.2%	23
<i>answered question</i>		<b>370</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>32</b>

<b>Table 8b. Primary Work Schedule by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/Supervis/Conf</b>
Daytime hours	89.2%	89.9%	98.1%
Evening hours	3.8%	4.6%	0.0%
Swing shift hours	7.0%	5.5%	1.9%

Forty-nine percent of respondents indicated that they expect to continue their career with SBCC for ten or more years, while only 4% expect to stay for less than one year (see Tables 9a & 9b).

<b>Table 9a. I expect to continue my career with SBCC for:</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Less than one year	4.4%	16
One to four years	21.6%	79
Five to nine years	26.6%	97
Ten to fourteen years	19.2%	70
Fifteen to nineteen years	9.9%	36
Twenty years or more	20.3%	74
<i>answered question</i>		<b>365</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>37</b>

<b>Table 9b. Expected Career Longevity by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/Supervis/Conf</b>
Less than one year	6.5%	3.7%	1.9%
One to four years	24.5%	17.8%	28.8%
Five to nine years	25.2%	22.4%	28.8%
Ten to fourteen years	16.8%	19.6%	21.2%
Fifteen to nineteen years	10.3%	7.5%	9.6%
Twenty years or more	18.7%	29.9%	15.4%

The four most important factors for continuing a career with SBCC, as measured by the percentage of respondents who chose each factor, are: appropriate compensation (chosen by 71% of respondents), employee benefits (63%), working conditions (55%) and relationship with supervisor (50%) (see Tables 10a & 10b).

<b>Table 10a. Critical Factors for Continuing Career with SBCC (choose all that apply)</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Appropriate compensation	71.2%	252
Employee benefits	62.7%	222
Working conditions	55.4%	196
Relationship with supervisor	50.3%	178
STRS/PERS retirement	44.4%	157
Cost of living	39.3%	139
Work load	35.9%	127
Possibility of upward mobility	29.4%	104
Distance of commute	21.2%	75
I plan to retire	16.4%	58
Housing availability	14.7%	52
Other (please specify):		63
<i>answered question</i>		<b>354</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>48</b>

<b>Table 10b. Critical Factors for Continuing Career with SBCC by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Appropriate compensation	65.6%	79.4%	75.5%
Employee benefits	68.2%	61.8%	73.5%
Working conditions	56.3%	55.9%	53.1%
Relationship with supervisor	50.3%	42.2%	73.5%
STRS/PERS retirement	49.7%	50.0%	42.9%
Cost of living	47.0%	43.1%	28.6%
Work load	31.8%	43.1%	28.6%
Possibility of upward mobility	39.1%	13.7%	30.6%
Distance of commute	25.8%	13.7%	24.5%
I plan to retire	21.2%	13.7%	16.3%
Housing availability	15.2%	21.6%	8.2%

Eighty-six percent of respondents indicated that they would choose to work for SBCC if they had to do it all over again (see Table 11a). Eighty-nine percent of classified staff would choose to work for SBCC again, along with 87% of managers and 84% of regular faculty (see Table 11b).

<b>Table 11a. If you had to do it all over again, would you choose to work for SBCC?</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Yes	86.4%	324
No	3.5%	13
Too soon to tell	4.0%	15
Undecided	6.1%	23
<i>answered question</i>		<b>375</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>27</b>

<b>Table 11b. Choose to work for SBCC Again by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Yes	89.1%	83.6%	87.0%
No	2.6%	4.5%	3.7%
Too soon to tell	3.8%	3.6%	1.9%
Undecided	4.5%	8.2%	7.4%

## Campus Climate

Eighty-two percent of the respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that there are opportunities for them to expand their skills at SBCC (see Tables 12a & 12b).

<b>Table 12a. There are opportunities for me to expand my skills at SBCC.</b>		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
I don't know	1.8%	7
Strongly disagree	6.6%	26
Somewhat disagree	9.9%	39
Somewhat agree	39.6%	156
Strongly agree	42.1%	166
<i>answered question</i>		394
<i>skipped question</i>		8

<b>Table 12b. Opportunities to Expand Skills by Employee Type</b>			
Answer Options	Classified Staff	Regular Faculty	Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf
I don't know	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	5.8%	4.6%	11.3%
Somewhat disagree	7.1%	9.2%	11.3%
Somewhat agree	43.5%	33.9%	35.8%
Strongly agree	41.6%	52.3%	41.5%

While 68% of the respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that campus facilities are maintained to ensure a physically safe working environment, 30% of respondents disagree (see Table 13a). When this question is evaluated by employee type, 48% of regular faculty disagree, compared to classified staff (24%) and management (20%) (see Table 13b).

