

Results of 2016 UUP Survey:

Seventh Quality of Professional Life and Administrative Assessment



Survey Committee:

Director: Dr. Jen-Ting Wang

Dr. William Simons, Chapter President

Dr. Robert W. Compton, Vice President for Academics

Copies of the report are placed in the library at the circulation desk and at the UUP Office for viewing. A copy was also given to management

Results of 2016 UUP Survey: Seventh Quality of Professional Life and Administrative Assessment

Introduction

Periodically, UUP Oneonta has conducted the **Quality of Life and Administrative Assessment Survey**. During the spring and summer of 2016, UUP officers met to discuss renewal of the survey process.

The Quality of Life and Administrative Survey Committee consisted of Robert Compton (Vice President for Academics); Bill Simons (President); and Jen-Ting Wang (Survey Director), developed the initial draft and fine tuned the instrument with an eye toward continuity of the instrument allowing comparisons to past surveys. At the same time, several changes for clarification and to assess new information were implemented. The survey was disseminated for completion electronically during the Fall 2016 semester. Those represented by UUP who were on the payroll during the Fall 2016 semester and at the end of the Spring 2016 semester received an invitation to participate in the survey.

Respondents completed the survey through a link that was provided. The union membership was informed that UUP guaranteed the anonymity and confidentiality of survey respondents. UUP announced prior to the dissemination of the survey that the union reserved the right to exclude portions of free responses that make reference to a the race, ethnicity, gender, appearance, orientation, or any other ad hominem attribute of individuals evaluated. Survey responses were recorded by an independent survey company.

The UUP Oneonta Executive Board met on July 6, 2016, and discussed the instrument and the administrators to include in the survey. The decision to conduct the survey was approved unanimously. Below is the list of those then incumbent administrators included in the survey and their positions at the time:

Table 1. Administrators Selected for Evaluation

Name	Position
Nancy Kleniewski	President
James Mackin	Provost and Vice President
Paul Adamo	Vice President for College Advancement
Todd Foreman	Vice President for Finance and Administration
Franklin Chambers	Vice President for Student Development
Eileen Morgan-Zayachek	Associate Provost for Academic Programs
Jan Bowers	Dean, School of Education and Human Ecology
Venkat Sharma	Dean, School of Natural and Mathematical Sciences
Susan Turell	Dean, School of Social Science

Thanks to UUP members for their participation in the union's **Seventh Quality of Professional Life & Administrative Assessment** survey. UUP member participation allows the union to better understand member priorities; more effectively construct an agenda, and strengthen representation.

Survey Director Dr. Jen-Ting Wang supervised survey design and dissemination. After completing tabulation and analysis of survey responses, Dr. Wang prepared a detailed report of the results. Dr. Wang merits UUP's appreciation for her commitment of time and expertise to the survey project.

Significant and substantive, the results will play an important role in shaping the Labor-Management dialogue.

At the UUP Chapter meeting on Thursday, January 26, 2017, Dr. Wang presented the statistical results to the union membership. Dr. Rob Compton, Vice President of Academics, provided commentary concerning the free response portion of the survey.

The statistical results were subsequently disseminated to the UUP membership in the January 2017 edition of *The Sentinel*.

Those represented by the UUP bargaining unit may view bound copies of the statistical and free response survey results in the UUP office (IRC 105) and in Milne Library. In addition, UUP provided Management with a bound copy of the statistical and free response survey results.

Statistical Summary Results of 2016 UUP Survey: Quality of Professional Life and Administrative Assessment:

During the Fall 2016 semester, UUP sent invitation emails to 706 current UUP employees who were also on the payroll at the end of the Spring 2016 semester. There were 253 respondents to the survey. Twenty of the respondents did not identify whether they were Academics or Professionals. Hence, "at least" precedes bulleted responses below specific to Professionals and Academics.

