



**ANALYSIS OF THE
GULF COAST CONSORTIUM
FACULTY/STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF COLLEGE SERVICES
FALL 2002 SURVEY**

Ziv Shafir, Analysis Coordinator

Office of Institutional Effectiveness



DISCLAIMER

Employment at the College and access to its programs or activities shall not be limited on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, political affiliation, or physical disability. ACC will take steps to ensure that the lack of English language skills will not be a barrier to admission and participation in all educational and vocational programs. All recruitment and admissions material complies with section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Inquiries regarding ACC's compliance with ADA, or requests for accommodations for persons with disabilities can be directed to:

EEO/ADA/Affirmative Action Coordinator
5930 Middle Fiskville Rd.
Austin, TX 78752-4390
512-223-7572 (voice)
1-800-735-2989 (Texas Relay Service TDD)

Table of Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	v
Summary of Findings	vii
Table 1 – Demographic Information of Faculty/Staff Who Completed Survey	1
Table 2 – Levels of Importance	5
Table 3 – Levels of Quality	9
Table 4 – Gap Analysis: Levels of Quality minus Levels of Importance	13
Table 5 – Institutional Purpose: Levels of Agreement	17
Table 6 – Institutional Effectiveness: Levels of Agreement	19
Table 7 – Educational Program: Levels of Agreement	21
Table 8 – Educational Support Services: Levels of Agreement	23
Table 9 – Administrative Processes: Levels of Agreement	25

INTRODUCTION

The Faculty/Staff Perceptions Survey was developed in the 1997 academic year by representatives from members of the Gulf Coast Association of Institutional Research (GCAIR). Researchers recognized a need to collect and analyze data on the perceptions of faculty and staff regarding their institution in accordance with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) criteria. The survey was administered in the fall semester of 2002 and then analyzed by researchers at San Jacinto College. Also, for fall 2002, Austin Community College (ACC) participated in the survey. This is the first year that an institution outside of the Gulf Coast Consortium has participated in this particular survey. The inclusion of Austin Community College allows researchers access to a wide range of comparative data.

Published results of this survey may be used for institutional effectiveness purposes. This report provides for a comparative analysis of faculty and staff responses. Note that administrative responses were grouped with staff responses for the purposes of this analysis. In addition, the tables in this report focus solely on Austin Community College and two peer institutions that participated in the survey, the Houston Community College System (HCCS) and San Jacinto College District (SJCD). The *Summary of Findings* to follow pertains to results from ACC respondents only.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS – AUSTIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Demographic Information (Table 1 – Page 1)

Just over 500 ACC employees participated in the survey – this represented 40% of the workforce at Austin Community College (ACC) in fall 2002. Over half of ACC participants classified themselves as “Teaching and Non-Teaching Faculty”. The majority of ACC participants were full time employees (64.8%) and 84% of those participating in the survey indicated being employed at ACC for two years or more. Roughly three-quarter of ACC participants in the survey were White; examination of the ACC faculty and staff ethnicity distribution in fall 2002 revealed that the survey slightly over-represented Whites and slightly under-represented Hispanics and Blacks. In addition, 58% of ACC participants were female, a comparable percentage when examining the ACC faculty and staff gender distribution in fall 2002.

Levels of Importance (Table 2 – Page 5)

In response to the question *How important is it for the college to provide the following?*, faculty and staff responded to 47 items on a rating scale ranging from 1 to 5 where 1 = *not important at all* and 5 = *very important*. Item scores are presented as means. Overall, in fall 2002, the ACC faculty mean for importance was 4.31 and the ACC staff mean for importance was 4.38.

The table below lists the top three most important items for both faculty and staff. Both faculty and staff considered academic advising and college catalog information important.

Faculty		Staff	
Item	Mean	Item	Mean
Academic advising/course planning	4.74	Academic advising/course planning	4.82
Information provided by course schedules	4.74	Information provided by course schedules	4.76
Library/learning resource facilities and services	4.74	Information provided in the college catalog	4.76

The table below lists the three lowest-rated items in terms of importance for both faculty and staff.

Faculty		Staff	
Item	Mean	Item	Mean
Student publications	3.63	Cultural programs and activities	3.77
Cafeteria/food services	3.59	Cafeteria/food services	3.69
Varsity athletics	2.10	Varsity athletics	2.31

Levels of Quality (Table 3 – Page 9)

Faculty and staff were asked to indicate the level of quality for each of the 47 items they rated on importance. Mean scores are based on a rating scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = *needs improvement* and 5 = *excellent*. Overall, in fall 2002, the ACC faculty mean for quality was 3.24 and the ACC staff importance for quality was 3.20.

The table below lists the three highest-rated items in terms of quality for both faculty and staff. The library facilities and the racial/ethnic harmony at ACC received high quality ratings from both faculty and staff.