<b>Table 13a. Campus facilities are maintained to ensure a physically safe working environment.</b>		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
I don't know	1.8%	7
Strongly disagree	7.8%	31
Somewhat disagree	22.0%	87
Somewhat agree	41.5%	164
Strongly agree	26.8%	106
<i>answered question</i>		395
<i>skipped question</i>		7



<b>Table 13b. Campus Facilities Maintained by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
I don't know	0.6%	0.9%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	6.5%	15.6%	3.7%
Somewhat disagree	17.5%	32.1%	16.7%
Somewhat agree	45.5%	33.0%	46.3%
Strongly agree	29.9%	18.3%	33.3%

While 65% of the respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that evaluation processes at SBCC improve the quality of their job performance, 31% of respondents disagree (see Table 14a). When this question is evaluated by employee type, 34% of regular faculty and 35% of managers do not think that evaluation processes at SBCC improve the quality of their job performance (see Table 14b).

<b>Table 14a. Evaluation processes at SBCC improve the quality of my job performance.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
I have not yet been evaluated	4.1%	16
Strongly disagree	13.7%	54
Somewhat disagree	17.0%	67
Somewhat agree	46.7%	184
Strongly agree	18.5%	73
<i>answered question</i>		<b>394</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>8</b>

<b>Table 14b. Evaluation processes at SBCC improve the quality of my job performance by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
I have not yet been evaluated	5.8%	0.0%	1.9%
Strongly disagree	13.6%	14.7%	14.8%
Somewhat disagree	14.9%	19.3%	20.4%
Somewhat agree	50.6%	45.9%	44.4%
Strongly agree	14.9%	20.2%	18.5%

Seventy-six percent of the respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that SBCC takes active steps to support and promote diversity (see Tables 15a & 15b).

<b>Table 15a. SBCC takes active steps to support and promote diversity.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
I don't know	11.2%	44
Strongly disagree	5.1%	20
Somewhat disagree	7.6%	30
Somewhat agree	32.6%	128
Strongly agree	43.5%	171
<i>answered question</i>		<b>393</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>9</b>

<b>Table 15b. SBCC takes active steps to support and promote diversity by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/Supervis/Conf</b>
I don't know	7.8%	6.4%	5.6%
Strongly disagree	3.9%	7.3%	7.4%
Somewhat disagree	7.1%	7.3%	14.8%
Somewhat agree	34.4%	39.4%	27.8%
Strongly agree	46.8%	39.4%	44.4%

Overall, there is a very high level of agreement among employees that the general campus climate is one that is welcoming of differences in race, ethnicity, gender, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion and educational level (see Tables 16a and 16b).

<b>Table 16a. The general campus climate is one that is welcoming and supportive of differences in:</b>						
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>I don't know</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Race and ethnicity	22	12	30	133	196	393
Gender	24	10	25	125	207	391
Disability	25	12	31	137	187	392
Age	27	13	29	136	188	393
Sexual orientation	68	10	25	121	165	389
Religion	85	13	22	124	148	392
Educational level	37	14	30	139	170	390
<i>answered question</i>						<b>393</b>
<i>skipped question</i>						<b>9</b>

<b>Table 16b. The general campus climate is one that is welcoming and supportive of differences in:</b>					
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>I don't know</b>	<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat disagree</b>	<b>Somewhat agree</b>	<b>Strongly agree</b>
Race and ethnicity	5.6%	3.1%	7.6%	33.8%	49.9%
Gender	6.1%	2.6%	6.4%	32.0%	52.9%
Disability	6.4%	3.1%	7.9%	34.9%	47.7%
Age	6.9%	3.3%	7.4%	34.6%	47.8%
Sexual orientation	17.5%	2.6%	6.4%	31.1%	42.4%
Religion	21.7%	3.3%	5.6%	31.6%	37.8%
Educational level	9.5%	3.6%	7.7%	35.6%	43.6%

Sixty-seven percent of respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that campus security measures currently in place are sufficient. However, 27% of classified staff, 28% of managers and 31% of regular faculty disagree (see Tables 17a & 17b).

<b>Table 17a. Campus security measures currently in place are sufficient.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
I don't know	6.3%	25
Strongly disagree	10.7%	42
Somewhat disagree	16.5%	65
Somewhat agree	48.0%	189
Strongly agree	18.5%	73
<i>answered question</i>		<b>394</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>8</b>

<b>Table 17b. Campus security measures currently in place are sufficient by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/Supervis/Conf</b>
I don't know	3.9%	5.6%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	12.3%	11.1%	13.0%
Somewhat disagree	14.9%	19.4%	14.8%
Somewhat agree	51.3%	44.4%	48.1%
Strongly agree	17.5%	19.4%	24.1%

## Campus Work Environment

Eighty percent of the respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that they are valued as employees of the college (see Table 18a). Regular faculty have the highest percentage 84% followed by classified staff at 81% and managers 76% (see Table 18b).