The response rates were:

- at least 32.0% for all Academics, with at least 46.2% for Full-Time Academics and at least 12.8% for Part-Time Academics
- at least 35.0% for all Professionals, with at least 36.4% for Full-Time Professionals and at least 24.1% part-time Professionals
- at least 14.2% overall response rate for eligible Part-Time UUP employees
- at least 41.8% overall response rate for eligible Full-Time UUP employees
- 35.8%. overall response rate with a total of 253 responses out of 706

Table 1. Response Rates

		Response count	N	Rate
Academic	Full-time	122	264	46.20%
	Part-time	25	196	12.80%
	Total	147	460	32.00%
Professional	Full-time	79	217	36.4%
	Part-time	7	29	24.1%
	Total	86	246	35.00%
All	Unidentified	20		
	Full-time	201	481	41.80%
	Part-time	32	225	14.20%
Overall		253	706	35.80%

Table 2. Survey responses by demographics (n=253)

			Count	Rate	Total %	Overall (%)
Academic	Full-time	Permanent	95	37.5%	20.7%	147 (58.1%)
		Non-Permanent	27	10.7%		
	Part-time	Non-Permanent	25	9.9%	9.9%	
Professional	Full-Time	Permanent	52	20.6%	31.3%	86 (34.0%)
		Non-Permanent	27	10.7%		
	Part-time	Non-Permanent	7	2.8%	2.8%	
Total	Full-Time	Permanent	147	58.1%	79.4%	
		Non-Permanent	54	21.3%		
	Full-time	Academic	122	48.2%	79.4%	
		Professional	79	31.2%		
Part-time	Non-Permanent	32	12.6%	12.6%		
Unidentified			20	7.9%		20 (7.9%)

Furthermore, among the respondents, at least 58.1% had permanent appointment or tenure, and 34.0% did not. There were 20 (7.9%) respondents who did not identify their demographic information.

(1) Quality of Professional Life

For the 19 seven-point Likert-scaled items (1= Strongly Disagree, 7= Strongly Agree) in the section of Quality of Professional Life, Cronbach's alpha was 0.95 indicating a very strong reliability.

Table 3. Year 2012, 2014 and 2016 Comparison on Professional Life Statistics

(*New question or questions with slightly changed wording from prior survey)

Item	2016 n		2012 Mean (Median)	2014 Mean (Median)	2016 Mean (Median)	2016 S.D.
	Valid	DK				
[1. the College provides a satisfactory physical environment for my work.]	252	1	5.24 (6)	5.29 (5)	5.39 (6)	1.62
[2. our academics/professionals possess positive morale.]	245	8	4.73 (5)	4.01 (5)	4.15 (5)	1.81
[3. the College provides adequate technology support.]	253	0	5.70 (6)	5.46 (6)	5.43 (6)	1.50
[4. the College provides adequate funding for my professional work.]	235	18	4.06 (4)	3.89 (4)	4.26 (5)	1.89
*[5. the College utilizes part-time employees appropriately.]	170	82			3.51 (3)	1.81
[6. the Discretionary Salary Award (DSA) results are fair.]	203	49	3.70 (4)	3.22 (3)	3.32 (3)	2.08
[7. my salary is equitable.]	247	5	3.49 (3)	2.97 (2)	3.35 (3)	1.97
[8. the College provides reasonable job security.]	246	5	4.87(5)	4.92 (5)	5.01 (6)	1.88
*[9. the content and results of assessment and accreditation activities are meaningful.]	208	43	3.74 (4)	3.64 (4)	3.51 (3.5)	1.89
*[10. the content/scope of my work has been extended or expanded without compensation.]	240	11	4.66 (5)	4.66 (5)	4.77 (5)	2.15
[11. my department or area receives adequate support from the administration.]	224	27	4.35 (5)	3.94 (4)	3.97(4)	1.94
[12. the College effectively uses my expertise and potential.]	248	3	4.58 (5)	4.04 (4)	4.23 (5)	1.90
[13. the College uses external consultants effectively.]	154	97	3.42 (3)	2.71 (2)	2.80 (2)	1.82
[14. the administration's decision-making process is transparent and consultative.]	220	30	3.99 (4)	3.30 (3)	3.27 (3)	1.84
*[15. the administration values recommendations from the governance structure.]	162	88			3.56 (3)	1.86
*[16. the administration succeeds in realizing diversity in recruitment of academics or professionals.]	202	48	4.77 (5)	4.58 (5)	4.11 (4)	1.91
*[17. the administration actively supports retention of academics/professionals.]	212	38	4.77 (5)	4.58 (5)	3.72 (4)	1.86