Faculty		Staff	
Item	Mean	Item	Mean
Racial/ethnic harmony at this college	3.98	Library/learning resource facilities and services	4.12
Library/learning resource facilities and services	3.96	Student access to computers and/or computer labs	4.08
Information provided by course schedules	3.90	Racial/ethnic harmony at this college	4.01

The table below lists the three lowest-rated items in terms of quality for both faculty and staff. Parking facilities for both employees and staff received low quality marks from faculty and staff at ACC.

Faculty		Staff	
Item	Mean	Item	Mean
Budgeting policies and procedures	2.30	Cafeteria/food services & Budgeting policies and procedures	2.34
Parking facilities and services for employees	2.15	Parking facilities and services for employees	2.00
Parking facilities and services for students	2.01	Parking facilities and services for students	1.89

Gap Analysis: Levels of Quality minus Levels of Importance (Table 4 – Page 13)

To further analyze quality and importance ratings of services by ACC faculty and staff, a gap analysis was performed by taking the mean level of quality minus the mean level of importance. A positive score indicates that ACC survey respondents' quality ratings were more than their importance ratings on an item. A negative score indicates that ACC survey respondents' quality ratings were less than their importance ratings on an item. Table 4 (page 13) lists gap analysis scores for all 47 items. Below are the three highest and lowest gap scores for both faculty and staff. The ACC faculty overall gap analysis mean for all 47 items was -1.07 and the ACC staff overall gap analysis mean was -1.18 .

The table below lists the items with the three smallest gap scores between levels of quality and levels of importance.

Faculty		Staff	
Item	Mean	Item	Mean
Varsity athletics	0.47	Varsity athletics	0.31
Cultural programs and activities	-0.24	Cultural programs and activities	-0.28
Student publications	-0.31	Racial/ethnic harmony at the college	-0.45

The table below lists the items with three largest gap scores between levels of quality and levels of importance. The items with the largest negative gaps between quality and importance were parking-related.

Faculty		Staff	
Item	Mean	Item	Mean
Budgeting policies and procedures	-2.21	Budgeting policies and procedures	-2.32
Parking facilities and services for employees	-2.43	Parking facilities and services for employees	-2.59
Parking facilities and services for students	-2.50	Parking facilities and services for students	-2.69

Institutional Purpose – Levels of Agreement (Table 5 – Page 17)

Two items examined respondents’ overall perception of the institutional purpose at ACC. The mean for levels of agreement is based on a ratings scale ranging from 1 to 5 where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

In response to the item “Mission statement clearly defined”, both faculty and staff had fairly positive levels of agreement on this item, 3.88 and 3.91, respectively. However, there was a discrepancy between staff and faculty on the item “Mission statement jointly developed” (faculty = 3.26; staff = 3.55).

Institutional Effectiveness – Levels of Agreement (Table 6 – Page 19)

Six items examined respondents’ overall perception of the institutional effectiveness at ACC. The mean for levels of agreement is based on a ratings scale ranging from 1 to 5 where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

The overall means for items related to institutional effectiveness at ACC were 3.25 for faculty and 3.41 for staff. Both employee groups rated ‘Evaluation results used for improvement’ highly (3.81 for faculty and 3.82 for staff). The lowest-rated item for both employee groups was “Clear measurement of goal achievement” (2.78 for faculty and 3.05 for staff).

Educational Program – Levels of Agreement (Table 7 – Page 21)

Seventeen items examined respondents' overall perception of the educational program at ACC. The mean for levels of agreement is based on a ratings scale ranging from 1 to 5 where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

Both faculty and staff had similar overall means on the 17 items examining educational programs at the college. Specifically, the faculty overall mean for educational programs was 3.54 and for staff the overall mean was 3.48.

The two highest-rated items for both faculty and staff were “The College provides the community with sufficient continuing education and outreach programs” (4.01 and 3.99, respectively) and “My department maintains consistent standards in courses regardless of the method” (3.98 and 3.80, respectively).

Educational Support Services – Levels of Agreement (Table 8 – Page 23)

Eight items examined respondents' overall perception of the educational support services at ACC. The mean for levels of agreement is based on a ratings scale ranging from 1 to 5 where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

Both faculty and staff had identical overall means for the eight items examining educational support services at the college: 3.75. Faculty and staff at ACC both gave high ratings for “The library staff projects a service-oriented attitude” (4.26 and 4.01, respectively).

Administrative Process – Levels of Agreement (Table 9 – Page 25)

Seven items examined respondents' overall perception of the administrative processes at the college. The mean for levels of agreement is based on a ratings scale ranging from 1 to 5 where 1 = *strongly disagree* and 5 = *strongly agree*.