<b>Table 18a. I am valued as an employee of the college.</b>		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Too early to tell	1.3%	5
Strongly disagree	4.9%	19
Somewhat disagree	10.4%	40
Somewhat agree	36.5%	141
Strongly agree	43.5%	168
No opinion	3.4%	13
<i>answered question</i>		<b>386</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>16</b>

<b>Table 18b. I am valued as an employee of the college by Employee Type</b>			
Answer Options	Classified Staff	Regular Faculty	Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf
Too early to tell	1.3%	0.9%	1.9%
Strongly disagree	4.6%	2.8%	3.7%
Somewhat disagree	9.8%	7.3%	16.7%
Somewhat agree	39.9%	34.9%	33.3%
Strongly agree	41.2%	49.5%	42.6%
No opinion	3.3%	4.6%	1.9%

Seventy-one percent of the respondents agree or strongly agree that the activities the college offers, such as in-service, retreats and lectures are effective in creating a sense of community for employees (see Table 19a). Twenty-five% of regular faculty, 20% of classified staff and 17% of managers disagree (see Table 19b).

<b>Table 19a. The activities that the college offers such as faculty and classified in-service, retreats, lectures, and orientations are effective in creating a sense of community for employees.</b>		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Too early to tell	2.1%	8
Strongly disagree	7.0%	27
Somewhat disagree	14.2%	55
Somewhat agree	45.7%	177
Strongly agree	25.1%	97
No opinion	5.9%	23
<i>answered question</i>		<b>387</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>15</b>

<b>Table 19b. The activities that the college offers such as faculty and classified in-service, retreats, lectures, and orientations are effective in creating a sense of community for employees by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/Supervis/Conf</b>
Too early to tell	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	5.9%	8.3%	5.6%
Somewhat disagree	14.4%	16.7%	11.1%
Somewhat agree	49.0%	43.5%	53.7%
Strongly agree	18.3%	30.6%	29.6%
No opinion	9.2%	0.9%	0.0%

Eighty-two percent of the respondents agree or strongly agree that they are adequately informed about what is going on at the college (see Tables 20a & 20b).

<b>Table 20a. I am adequately informed about what is going on at the college.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Too early to tell	0.3%	1
Strongly disagree	5.9%	23
Somewhat disagree	10.8%	42
Somewhat agree	43.4%	169
Strongly agree	38.8%	151
No opinion	0.8%	3
<i>answered question</i>		<b>389</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>13</b>

<b>Table 20b. I am adequately informed about what is going on at the college by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/Supervis/Conf</b>
Too early to tell	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	7.1%	5.5%	5.6%
Somewhat disagree	7.1%	12.8%	9.3%
Somewhat agree	48.1%	39.4%	42.6%
Strongly agree	36.4%	42.2%	42.6%
No opinion	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%

While 65% of respondents feel that their representatives in governance committees adequately inform them about important college committee issues and recommendations, 20% of classified staff, 21% of regular faculty and 37% of managers feel that they are not adequately informed by their representatives (see Tables 21a & 21b). This is partially explained by the response below about knowing who the representatives in various College committees for each constituency are.

<b>Table 21a. My representatives in governance committees adequately inform me about important college committee issues and recommendations.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Too early to tell	2.8%	11
Strongly disagree	7.0%	27
Somewhat disagree	15.5%	60
Somewhat agree	36.2%	140
Strongly agree	28.7%	111
No opinion	9.8%	38
<i>answered question</i>		<b>387</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>15</b>

<b>Table 21b. My representatives in governance committees adequately inform me about important college committee issues and recommendations by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Too early to tell	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	5.9%	4.6%	18.5%
Somewhat disagree	13.7%	16.5%	18.5%
Somewhat agree	41.2%	35.8%	31.5%
Strongly agree	24.2%	41.3%	22.2%
No opinion	12.4%	1.8%	9.3%

Overall, 61% of respondents know who their representatives are in college committees (see Table 22a). Regular faculty are better informed about who their representatives are (84%) than managers (59%) or classified staff (51%) (see Table 22b).

<b>Table 22a. I know who my representatives are in college committees.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Yes	61.3%	234
No	38.7%	148
<i>answered question</i>		<b>382</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>20</b>

<b>Table 22b. I know who my representatives are in college committees by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Yes	50.7%	84.1%	58.5%
No	49.3%	15.9%	41.5%

Overall, 52% of respondents feel that they are adequately represented in college-wide decision making (see Table 23a). However, only 48% of classified staff feel that they are adequately represented, compared to 52% of managers and 62% of regular faculty (see Table 23b). This is again correlated with knowing who the representatives of each group are in various College committees.