*[18. the administration appropriately and effectively resolves interpersonal disputes.]	136	114	3.76 (4)	3.26 (3)	3.23 (3)	1.85
[19. overall, working at the College is satisfying.]	250	0	5.12 (5)	4.61 (5)	4.88 (5)	1.58

Table 4. Year 2012, 2014 and 2016 Comparison on Professional Life Statistics by Type of Position

(*New question or questions with slightly changed wording from prior survey)

Item	Position	2012 Mean	2014 Mean	2016 Mean	2016 Median	2016 n
[1. the College provides a satisfactory physical environment for my work.]	Academic	5.07	5.17	5.27	6	146
	Professional	5.52	5.43	5.58	6	86
[2. our academics/professionals possess positive morale.]	Academic	4.66	3.80	4.01	4	144
	Professional	4.90	4.40	4.36	5	81
[3. the College provides adequate technology support.]	Academic	5.43	5.44	5.92	6	147
	Professional	6.11	5.51	5.69	6	86
[4. the College provides adequate funding for my professional work.]	Academic	3.54	3.52	3.71	4	136
	Professional	4.94	4.60	5.05	6	81
*[5. the College utilizes part-time employees appropriately.]	Academic			3.30	4	122
	Professional			4.03	5	39
[6. the Discretionary Salary Award (DSA) results are fair.]	Academic	3.48	3.04	2.02	3	117
	Professional	3.99	3.45	2.20	3	71
[7. my salary is equitable.]	Academic	2.97	2.59	2.97	3	145
	Professional	4.37	3.56	4.02	4	83
[8. the College provides reasonable job security.]	Academic	4.56	4.76	4.69	5	143
	Professional	5.29	5.27	5.64	6	86
*[9. the content and results of assessment and accreditation activities are meaningful.]	Academic	3.42	3.33	3.25	3	125
	Professional	4.32	4.32	3.98	4	68
*[10. the content/scope of my work has been extended or expanded without compensation.]	Academic	4.52	4.40	5.05	6	139
	Professional	4.93	5.01	4.42	4	84
[11. my department or area receives adequate support from the administration.]	Academic	3.92	3.49	3.40	3	129
	Professional	5.08	4.64	4.77	5	78
[12. the College effectively uses my expertise and potential.]	Academic	4.33	3.77	3.99	4	146
	Professional	5.04	4.47	4.62	5	85
[13. the College uses external consultants effectively.]	Academic	3.01	2.17	2.35	2	99
	Professional	4.10	3.92	3.54	4	48
[14. the administration's decision-making process is transparent and consultative.]	Academic	3.68	2.96	2.89	3	130
	Professional	4.53	3.93	3.72	4	74
*[15. the administration values recommendations from the governance structure.]	Academic			3.19	3	107
	Professional			4.22	5	45
*[16. the administration succeeds in realizing diversity in recruitment of academics or professionals.]	Academic	4.53	4.40	3.79	4	121
	Professional	5.11	4.88	4.61	5	67

*[17. the administration actively supports retention of academics/professionals.]	Academic	3.65	2.99	3.37	3	129
	Professional	3.96	3.47	4.30	5	70
*[18. the administration appropriately and effectively resolves interpersonal disputes.]	Academic	3.65	2.99	3.02	3	82
	Professional	3.96	3.47	3.58	4	45
19. overall, working at the College is satisfying.]	Academic	4.85	4.30	4.54	5	147
	Professional	5.54	5.12	5.43	6	86