Faculty at ACC had slightly lower ratings than staff on the seven items examining administrative processes at the college (2.74 vs. 2.89, respectively). For faculty, "Safety and emergency evacuation procedures are clearly understood" was the highest-rated item at 3.28. For staff, the highest-rated item was on the item "The administration supports my department in performing its responsibilities" (3.40). The lowest-rated item for both employee groups was "My department had an adequate budget to meet its goals."

Table 1
Demographic Information of Survey Participants
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

		ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Primary Position	Teaching and Non-Teaching Faculty	281	54.7	653	59.5	175	48.1	1,109	56.2
	Administrator	52	10.1	86	7.8	46	12.6	184	9.3
	Other Staff	181	35.2	358	32.6	143	39.3	682	34.5
Area within which you work (Teaching Faculty only)	Academic	191	71.3	324	51.0	110	65.5	625	58.4
	Technical-Vocational	71	26.5	192	30.2	52	31.0	315	29.4
	Continuing Education	2	0.7	32	5.0	5	3.0	39	3.6
	Adult Literacy Program	4	1.5	87	13.7	1	0.6	92	8.6

Table 1
Demographic Information of Survey Participants
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

		ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Employment Status	Full-Time	330	64.8	668	61.2	304	84.0	1,302	66.4
	Part-Time	179	35.2	423	38.8	58	16.0	660	33.6
Years employed at this college	Less than 2 years	82	16.0	223	20.3	88	24.2	393	19.9
	2 To 8 Years	201	39.1	345	31.4	111	30.5	657	33.3
	more than 8 years	231	44.9	529	48.2	165	45.3	925	46.8

Table 1
Demographic Information of Survey Participants
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

		ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Ethnicity / Race	African-American	33	6.5	320	29.5	23	6.4	376	19.3
	American Indian or Alaskan Native	7	1.4	3	0.3	3	0.8	13	0.7
	Asian or Pacific Islander	10	2.0	70	6.5	9	2.5	89	4.6
	White	372	73.5	454	41.9	288	80.0	1,114	57.1
	Hispanic	66	13.0	188	17.3	30	8.3	284	14.6
	Other	18	3.6	49	4.5	7	1.9	74	3.8

Table 1
Demographic Information of Survey Participants
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

		ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Gender	Male	213	41.8	433	39.7	118	32.7	764	38.9
	Female	296	58.2	659	60.3	243	67.3	1,198	61.1

Table 2
Levels of Importance
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
1	Academic Advising-Course Planning	4.74	4.82	4.73	4.80	4.67	4.83	4.72	4.81
2	Admission-Registration Assistance by Staff	4.58	4.68	4.61	4.69	4.46	4.75	4.58	4.70
3	Admission Procedures	4.66	4.75	4.61	4.70	4.51	4.77	4.60	4.73
4	Telephone Registration	4.53	4.67	4.22	4.24	4.68	4.77	4.38	4.48
5	On-line Registration	4.42	4.61	4.45	4.67	4.52	4.70	4.46	4.66
6	Student Advising-Vocational Guidance-Career Planning	4.64	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.67	4.77	4.66	4.69
7	Information Provided in College Catalog	4.63	4.75	4.65	4.72	4.54	4.76	4.63	4.74
8	Information Provided by Course Schedule	4.74	4.76	4.68	4.71	4.71	4.79	4.70	4.74
9	Department Brochures for Students	3.88	4.05	4.15	4.20	3.95	4.23	4.05	4.16
10	Student Publications	3.63	3.83	3.96	4.03	3.69	4.10	3.84	3.99
11	Communication of Information by Administration	4.54	4.70	4.54	4.63	4.44	4.62	4.52	4.65
12	Published and Electronic Media Employee Communication	4.32	4.41	4.39	4.36	4.18	4.38	4.34	4.38
13	Grievance Policies and Procedures for Employees	4.50	4.53	4.45	4.59	4.33	4.55	4.44	4.57
14	Institution Publicity-Advertisement Efforts	4.08	4.23	4.33	4.41	4.33	4.47	4.27	4.37
15	Academic Probation and Suspension Policies	4.41	4.29	4.34	4.36	4.31	4.43	4.35	4.36

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=not important at all; 2=not very important;
3=neutral; 4=important; 5=very important