<b>Table 23a. I am adequately represented in college-wide decision making.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Too early to tell	4.7%	18
Strongly disagree	14.8%	57
Somewhat disagree	21.0%	81
Somewhat agree	37.8%	146
Strongly agree	14.0%	54
No opinion	7.8%	30
<i>answered question</i>		<b>386</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>16</b>

<b>Table 23b. I am adequately represented in college-wide decision making by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Too early to tell	4.6%	3.7%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	15.7%	11.0%	16.7%
Somewhat disagree	20.9%	21.1%	29.6%
Somewhat agree	37.3%	43.1%	33.3%
Strongly agree	10.5%	19.3%	18.5%
No opinion	11.1%	1.8%	1.9%

Seventy-three percent of the respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that there are processes in place for them to be involved in decision making and problem solving within their work group (see Table 24a). Regular faculty (84%) and managers (85%) are much more aware of these processes than classified staff (69%) (see Table 24b).

<b>Table 24a. There are processes in place for me to be involved in decision making and problem solving within my work group.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Too early to tell	3.1%	12
Strongly disagree	8.5%	33
Somewhat disagree	12.4%	48
Somewhat agree	38.2%	148
Strongly agree	34.4%	133
No opinion	3.4%	13
<i>answered question</i>		<b>387</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>15</b>

<b>Table 24b. There are processes in place for me to be involved in decision making and problem solving within my work group by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Too early to tell	2.0%	0.0%	1.9%
Strongly disagree	11.1%	4.6%	5.6%
Somewhat disagree	13.7%	10.1%	7.4%
Somewhat agree	37.3%	40.4%	37.0%
Strongly agree	32.0%	43.1%	48.1%
No opinion	3.9%	1.8%	0.0%

Seventy-one percent of the respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that SBCC is making a good effort to support practices that move towards sustainability (see Table 25a).

<b>Table 25a. SBCC is making a good effort to support practices that move towards sustainability (ecological longevity).</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Too early to tell	6.0%	23
Strongly disagree	3.4%	13
Somewhat disagree	10.9%	42
Somewhat agree	39.1%	151
Strongly agree	31.6%	122
No opinion	9.1%	35
<i>answered question</i>		<b>386</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>16</b>

Eighty-five percent of managers and 77% of classified staff agree that SBCC is making a good effort towards sustainability. Lower levels of agreement are seen among regular faculty (61%) (see Table 25b).

<b>Table 25b. SBCC is making a good effort to support practices that move towards sustainability (ecological longevity) by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Too early to tell	5.2%	5.5%	1.9%
Strongly disagree	1.3%	7.3%	5.6%
Somewhat disagree	9.8%	19.3%	5.6%
Somewhat agree	38.6%	38.5%	48.1%
Strongly agree	38.6%	22.0%	37.0%
No opinion	6.5%	7.3%	1.9%

Seventy-four percent of the respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that SBCC encourages employees to take initiative in improving practices, programs and services (see Table 26a). Managers as a group agree strongly (85%) followed by classified staff (73%) and regular faculty (72%) (see Table 26b).



<b>Table 26a. SBCC encourages employees in my area to take initiative in improving practices, programs and services.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Too early to tell	1.6%	6
Strongly disagree	8.3%	32
Somewhat disagree	12.4%	48
Somewhat agree	39.8%	154
Strongly agree	34.6%	134
No opinion	3.4%	13
<i>answered question</i>		<b>387</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>15</b>

<b>Table 26b. SBCC encourages employees in my area to take initiative in improving practices, programs and services by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Too early to tell	2.6%	0.9%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	12.3%	8.3%	0.0%
Somewhat disagree	9.1%	18.3%	15.1%
Somewhat agree	45.5%	36.7%	39.6%
Strongly agree	27.9%	34.9%	45.3%
No opinion	2.6%	0.9%	0.0%

Sixty-eight percent of the respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that the college is making a good effort to inform them about opportunities to improve their health and well being, but 30% of regular faculty, 26% of managers and 16% of classified staff disagree (see Tables 27a & 27b).