Table 5. Year 2012, 2014 and 2016 Comparison on Professional Life Statistics by

Employment Status (*Questions with slightly changed wording from prior survey)

Item	Employment Status	2012 Mean	2014 Mean	2016 Mean	2016 Median	2016 n
[1. the College provides a satisfactory physical environment for my work.]	Full-time	4.67	5.30	5.38	6	200
	Part-time	5.09	5.11	5.41	6	32
[2. our academics/professionals possess positive morale.]	Full-time	4.67	3.92	4.00	4	196
	Part-time	5.09	4.61	5.10	5	29
[3. the College provides adequate technology support.]	Full-time	5.22	5.39	5.33	6	201
	Part-time	5.29	5.87	5.66	6	32
[4. the College provides adequate funding for my professional work.]	Full-time	5.66	4.05	4.33	3	193
	Part-time	5.82	3.20	3.25	5	24
*[5. the College utilizes part-time employees appropriately.]	Full-time			3.48	3	134
	Part-time			3.48	3	27
[6. the Discretionary Salary Award (DSA) results are fair.]	Full-time	4.60	3.11	3.28	3	173
	Part-time	4.41	3.96	4.07	4	15
[7. my salary is equitable.]	Full-time	3.64	2.98	3.41	3	197
	Part-time	4.41	3.96	4.07	4	15
[8. the College provides reasonable job security.]	Full-time	3.63	5.26	5.28	6	200
	Part-time	2.74	3.17	3.45	3	29
*[9. the content and results of assessment and accreditation activities are meaningful.]	Full-time	3.60	3.60	3.45	3	174
	Part-time	4.13	3.90	4.00	4	19
*[10. the content/scope of my work has been extended or expanded without compensation.]	Full-time	4.58	4.63	4.88	6	195
	Part-time	5.09	4.74	4.32	4.5	28
[11. my department or area receives adequate support from the administration.]	Full-time	4.34	3.98	3.91	4	188
	Part-time	4.33	3.73	3.95	4	19
[12. the College effectively uses my expertise and potential.]	Full-time	4.62	4.05	4.24	5	200
	Part-time	4.33	3.98	4.07	4	31
[13. the College uses external consultants effectively.]	Full-time	3.31	2.81	2.71	2	136
	Part-time	3.67	2.08	3.09	2	11
[14. the administration's decision-making process is transparent and consultative.]	Full-time	4.15	3.84	3.17	3	185
	Part-time	4.33	3.60	3.32	3	19
*[15. the administration values recommendations from the governance structure.]	Full-time			3.43	3	143
	Part-time			4.44	5	9
*[16. the administration succeeds in realizing diversity in recruitment of academics or professionals.]	Full-time	3.91	3.39	4.06	4	173
	Part-time	4.20	2.52	4.33	5	15
*[17. the administration actively supports retention of academics/professionals.]	Full-time	4.70	4.58	3.68	4	180
	Part-time	4.89	4.53	3.84	5	199
*[18. the administration appropriately and effectively resolves interpersonal disputes.]	Full-time	3.67	3.20	3.14	3	118
	Part-time	4.35	3.46	4.22	5	9
[19. overall, working at the College is satisfying.]	Full-time	5.08	4.60	4.86	5	201