Table 2
Levels of Importance
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
16	Personal Security-Safety at the College	4.66	4.66	4.74	4.79	4.71	4.85	4.72	4.77
17	Racial-Ethnic Harmony at This College	4.49	4.46	4.58	4.57	4.45	4.61	4.54	4.55
18	The College Bookstore	4.32	4.31	4.42	4.46	4.29	4.56	4.38	4.44
19	Student Job Placement Services	4.05	4.02	4.43	4.43	4.24	4.46	4.30	4.33
20	Financial Aid Services	4.61	4.70	4.67	4.79	4.64	4.82	4.65	4.78
21	Child Care Services	3.74	3.80	3.95	4.22	4.06	4.37	3.92	4.14
22	Services for Persons with Disabilities	4.53	4.58	4.54	4.67	4.46	4.73	4.53	4.66
23	Cafeteria-Food Services	3.59	3.69	3.74	3.94	4.02	4.21	3.75	3.94
24	Parking Facilities and Services for Employees	4.58	4.59	4.67	4.66	4.52	4.59	4.62	4.63
25	Parking Facilities and Services for Students	4.51	4.58	4.60	4.63	4.46	4.59	4.56	4.61
26	College Support of Student Groups and Activities	3.95	4.04	4.15	4.26	4.05	4.33	4.09	4.22
27	Varsity Athletics	2.10	2.31	2.84	3.04	3.10	3.50	2.72	2.97
28	Student Access to Computers and-or Computer Labs	4.69	4.70	4.73	4.69	4.64	4.78	4.70	4.71
29	Library-Learning Resource Facilities and Services	4.74	4.74	4.70	4.71	4.64	4.83	4.70	4.75
30	Cultural Programs and Activities	3.71	3.77	4.06	4.04	3.83	4.08	3.93	3.98

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=not important at all; 2=not very important;
3=neutral; 4=important; 5=very important

Table 2
Levels of Importance
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
31	College Orientation Program for Students	4.30	4.42	4.43	4.46	4.17	4.48	4.35	4.46
32	College Orientation Program for Employees	4.15	4.32	4.30	4.46	4.05	4.33	4.22	4.39
33	In-Service Activities	3.83	3.87	4.07	4.13	3.26	4.02	3.88	4.05
34	Professional Development	4.21	4.13	4.48	4.48	4.38	4.48	4.40	4.39
35	Condition-Appearance of Buildings-Grounds	4.30	4.36	4.47	4.55	4.38	4.58	4.41	4.51
36	Janitorial Services	4.50	4.50	4.51	4.61	4.49	4.64	4.50	4.59
37	Student Discipline Policies and Procedures	4.45	4.40	4.55	4.52	4.43	4.55	4.50	4.49
38	Business Office Policies and Procedures	4.29	4.46	4.35	4.51	4.19	4.48	4.31	4.49
39	Purchasing Policies and Procedures	4.19	4.43	4.29	4.48	4.13	4.45	4.24	4.46
40	Payroll Policies and Procedures	4.57	4.68	4.59	4.64	4.49	4.62	4.57	4.65
41	Personnel Policies and Procedures	4.51	4.65	4.49	4.63	4.40	4.53	4.48	4.62
42	Budgeting Policies and Procedures	4.51	4.66	4.40	4.56	4.30	4.49	4.41	4.57
43	Information Provided on College Web Site	4.54	4.60	4.50	4.58	4.40	4.60	4.49	4.59
44	Institutional Research Office Services	3.87	3.97	4.05	4.25	3.56	4.19	3.92	4.17
45	Computer Hardware-Software Support	4.63	4.64	4.62	4.65	4.60	4.78	4.62	4.67

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=not important at all; 2=not very important;
3=neutral; 4=important; 5=very important

Table 2
Levels of Importance
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
46	Computer Network Availability and Reliability	4.66	4.72	4.65	4.69	4.65	4.82	4.66	4.73
47	Non-Computer Equipment Support	4.33	4.22	4.33	4.27	4.34	4.50	4.33	4.31
	Totals	4.31	4.38	4.40	4.47	4.31	4.53	4.36	4.46

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
 1=not important at all; 2=not very important;
 3=neutral; 4=important; 5=very important

Table 3
Levels of Quality
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
1	Academic Advising-Course Planning	3.09	3.21	3.03	3.03	3.17	3.50	3.07	3.18
2	Admission-Registration Assistance by Staff	3.49	3.26	3.14	3.29	3.76	3.68	3.35	3.37
3	Admission Procedures	3.57	3.32	3.20	3.27	3.62	3.59	3.37	3.35
4	Telephone Registration	3.72	3.64	3.15	3.02	3.83	3.83	3.47	3.43
5	On-line Registration	3.43	2.92	3.30	3.29	2.80	2.91	3.27	3.17
6	Student Advising-Vocational Guidance-Career Planning	3.18	3.14	3.00	2.96	3.05	3.40	3.05	3.11
7	Information Provided in College Catalog	3.89	3.83	3.74	3.73	3.91	3.72	3.81	3.75
8	Information Provided by Course Schedule	3.90	3.76	3.60	3.57	3.83	3.70	3.72	3.65
9	Department Brochures for Students	3.47	3.45	3.37	3.03	3.51	3.63	3.42	3.27
10	Student Publications	3.32	3.24	3.18	3.01	3.30	3.34	3.24	3.13
11	Communication of Information by Administration	2.66	2.49	3.02	2.82	3.09	3.14	2.94	2.80
12	Published and Electronic Media Employee Communication	3.25	3.08	3.26	3.11	3.45	3.25	3.29	3.13
13	Grievance Policies and Procedures for Employees	2.89	2.93	3.01	2.80	3.31	3.24	3.04	2.92
14	Institution Publicity-Advertisement Efforts	3.44	3.55	3.01	2.99	3.20	3.30	3.16	3.21
15	Academic Probation and Suspension Policies	3.45	3.38	3.29	3.18	3.59	3.59	3.39	3.32