<b>Table 27a. The college is making a good effort to inform me about opportunities to improve my health and well being.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Too early to tell	2.1%	8
Strongly disagree	8.5%	33
Somewhat disagree	16.8%	65
Somewhat agree	45.6%	177
Strongly agree	22.4%	87
No opinion	4.6%	18
<i>answered question</i>		<b>388</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>14</b>

<b>Table 27b. The college is making a good effort to inform me about opportunities to improve my health and well being by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Too early to tell	1.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	6.5%	9.2%	5.6%
Somewhat disagree	9.7%	21.1%	20.4%
Somewhat agree	51.3%	42.2%	48.1%
Strongly agree	26.0%	22.9%	22.2%
No opinion	4.5%	4.6%	3.7%

## SBCC Employment Relationship

Seventy-two % of respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that they receive recognition for doing a good job. 74% of managers, 70% of regular faculty and 78% of classified staff feel that they are recognized for doing a good job (see Tables 28a & 28b).

<b>Table 28a. I receive recognition for doing a good job.</b>		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Too early to tell	2.6%	10
Strongly disagree	7.7%	29
Somewhat disagree	15.6%	59
Somewhat agree	35.4%	134
Strongly agree	36.1%	137
No opinion	2.6%	10
<i>answered question</i>		<b>379</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>23</b>

<b>Table 28b. I receive recognition for doing a good job by Employee Type</b>			
Answer Options	Classified Staff	Regular Faculty	Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf
Too early to tell	2.6%	1.8%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	5.8%	9.1%	5.6%
Somewhat disagree	12.3%	15.5%	20.4%
Somewhat agree	37.0%	40.0%	29.6%
Strongly agree	40.9%	30.0%	44.4%
No opinion	1.3%	3.6%	0.0%

Almost all (91%) of the respondents know what is expected of them in their job (see Table 29a). Regular faculty have the highest percentage who know what is expected of them (95%), followed by classified staff (90%) and managers (87%) (see Table 29b).

<b>Table 29a. I know what is expected of me in my job.</b>		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Too early to tell	0.3%	1
Strongly disagree	2.7%	10
Somewhat disagree	4.2%	16
Somewhat agree	25.7%	97
Strongly agree	65.3%	246
No opinion	1.9%	7
<i>answered question</i>		<b>377</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>25</b>

<b>Table 29b. I know what is expected of me in my job by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Too early to tell	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	3.3%	2.8%	0.0%
Somewhat disagree	4.6%	0.9%	9.3%
Somewhat agree	26.8%	22.0%	20.4%
Strongly agree	63.4%	72.5%	66.7%
No opinion	1.3%	1.8%	3.7%

Seventy-eight percent of respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that their supervisor supports a team environment (see Table 30a). Eighty-five percent of managers and 84% of classified staff agree, compared to 73% of regular faculty (see Table 30b).

<b>Table 30a. My supervisor supports a team environment of collaboration, cooperation and contributing to the success of others.</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Too early to tell	1.1%	4
Strongly disagree	8.4%	31
Somewhat disagree	8.9%	33
Somewhat agree	24.3%	90
Strongly agree	53.8%	199
No opinion	3.5%	13
<i>answered question</i>		<b>370</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>32</b>

<b>Table 30b. My supervisor supports a team environment of collaboration, cooperation and contributing to the success of others by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Too early to tell	0.7%	0.9%	0.0%
Strongly disagree	8.6%	8.3%	9.6%
Somewhat disagree	6.6%	11.1%	5.8%
Somewhat agree	25.7%	24.1%	23.1%
Strongly agree	57.9%	49.1%	61.5%
No opinion	0.7%	6.5%	0.0%

## Professional Growth

While 78% of respondents somewhat agree or strongly agree that their supervisor encourages and supports their professional growth (see Tables 31a & 31b), only 36.5% have taken advantage of the professional growth stipend program (see Table 32a). Slightly more classified staff (44%) have taken advantage of the program than managers (35%) (see Table 32b).

<b>Table 31a. My supervisor encourages and supports my professional growth and development.</b>		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Too early to tell	3.0%	8
Strongly disagree	5.2%	14
Somewhat disagree	9.7%	26
Somewhat agree	24.7%	66
Strongly agree	53.6%	143
No opinion	3.7%	10
<i>answered question</i>		<b>267</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>135</b>

<b>Table 31b. My supervisor encourages and supports my professional growth and development by Employee Type</b>			
Answer Options	Classified Staff	Regular Faculty	Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf
Too early to tell	3.3%	0.0%	2.3%
Strongly disagree	4.0%	0.0%	7.0%
Somewhat disagree	6.6%	16.7%	11.6%
Somewhat agree	25.2%	28.6%	20.9%
Strongly agree	57.0%	50.0%	55.8%
No opinion	4.0%	4.8%	2.3%

<b>Table 32a. I have taken advantage of the Professional Growth (stipend) Program.</b>		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Yes	36.5%	97
No	63.5%	169
<i>answered question</i>		<b>266</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>136</b>

<b>Table 32b. I have taken advantage of the Professional Growth (stipend) Program by Employee Type</b>			
Answer Options	Classified Staff	Regular Faculty	Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf
Yes	44.2%	N/A	34.9%
No	55.8%	N/A	65.1%

Respondents were asked to provide suggestions for additional classes to be offered through the Professional Development Center. Below suggestions received:

Dealing with disruptive behavior

Use of systems of web management (spaceghost, web editor)

Written communication such as clearer e-mail memos so there is less misunderstanding.