(2) College Direction

Table 6. Statistics on College Direction by Demographics

Position	Appointment	Status	N	Mean	Median	S.D.	
Academic	Non-Permanent	Full-time	24	3.42	3	1.792	
		Part-time	20	3.90	5	1.971	
		Total	44	3.64	4	1.869	
	Permanent	Full-time	94	3.46	3	1.695	
		Total	94	3.46	3	1.695	
	Total	Full-time	118	3.45	3	1.708	
		Part-time	20	3.90	5	1.971	
		Total	138	3.51	3	1.748	
	Professional	Non-Permanent	Full-time	24	4.96	5	1.654
Part-time			7	4.71	5	1.704	
Total			31	4.90	5	1.640	
Permanent		Full-time	47	4.49	5	1.864	
		Total	47	4.49	5	1.864	
Total		Full-time	71	4.65	5	1.798	
		Part-time	7	4.71	5	1.704	
		Total	78	4.65	5	1.779	
Total		Unidentified		2	3.50	3.50	3.536
	Non-Permanent		Full-time	48	4.19	5	1.875
			Part-time	27	4.11	5	1.908
		Total	75	4.16	5	1.875	
	Permanent	Full-time	141	3.80	4	1.814	
		Total	141	3.80	4	1.814	
	Total	Full-time	189	3.90	4	1.832	
		Part-time	27	4.11	5	1.908	
		Total	218	3.92	4	1.846	

Table 7. Year 2014 and 2016 Comparison on College Direction by Demographics

The College is moving in the right direction.

Position	Appointment	2014 Mean	2016 Mean	2016 Median	2016 n
Academic	Non-Permanent	3.98	3.64	4	44

	Permanent	3.30	3.46	3	94
	Full-time	3.46	3.45	3	118
	Part-time	3.78	3.90	5	20
	Total	3.51	3.51	3	138
Professional	Non-Permanent	4.28	4.90	5	31
	Permanent	4.59	4.49	5	47
	Full-time	4.52	4.65	5	71
	Part-time	3.78	4.71	5	7
	Total	4.45	4.65	5	78
Total	Non-Permanent	4.12	4.16	5	75
	Permanent	3.75	3.80	4	141
	Full-time	3.90	3.90	4	189
	Part-time	3.78	4.11	5	27
	Overall Total	3.88	3.92	4	218

(3) Administrative Assessment

There were seven questions in the evaluation of the nine remaining administrators: President (Dr. Nancy Kleniewski), Provost and VP for Academic Affairs (Dr. James Mackin), VP for College Advancement (Mr. Paul Adamo), VP for Finance and Administration (Mr. Todd Foreman), VP for Student Development (Dr. Franklin Chambers), Associate Provost for Academic Programs (Dr. Eileen Morgan-Zayachek), Dean of Education and Human Ecology (Dr. Jan Bowers), Dean of Natural and Mathematical Sciences (Dr. Venkat Sharma), Dean of Social Science (Dr. Susan Turell).

The questions were:

1. This administrator properly allocates spaces, supplies, equipment, and budgetary resources.
2. This administrator supports my work needs.
3. This administrator effectively promotes professional growth.
4. This administrator recognizes the strengths and weaknesses within her/his areas of responsibility.
5. This administrator selects and manages personnel effectively.
6. This administrator articulates a compelling vision.
7. This administrator effectively fulfills the responsibilities of her/his position.

Table 8. Year 2012, 2014 and 2016 Statistics for Performance of Administrators

The responses had min=1 and max=7 for all questions.

Q1. This administrator properly allocates spaces, supplies, equipment, and budgetary resources.	2016 n	2012 Mean	2014 Mean	2016 Mean	2016 Median
President Nancy Kleniewski	83	4.37	3.88	3.71	4
Provost James Mackin	68			3.81	4
VP Paul Adamo	29	4.86	4.45	4.45	4

VP Todd Foreman	53	5.24	4.77	4.49	5
VP Franklin Chambers	16			3.25	3
Associate Provost Eileen Morgan-Zayachek	24			4.38	5
Dean Jan Bowers	24			3.96	4
Dean Venkat Sharma	34		4.03	3.29	3
Dean Susan Turell	38		3.71	3.63	3.5