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=needs improvement; 2=fair; 3=average;
4=good; 5=excellent

Table 3
Levels of Quality
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
16	Personal Security-Safety at the College	3.65	3.55	3.61	3.32	3.79	3.73	3.65	3.47
17	Racial-Ethnic Harmony at This College	3.98	4.01	3.77	3.43	3.82	3.77	3.84	3.65
18	The College Bookstore	2.76	3.00	2.89	3.07	3.58	3.82	2.98	3.22
19	Student Job Placement Services	2.92	2.65	2.95	3.05	3.71	3.85	3.12	3.17
20	Financial Aid Services	3.47	3.71	3.10	3.08	3.37	3.21	3.24	3.26
21	Child Care Services	2.73	2.97	2.51	2.68	3.89	4.03	2.89	3.08
22	Services for Persons with Disabilities	3.82	3.81	3.50	3.41	3.60	3.59	3.60	3.56
23	Cafeteria-Food Services	2.68	2.34	2.29	2.54	2.91	2.81	2.54	2.56
24	Parking Facilities and Services for Employees	2.15	2.00	3.10	3.06	3.23	2.93	2.88	2.75
25	Parking Facilities and Services for Students	2.01	1.89	2.96	2.93	2.81	2.78	2.68	2.62
26	College Support of Student Groups and Activities	3.30	3.29	3.10	3.04	3.71	3.67	3.28	3.25
27	Varsity Athletics	2.58	2.62	2.66	2.45	3.78	4.00	3.08	3.11
28	Student Access to Computers and-or Computer Labs	3.85	4.08	3.66	3.67	3.90	4.10	3.75	3.87
29	Library-Learning Resource Facilities and Services	3.96	4.12	3.56	3.60	3.98	4.14	3.74	3.85
30	Cultural Programs and Activities	3.47	3.49	3.37	3.25	3.48	3.66	3.41	3.40

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=needs improvement; 2=fair; 3=average;
4=good; 5=excellent

Table 3
Levels of Quality
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
31	College Orientation Program for Students	3.27	3.25	3.07	3.05	3.24	3.54	3.15	3.20
32	College Orientation Program for Employees	2.98	3.09	3.31	3.35	3.26	3.41	3.22	3.29
33	In-Service Activities	3.11	3.01	3.20	3.01	2.45	3.28	3.04	3.07
34	Professional Development	3.28	3.10	3.16	3.12	3.12	3.37	3.19	3.16
35	Condition-Appearance of Buildings-Grounds	3.21	3.44	3.31	3.17	3.40	3.62	3.30	3.34
36	Janitorial Services	3.38	3.26	3.51	3.15	3.65	3.63	3.50	3.28
37	Student Discipline Policies and Procedures	3.51	3.44	3.40	3.19	3.61	3.55	3.47	3.33
38	Business Office Policies and Procedures	3.03	2.96	3.10	3.05	3.68	3.45	3.19	3.11
39	Purchasing Policies and Procedures	3.05	3.06	2.77	2.99	2.81	2.91	2.85	2.99
40	Payroll Policies and Procedures	2.93	2.62	3.34	3.38	3.20	3.18	3.21	3.13
41	Personnel Policies and Procedures	2.81	2.66	3.16	2.90	3.41	3.30	3.11	2.92
42	Budgeting Policies and Procedures	2.30	2.34	2.74	2.85	2.96	3.17	2.65	2.77
43	Information Provided on College Web Site	3.76	3.60	3.59	3.37	3.34	2.90	3.60	3.33
44	Institutional Research Office Services	3.39	3.50	3.26	3.32	3.55	3.74	3.35	3.46
45	Computer Hardware-Software Support	3.38	3.50	3.32	3.28	3.65	3.65	3.40	3.42

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=needs improvement; 2=fair; 3=average;
4=good; 5=excellent

Table 3
Levels of Quality
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
46	Computer Network Availability and Reliability	3.47	3.66	3.20	3.23	3.59	3.44	3.35	3.39
47	Non-Computer Equipment Support	3.19	3.14	3.08	3.00	3.44	3.40	3.18	3.13
	Totals	3.24	3.20	3.19	3.13	3.43	3.48	3.26	3.23