Anything that is cutting edge for teacher to use as a tool to become a better teacher.

Argos

As many technology classes as possible. The ones offered are very, very good but fill up quickly

Classes in personality and creativity recognition and respect.

Conflict resolution between co-workers

Disability awareness

Cultures in the workplace spanish in the workplace customer service for students workplace etiquette

Dealing with difficult students.

Dealing with students in emotional or mental distress

Diversity in the workplace.

Generations in the workplace.

Communicating respect to people at your workplace.

Eliminating favoritism in the workplace.

Dreamweaver Publisher

Dreamweaver or any sort of web content building training.

Customer service - support staff should get a baseline training for this.

Emergency plans special education

Ethics

Grant writing/reporting

Health related topics

How to maintain a blog for classroom activities, rather than Moodle which is getting more intuitive and easy to use but not there yet.

How to use technology in lieu of face to face meetings.

I recommend that PRO classes be offered in an online format where appropriate.

Inter communication skills.

Personality and work related skills testing to learn our aptitude and talents on a broader level than our job descriptions.

Leadership and program development (not just to be attended, but to be included with in the chair evaluation)

Learning to deal with difficult supervisors.

Making most of office hours Encouraging student participation in class

Marketing classes (i.e. ways to market classes; reach more new students,...)

Money management/ CPR/ classes helping to understand insurance (health, auto, life etc.)

Moodle training;Banner training,Filemaker Pro Training. For starters.

More classes on constructing websites to use in conjunction with my course(s).

New computer programs - Publisher, vizio, etc

personal safety office safety

Photoshop Web Site design/set-up

Political tolerance; being open to opposing points of view

Salient characteristics of a professional supervisor, mgmt/employee relations. Proper performance evals.

Stress management

Team building for departments.

The Power of the Mind: Using affirmations  
The Power of the Spoken Word Expressing Love, Praise and Appreciation  
Time Mgmt/Personal Organization and Planning Customer Service Covey 7 Habits  
Covey for Managers and Covey Leadership  
Supervisors Institute  
Dealing with Difficult People  
Innovation  
Performance Evaluations  
Teams  
Business Writing  
Effective Meetings  
Understanding college structure, governance, and committee: a primer.  
Web 2.0 instruction classes  
Web creation and Internet content classes.  
Work Safety Awareness

## Campus Interactions

Eighty-eight percent of survey respondents indicated that their interactions with most faculty at SBCC are positive or very positive (see Tables 33a & 33b).

Table 33a. My interactions with most faculty at SBCC are:		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Not applicable	1.6%	6
Insufficient	7.1%	27
Very negative	0.5%	2
Negative	2.4%	9
Positive	54.5%	207
Very positive	33.9%	129
<i>answered question</i>		<b>380</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>22</b>

Table 33b. Interactions with most faculty at SBCC by Employee Type			
Answer Options	Classified Staff	Regular Faculty	Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf
Not applicable	1.3%	0.9%	0.0%
Insufficient	7.1%	6.4%	7.4%
Very negative	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Negative	4.5%	0.0%	3.7%
Positive	60.6%	49.5%	59.3%
Very positive	25.2%	43.1%	29.6%

Almost all (95%) of the respondents indicated that their interactions with most classified staff at SBCC are positive or very positive (see Tables 34a & 34b).

Table 34a. My interactions with most classified staff at SBCC are:		
Answer Options	Response Frequency	Response Count
Not applicable	1.3%	5
Insufficient	2.4%	9
Very negative	0.5%	2
Negative	0.8%	3
Positive	57.3%	217
Very positive	37.7%	143
<i>answered question</i>		<b>379</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>23</b>

<b>Table 34b. Interactions with most classified staff at SBCC by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/Supervis/Conf</b>
Not applicable	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%
Insufficient	1.3%	1.8%	1.9%
Very negative	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Negative	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%
Positive	60.0%	60.6%	59.3%
Very positive	38.1%	35.8%	38.9%

Almost all (96%) of the respondents indicated that their interactions with most students at SBCC are positive or very positive (see Tables 35a & 35b).