Q2. This administrator supports my work needs.	2016 n	2012 Mean	2014 Mean	2016 Mean	2016 Median
President Nancy Kleniewski	96	4.75	3.87	4.06	4
Provost James Mackin	77			3.91	4
VP Paul Adamo	23	4.83	4.41	4.65	5
VP Todd Foreman	46	5.04	4.96	4.48	5
VP Franklin Chambers	18			3.44	4
Associate Provost Eileen Morgan-Zayachek	41			4.51	5
Dean Jan Bowers	26			3.77	3.5
Dean Venkat Sharma	32		4.26	3.44	3
Dean Susan Turell	43		4.27	4.07	5

Q3. This administrator effectively promotes professional growth.	2016 n	2012 Mean	2014 Mean	2016 Mean	2016 Median
President Nancy Kleniewski	88	4.58	3.98	3.77	4
Provost James Mackin	72			3.90	4
VP Paul Adamo	21	4.68	4.42	4.38	4
VP Todd Foreman	39	4.89	4.81	3.92	4
VP Franklin Chambers	17	4.68	4.42	3.82	4
Associate Provost Eileen Morgan-Zayachek	35			4.29	4
Dean Jan Bowers	23			3.91	4
Dean Venkat Sharma	30		4.20	3.60	3
Dean Susan Turell	42		4.11	3.90	3

Q4. This administrator recognizes the strengths and weaknesses within his/her areas of responsibility.	2016 n	2012 Mean	2014 Mean	2016 Mean	2016 Median
President Nancy Kleniewski	90	4.55	3.77	3.29	3
Provost James Mackin	71			3.73	4
VP Paul Adamo	27	4.84	4.76	4.41	5
VP Todd Foreman	47	5.20	4.95	4.38	5
VP Franklin Chambers	19	4.84	4.76	3.42	4
Associate Provost Eileen Morgan-Zayachek	42			4.40	5
Dean Jan Bowers	24			3.08	2.5

Dean Venkat Sharma	30		3.91	3.00	2.5
Dean Susan Turell	42		3.64	3.62	3

Q5. This administrator selects and manages personnel effectively.	2016 n	2012 Mean	2014 Mean	2016 Mean	2016 Median
President Nancy Kleniewski	95	4.43	3.62	3.00	2
Provost James Mackin	67			3.64	4
VP Paul Adamo	24	4.78	4.65	3.75	3.5
VP Todd Foreman	48	5.32	4.80	4.42	5
VP Franklin Chambers	20	4.78	4.65	3.20	3.5
Associate Provost Eileen Morgan-Zayachek	31			4.29	5
Dean Jan Bowers	23			3.26	3
Dean Venkat Sharma	29		4.26	3.28	3
Dean Susan Turell	42		3.20	3.40	3

Q6. This administrator articulates a compelling vision. **	2016 n	2016 Mean	2016 Median
President Nancy Kleniewski	103	3.67	3
Provost James Mackin	74	3.53	3
VP Paul Adamo	32	4.66	5.5
VP Todd Foreman	47	4.53	5
VP Franklin Chambers	25	3.64	4
Associate Provost Eileen Morgan-Zayachek	40	4.25	5
Dean Jan Bowers	26	3.12	3
Dean Venkat Sharma	31	3.19	2
Dean Susan Turell	45	3.93	4

(**): new question)

Q7. This administrator effectively fulfills the responsibilities of her/his position.	2016 n	2012 Mean	2014 Mean	2016 Mean	2016 Median
President Nancy Kleniewski	99	5.11	4.16	3.92	4
Provost James Mackin	78			4.03	4
VP Paul Adamo	36	5.40	5.35	4.86	5
VP Todd Foreman	55	5.59	5.35	4.95	6
VP Franklin Chambers	21	5.40	5.35	3.62	4
Associate Provost Eileen Morgan-Zayachek	48			4.96	6
Dean Jan Bowers	24			3.13	3
Dean Venkat Sharma	32		4.56	3.41	3
Dean Susan Turell	44		4.10	4.16	4.5