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
 1=needs improvement; 2=fair; 3=average;
 4=good; 5=excellent

Table 4
Gap Analysis: Levels of Quality minus Levels of Importance
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Response	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
1	Academic Advising-Course Planning	-1.65	-1.62	-1.69	-1.77	-1.50	-1.33	-1.65	-1.63
2	Admission-Registration Assistance by Staff	-1.09	-1.42	-1.47	-1.40	-0.71	-1.07	-1.23	-1.33
3	Admission Procedures	-1.09	-1.44	-1.40	-1.44	-0.89	-1.18	-1.23	-1.38
4	Telephone Registration	-0.81	-1.03	-1.06	-1.21	-0.85	-0.94	-0.90	-1.05
5	On-line Registration	-0.99	-1.69	-1.16	-1.37	-1.72	-1.80	-1.19	-1.49
6	Student Advising-Vocational Guidance-Career Planning	-1.47	-1.46	-1.67	-1.74	-1.62	-1.37	-1.61	-1.59
7	Information Provided in College Catalog	-0.74	-0.91	-0.90	-0.99	-0.62	-1.04	-0.81	-0.98
8	Information Provided by Course Schedule	-0.84	-1.00	-1.08	-1.14	-0.88	-1.10	-0.98	-1.10
9	Department Brochures for Students	-0.40	-0.60	-0.78	-1.16	-0.44	-0.60	-0.63	-0.90
10	Student Publications	-0.31	-0.59	-0.78	-1.02	-0.39	-0.76	-0.60	-0.86
11	Communication of Information by Administration	-1.87	-2.21	-1.52	-1.81	-1.35	-1.48	-1.59	-1.84
12	Published and Electronic Media Employee Communication	-1.07	-1.33	-1.13	-1.25	-0.73	-1.13	-1.04	-1.24
13	Grievance Policies and Procedures for Employees	-1.60	-1.61	-1.43	-1.80	-1.01	-1.31	-1.40	-1.65
14	Institution Publicity-Advertisement Efforts	-0.63	-0.68	-1.33	-1.42	-1.13	-1.18	-1.11	-1.17
15	Academic Probation and Suspension Policies	-0.97	-0.91	-1.05	-1.18	-0.72	-0.84	-0.96	-1.04

Quality mean is based on a ratings scale where:

1=needs improvement....5=excellent;

Importance mean is: 1=not imp. at all....5=very imp.

Table 4
Gap Analysis: Levels of Quality minus Levels of Importance
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Response	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
16	Personal Security-Safety at the College	-1.01	-1.11	-1.13	-1.47	-0.93	-1.12	-1.07	-1.30
17	Racial-Ethnic Harmony at This College	-0.51	-0.45	-0.81	-1.14	-0.63	-0.84	-0.70	-0.90
18	The College Bookstore	-1.57	-1.31	-1.53	-1.39	-0.71	-0.74	-1.40	-1.22
19	Student Job Placement Services	-1.12	-1.37	-1.47	-1.38	-0.53	-0.61	-1.18	-1.16
20	Financial Aid Services	-1.14	-1.00	-1.57	-1.71	-1.27	-1.61	-1.41	-1.52
21	Child Care Services	-1.00	-0.83	-1.44	-1.54	-0.17	-0.35	-1.03	-1.06
22	Services for Persons with Disabilities	-0.71	-0.77	-1.04	-1.25	-0.86	-1.14	-0.92	-1.10
23	Cafeteria-Food Services	-0.91	-1.35	-1.45	-1.40	-1.12	-1.40	-1.21	-1.38
24	Parking Facilities and Services for Employees	-2.43	-2.59	-1.56	-1.60	-1.29	-1.66	-1.74	-1.88
25	Parking Facilities and Services for Students	-2.50	-2.69	-1.64	-1.70	-1.66	-1.80	-1.88	-1.99
26	College Support of Student Groups and Activities	-0.65	-0.75	-1.05	-1.22	-0.34	-0.66	-0.81	-0.97
27	Varsity Athletics	0.47	0.31	-0.18	-0.59	0.68	0.50	0.36	0.13
28	Student Access to Computers and-or Computer Labs	-0.84	-0.61	-1.07	-1.02	-0.74	-0.68	-0.95	-0.84
29	Library-Learning Resource Facilities and Services	-0.78	-0.62	-1.15	-1.11	-0.66	-0.69	-0.97	-0.89
30	Cultural Programs and Activities	-0.24	-0.28	-0.69	-0.79	-0.35	-0.42	-0.52	-0.58

Quality mean is based on a ratings scale where:

1=needs improvement....5=excellent;

Importance mean is: 1=not imp. at all....5=very imp.