<b>Table 35a. My interactions with most students at SBCC are:</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Insufficient experience	2.4%	9
Very negative	0.0%	0
Negative	1.3%	5
Positive	57.5%	218
Very positive	38.8%	147
<i>answered question</i>		<b>379</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>23</b>

<b>Table 35b. Interactions with most students at SBCC by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/Supervis/Conf</b>
Insufficient experience	3.9%	0.0%	1.9%
Very negative	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Negative	1.9%	0.9%	1.9%
Positive	64.3%	54.1%	66.7%
Very positive	29.9%	45.0%	29.6%



Eighty-seven percent of respondents indicated that their interactions with most managers and administrators at SBCC are positive or very positive (see Table 36a). This is true for 96% of managers, 91% of regular faculty and 81% of classified staff (see Table 36b).

<b>Table 36a. My interactions with most managers and administrators at SBCC are:</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Not applicable	2.4%	9
Insufficient	5.3%	20
Very negative	1.1%	4
Negative	4.5%	17
Positive	60.2%	227
Very positive	26.5%	100
<i>answered question</i>		<b>377</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>25</b>

<b>Table 36b. Interactions with most managers and administrators at SBCC by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/Supervis/Conf</b>
Not applicable	3.2%	0.9%	0.0%
Insufficient	7.1%	4.7%	1.9%
Very negative	0.6%	1.9%	0.0%
Negative	8.4%	1.9%	1.9%
Positive	59.4%	64.5%	61.1%
Very positive	21.3%	26.2%	35.2%

Eighty-five percent of respondents indicated that their interactions with their immediate supervisor are positive or very positive (see Table 37a). Similarly high percentages are seen among all three employee groups (see Table 37b).

<b>Table 37a. My interactions with my immediate supervisor are:</b>		
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Response Frequency</b>	<b>Response Count</b>
Insufficient	2.7%	10
Very negative	1.9%	7
Negative	4.5%	17
Positive	23.1%	87
Very positive	62.0%	233
Decline to state	5.9%	22
<i>answered question</i>		<b>376</b>
<i>skipped question</i>		<b>26</b>

<b>Table 37b. Interactions with immediate supervisor by Employee Type</b>			
<b>Answer Options</b>	<b>Classified Staff</b>	<b>Regular Faculty</b>	<b>Mgmt/ Supervis/Conf</b>
Insufficient	0.6%	1.9%	1.9%
Very negative	2.6%	2.8%	0.0%
Negative	5.2%	5.7%	1.9%
Positive	23.9%	26.4%	20.8%
Very positive	61.9%	58.5%	67.9%
Decline to state	5.8%	4.7%	7.5%

## *Implications for the College*

Overall, the results of the survey indicate a high degree of satisfaction with many aspects of the College. Based on the findings, below are a number of suggested implications. The results of this survey will be discussed with all employee groups to identify additional ways for improving some of the areas which were not rated as highly as many others.

<b>Finding</b>	<b>Implication</b>
65% of respondents think that evaluation processes at SBCC improves the quality of their job performance; classified staff and regular faculty have equal percentages at 66%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 63%	The College will examine the evaluation process in order to increase its efficacy.
<p>65% of respondents feel that their representatives in governance committees adequately inform them about important committee issues and recommendations; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 77%, followed by classified staff at 65%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at only 54%</p> <p>61% of respondents know who their representatives are in college committees; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 84%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 59% and classified staff at only 51%</p> <p>52% of respondents feel that they are adequately represented in college-wide decision making; regular faculty have the highest percentage at 62%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 52% and classified staff at only 48%.</p>	The College will explore and implement enhanced avenues to ensure that classified staff and management/supervisory/confidential know who their representatives in various College committees are. The communication from the representatives of employee groups to their constituency will need to be enhanced.
68% of respondents agree that the College is making a good effort to inform them about opportunities to improve their health and well being; classified staff have the highest percentage at 77%, followed by management/supervisory/confidential at 70% and regular faculty at 65%	The College will seek ways to increase the awareness of all employee groups but particularly faculty about what the College offers for improvement of health and well being
68% of respondents agree that campus facilities are maintained to ensure a physically safe working environment; management/supervisory/confidential have the highest percentage at 80% followed by classified staff at 75%, followed by regular faculty at only 51%	The College will discuss with faculty to find out their concerns regarding campus facilities and take corrective actions, as appropriate.

78% of respondents agree that their supervisor supports their professional growth, but only 36.5% have taken advantage of the professional growth stipend program.	The College will continue to inform employees about the value of the professional development program, and to show how employees can benefit from participating.
--	--

The findings of the survey provide support for the directions the College is taking regarding efforts to improve campus sustainability, increase the flow of information to all members of the campus and community, and provide opportunities for professional growth for its employees. Some areas of concern do exist, including the efficacy of the performance evaluation process and the knowledge of who the representatives of classified staff and management/supervisory/confidential employees are in various College committees along with the communication of the representatives back to their constituencies. Overall, the results of the survey re-affirm the efforts of the College to maintain an academic, physical and psychological environment that facilitates a safe and rewarding work environment for all employees.