Table 4
Gap Analysis: Levels of Quality minus Levels of Importance
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Response	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
31	College Orientation Program for Students	-1.03	-1.17	-1.36	-1.42	-0.93	-0.94	-1.21	-1.25
32	College Orientation Program for Employees	-1.17	-1.23	-0.98	-1.11	-0.79	-0.93	-1.00	-1.10
33	In-Service Activities	-0.72	-0.86	-0.87	-1.12	-0.81	-0.74	-0.84	-0.97
34	Professional Development	-0.93	-1.03	-1.32	-1.37	-1.26	-1.12	-1.21	-1.23
35	Condition-Appearance of Buildings-Grounds	-1.09	-0.92	-1.16	-1.37	-0.98	-0.96	-1.11	-1.16
36	Janitorial Services	-1.12	-1.24	-1.00	-1.46	-0.85	-1.01	-1.00	-1.30
37	Student Discipline Policies and Procedures	-0.94	-0.96	-1.15	-1.32	-0.82	-0.99	-1.03	-1.17
38	Business Office Policies and Procedures	-1.26	-1.50	-1.25	-1.46	-0.51	-1.03	-1.12	-1.38
39	Purchasing Policies and Procedures	-1.14	-1.37	-1.52	-1.49	-1.31	-1.54	-1.38	-1.47
40	Payroll Policies and Procedures	-1.64	-2.06	-1.24	-1.26	-1.30	-1.45	-1.36	-1.52
41	Personnel Policies and Procedures	-1.70	-2.00	-1.33	-1.73	-0.98	-1.23	-1.37	-1.70
42	Budgeting Policies and Procedures	-2.21	-2.32	-1.66	-1.71	-1.34	-1.31	-1.76	-1.80
43	Information Provided on College Web Site	-0.78	-1.00	-0.91	-1.20	-1.07	-1.70	-0.90	-1.26
44	Institutional Research Office Services	-0.48	-0.47	-0.79	-0.94	-0.02	-0.46	-0.57	-0.71
45	Computer Hardware-Software Support	-1.26	-1.14	-1.30	-1.36	-0.96	-1.13	-1.23	-1.25

Quality mean is based on a ratings scale where:

1=needs improvement....5=excellent;

Importance mean is: 1=not imp. at all....5=very imp.

Table 4
Gap Analysis: Levels of Quality minus Levels of Importance
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Response	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
46	Computer Network Availability and Reliability	-1.19	-1.06	-1.45	-1.46	-1.06	-1.39	-1.31	-1.33
47	Non-Computer Equipment Support	-1.14	-1.08	-1.25	-1.28	-0.90	-1.10	-1.15	-1.18
	Totals	-1.07	-1.18	-1.21	-1.34	-0.88	-1.05	-1.10	-1.23

Quality mean is based on a ratings scale where:
1=needs improvement....5=excellent;
Importance mean is: 1=not imp. at all....5=very imp.

Table 5
Institutional Purpose: Levels of Agreement
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
1	Mission Statement Clearly Defined	3.88	3.91	4.19	4.06	4.25	4.20	4.12	4.05
2	Mission Statement Jointly Developed	3.26	3.55	3.75	3.74	3.93	3.98	3.65	3.74
	Totals	3.57	3.73	3.97	3.90	4.09	4.09	3.89	3.89

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral;
4=agree; 5=strongly agree

This page left intentionally blank.

Table 6
Institutional Effectiveness: Levels of Agreement
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
1	Goal-Setting Process Well-Defined	2.91	3.16	3.68	3.57	3.94	3.93	3.53	3.53
2	Clear Measurement of Goal Achievement	2.78	3.05	3.49	3.42	3.78	3.73	3.36	3.38
3	Student Success is Evaluated	3.51	3.42	3.67	3.50	3.77	3.84	3.65	3.55
4	Evaluation Results Used for Improvement	3.81	3.82	3.87	3.57	3.90	4.00	3.86	3.72
5	Reports of Office of IR Are Useful for measuring progress of department goals	3.17	3.36	3.49	3.54	3.21	3.61	3.36	3.50
6	My department obtains information from IR upon Request	3.33	3.64	3.52	3.59	3.50	3.74	3.47	3.63
	Totals	3.25	3.41	3.62	3.53	3.69	3.81	3.54	3.55

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral;
4=agree; 5=strongly agree

This page left intentionally blank.

Table 7
Educational Program: Levels of Agreement
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
1	My Dept. Maintains Consistent Standards in Courses for All Methods and Locations	3.98	3.80	4.09	3.80	4.11	4.12	4.07	3.86
2	Distance Learning courses in my department meet the same standards as Courses Taught on Campus	3.81	3.94	3.72	3.65	3.75	3.84	3.75	3.77
3	Faculty have a Well-Defined Role in Curriculum Development	3.31	3.37	3.73	3.64	3.91	3.97	3.65	3.63
4	The College conducts an Effective program of Academic Advising	3.17	3.23	3.39	3.34	3.31	3.59	3.32	3.36
5	Items in Institutional Publications are Accurate and Consistent	3.78	3.72	3.87	3.81	3.87	3.54	3.85	3.73
6	Continuing Education and Outreach and Service Programs Are Supported	4.01	3.99	3.94	3.72	4.15	4.05	3.99	3.87
7	My department has an established process for Hiring Full-Time Faculty	3.56	3.50	3.79	3.50	3.71	3.78	3.72	3.56

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral;
4=agree; 5=strongly agree

Table 7
Educational Program: Levels of Agreement
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
8	PT Faculty Oriented, Supervised and Evaluated	3.31	3.10	3.72	3.40	3.62	3.63	3.60	3.37
9	Student have Adequate Access to PT Faculty	3.82	3.19	3.71	3.27	3.13	3.42	3.65	3.28
10	Faculty Has Academic Freedom	3.91	3.74	4.06	3.60	3.96	3.89	4.01	3.69
11	Adequate Support for Professional Development Opportunities	3.66	3.61	3.61	3.56	3.51	3.76	3.60	3.62
12	Faculty Granted Sufficient Authority to Ensure Quality of Courses	3.84	3.75	4.03	3.73	3.94	4.08	3.96	3.80
13	Faculty Granted Sufficient Resources to Ensure Quality of Courses	3.51	3.55	3.69	3.54	3.50	3.69	3.62	3.57
14	Department Has Enough Faculty to Support Its Purpose	3.19	3.12	3.50	3.38	3.31	3.19	3.39	3.28
15	Adequate Ratio of Full-time to Part-time Faculty to achieve Institutional Obligations	2.74	2.85	3.23	3.26	3.28	3.27	3.12	3.17
16	Evaluative Criteria Are Consistent with Goals	3.39	3.45	3.84	3.56	3.71	3.77	3.70	3.57
17	Evaluative Process Contributes to Better Teaching	3.15	3.33	3.67	3.54	3.21	3.62	3.46	3.50
	Totals	3.54	3.48	3.74	3.55	3.65	3.72	3.67	3.57

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral;
4=agree; 5=strongly agree

Table 8
Educational Support Services: Levels of Agreement
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
1	The colleges library collection adequately meets the needs of students	3.61	3.71	3.40	3.38	3.58	3.62	3.48	3.52
2	The library's hours of operation meet the needs of students	3.62	3.52	3.69	3.65	3.60	3.90	3.66	3.67
3	The library staff projects a service-oriented attitude	4.26	4.01	3.99	3.78	4.02	3.97	4.07	3.88
4	Training on computer application software is readily available	3.61	3.53	3.71	3.61	3.82	3.90	3.70	3.66
5	Technical support is provided as needed for the computers used by faculty	3.62	3.66	3.68	3.79	3.96	4.07	3.71	3.82
6	Technical support is provided as needed for the computers used by students	3.87	3.80	3.68	3.79	3.73	3.98	3.73	3.83
7	My department has adequate access to computers and software	3.63	3.98	3.75	3.79	3.87	4.16	3.74	3.93
8	The use of Information Technology is incorporated into the departments curriculum	3.78	3.78	3.91	3.65	3.90	3.94	3.88	3.75
	Totals	3.75	3.75	3.73	3.68	3.81	3.94	3.75	3.76

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral;
4=agree; 5=strongly agree

This page left intentionally blank.

Table 9
Administrative Processes: Levels of Agreement
Texas Gulf Coast Consortium
Faculty/Staff Perceptions: 2002

Item #	Item	ACC		HCCS		SJCD		All Colleges	
		Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff	Faculty	Staff
1	The administration supports my department in performing its responsibilities	2.94	3.40	3.51	3.56	3.51	3.78	3.36	3.56
2	The institutional budget is developed with input from my department	2.92	3.07	3.03	3.20	3.55	3.80	3.10	3.29
3	My department has an adequate budget to meet its goals	2.30	2.36	2.63	2.95	2.87	3.15	2.57	2.82
4	Budget control at my college allows for revisions to the budget	2.77	2.76	3.02	3.18	3.08	3.58	2.96	3.14
5	The college has a well-organized system of purchasing and inventory control	2.59	2.81	2.88	3.15	2.90	3.10	2.81	3.04
6	The space provided to my department is adequate to meet its goals	2.34	2.69	2.77	2.97	2.81	2.75	2.66	2.84
7	Safety and emergency evacuation procedures are clearly understood	3.28	3.12	3.61	3.55	3.59	3.68	3.52	3.46
	Totals	2.74	2.89	3.07	3.22	3.19	3.40	3.00	3.16

Mean based on a ratings scale where:
1=strongly disagree; 2=disagree; 3=neutral;
4=agree; 5=strongly agree