# Evaluation of the Institutional Governance and Decision Making Structure and Processes DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION April 7, 2009

The College Plan 2008-11 includes two objectives aimed at establishing a regular evaluation and improvement of institutional shared governance and decision-making structures and processes, conduct the evaluation and using the results to make changes as needed. The results of this survey will help the College to achieve these two objectives,

Please complete this survey reflecting on your experience while participating in the institutional governance committees. Melanie Rogers will distribute, collect and then tabulate and summarize the results. Responses will remain confidential and anonymous. **Please complete only one survey even if you serve on more than one committee.** Thank you.

Direct questions to Melanie Rogers.

**Please make your marks as follows:**

Like this:  Not like this:

1. Today's Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## Participant Profile

2. What is your position in the college?

Position       Administration       Dept. Chair       Faculty       Staff       Student

Hours       Full time       Part time

Primary Campus       Main       Schott       Wake

3. How many different institutional governance committees have you served on in during the 2008-09 academic year?

1       2       3       4       5 or more

4. Check each committee you served on during the 2008-09 Academic year?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="radio"/> College Planning Council      | <input type="radio"/> Student Senate         |
| <input type="radio"/> District Technology Committee | <input type="radio"/> Planning and Resources |
| <input type="radio"/> Academic Senate               | <input type="radio"/> Curriculum             |
| <input type="radio"/> Instructional Technology      |  |
| <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify)        |  |

6. Did you receive an orientation on how the governance system functions when you started serving on a committee?

Yes       No       Don't recall       Did not require an orientation

If no, what would you recommend?

7. Did you receive adequate or specialized training to make decisions when you started serving on a committee?

- Yes       No       Don't recall       Did not require special training

If no, what would you recommend?

8. What training would you like to receive or would recommend for a new member?

- Budgeting                                       Conflict Resolution                                       Consensus Decision Making  
 How to chair a meeting                                       Leadership                                       Meeting Management  
 Parliamentary Procedures                                       Other (Comment below)

Comment:

9. Check the committee you are evaluating today.

- College Planning Council                                       Student Senate  
 District Technology Committee                                       Planning and Resources  
 Academic Senate                                       Curriculum  
 Instructional Technology  
 Other (please specify)

10. How often do (did) you attend committee meetings?

- Occasionally (approx. half the meetings or fewer)                                       All the time (missed two meetings at most)  
 Regularly (more than half the meetings)                                       Perfect Attendance

11. Consider your experience on the Committee selected above. For each statement below please mark: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree or Strongly Disagree.

<u>Task</u>	<u>Statement</u>	<u>SA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>SD</u>
1.	Agendas, minutes and ancillary materials were provided electronically prior to the committee meetings.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.	In general, the objectives of each committee meeting were clear and understood.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3.	The discussions usually followed the agenda.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4.	Committees completed the agenda in an efficient and timely manner.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5.	Action items and parties responsible were clearly articulated.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- |  |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 6. Action items were assigned and completed in a timely fashion.     | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 7. Standardized procedures were identified and followed.             | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 8. Committee chair or co-chairs were effective in managing meetings. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Information Adequacy**

- |  |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 9. The committee members had appropriate information to make informed decisions. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 10. Discussion and decisions were data driven and supported by sound evidence.   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Participation**

- |   |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 11. All constituent groups had an opportunity to participate on College committees. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 12. All members attended regularly.   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 13. All members were encouraged to be actively involved.                            | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 14. All members participated in the discussion and decision making process.         | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 15. Decisions were made by consensus.   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Statement**

**SA      A      N      D      SD**

**Professional Conduct & Respectful Dialogue**

- |  |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 16. Different opinions and values were respected.            | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 17. Committee members were always respectful of all members. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

**Overall**

- |  |                       |                       |                       |                       |                       |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 18. Participation in the committee was important and valuable to the college.                | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 19. The committee charge was understood and the members worked toward fulfilling the charge. | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 20. Committees have means to evaluate the effectiveness of its decisions and actions.        | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 21. Meetings were positive and constructive.   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 22. Committees acted in accordance with Title 5 Participatory Governance guidelines.         | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 23. Overall, I am satisfied with the Committee's   | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

performance.

24. I was an effective participant.

**25. Please use the space below to provide any written comments about the institutional governance and committee structure in general and any specific committees. Include general comments, specific observations regarding positive or negative occurrences, suggestions for improvement. Use the other side as needed. Thank you.**