



Executive Summary

- 331 of 973 employees responded, for a response rate of 34%. All employee classifications are represented.
- Overall, STCC's employees' mean value for "Should" (i.e., how things should be at STCC in employees' opinions) on each Quality Scale is about the same or slightly higher than in 2000.
- Overall, STCC's employees' mean value for "Is" (i.e., how STCC's employees perceive things to be at STCC) on each Quality Scale is higher than in 2000.
- Overall, the Gap between "Should" and "Is" narrowed between 2000 and 2001 for each Quality Scale.
- 74% of respondents are satisfied to very satisfied with employment at STCC in 2001. Only 2% report being not at all satisfied.
- 74% of respondents report their overall perception of quality at STCC to be good or excellent. 1% report being not at all satisfied with quality.
- Items with the smallest Gaps common to both years include:
 - Mission, purpose and values of STCC are familiar to employees
 - I know what is expected of me.
 - I am proud to say I work at STCC.
 - Faculty and staff take pride in their work.
 - STCC believes in continuous quality improvement.
 - STCC has "user-friendly" computer systems.Small gaps between "Should" and "Is" are desirable.
- Items with the largest Gaps common to both years include:
 - Employees are rewarded for outstanding job performance.
 - There are effective lines of communication between departments.
 - Selection, orientation, training, empowering and recognizing employees are carefully planned.
 - Administrators recognize faculty and staff when they do a good job.
 - My pay is reasonable for my job.
 - Employees are empowered to resolve problems quickly.
 - STCC analyzes all relevant data before making decisions.Large gaps between "Should" and "Is" are undesirable. These appear to be areas where employee's expectations continue to be unmet.
- The single item with the highest mean rating for "Is" in 2001 is "I am proud to say I work at STCC."
- Two items are in a virtual tie for highest mean rating for "Should" in 2001:
 - "I trust my supervisor to stand up for me when I need their support"
 - "I am proud to say I work at STCC."

- The most highly rated service, program or activity in both 2000 and 2001 is Payroll Services. The ratings of most services, programs and activities increased from 2000 to 2001.
- 3 programs, services or activities were distinctly lowest rated in 2001:
 - Cafeteria and food services (lowest rated)
 - Communication with other departments
 - Parking for faculty and staff
- Perceptions of quality, employment satisfaction, pride in STCC, and desire to continue employment at STCC are closely related to expectations that everyone is working toward the same goal(s) and taking personal responsibility for doing the best job possible.
- 50% of the negative comments hand-written on the CQS deal with related topics:
 - employee benefits
 - equity of treatment and pay/benefits among employees or employee groups
 - level of salary/pay
- Recommendations include further professional development, increased efforts at employee recognition, improved efforts aimed at addressing areas of concern and celebrating areas of success, improved communication, emphasis on the role of leaders in establishing culture and climate, and further study where results need clarification.

2000 and 2001 Scale Comparisons, All Employees

All Respondents							Change
Quality Scales: Means	How It Is 2000	How It Should Be 2000	2000 Gap	How It Is 2001	How It Should Be 2001	2001 Gap	in Gap in Year
Leadership & Support	3.24	4.59	1.35	3.48	4.62	1.15	-0.20
Employee Training & Recognition	3.08	4.56	1.48	3.25	4.60	1.35	-0.13
Empowerment & Teamwork	3.33	4.56	1.23	3.55	4.60	1.05	-0.18
Strategic Quality Planning	3.31	4.51	1.21	3.61	4.55	0.94	-0.27
Quality Improvement Results	3.35	4.50	1.15	3.57	4.55	0.98	-0.17
Quality Assurance	3.40	4.49	1.09	3.62	4.53	0.91	-0.18
Client Focus	3.32	4.49	1.16	3.57	4.55	0.97	-0.19
Measurement & Analysis	3.31	4.52	1.21	3.56	4.56	1.00	-0.21

All table values reflect rounding and may not appear to sum correctly.

Campus Quality Survey, as analyzed by Performance Horizons, is composed of 8 scales derived from Baldrige and Presidential Quality Awards. They are:

- **Leadership and Support** – Examines how management creates and sustains a clear and visible quality value system along with appropriate management systems to guide the activities of the organization
- **Training and Recognition** – Examines how efforts to develop full potential of staff for quality improvement, and analyzes training efforts, rewards, and incentives to support and recognize individuals
- **Empowerment and Teamwork** – Determines effectiveness and extent of employee involvement in continuous quality improvement (CQI) and approaches used to enhance employee empowerment
- **Client Focus** – Assesses client service systems and the responsiveness and ability of the organization to meet requirements and expectations
- **Strategic Quality Planning** – Examines quality planning process and reviews how key quality requirements are integrated into the process
- **Quality Improvement** – Reviews measurable results of quality improvement efforts
- **Quality Assurance** – Examines approaches used to design, assess, control and improve processes
- **Measurement and Analysis** – Reviews validity, scope, application and management of information and data that underscore the CQI system

Table 10 - Global Satisfaction with Employment at STCC

	2000		2001	
	Number of Respondents	% of Total	Number of Respondents	% of Total
Very Satisfied	49	25%	57	25%
Satisfied	83	43%	110	49%
Neutral	28	14%	35	15%
Somewhat Dissatisfied	19	10%	20	9%
Not at All Satisfied	13	7%	5	2%
Totals as compared to all surveys returned	192 of 341	56%	227 of 329	69%

Percentages are rounded and may not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Table 12 – Overall Perception of Quality at STCC

	2000		2001	
	Number of Respondents	% of Total	Number of Respondents	% of Total
Excellent	44	20%	60	21%
Good	92	43%	151	53%
Average	57	26%	56	20%
Below Average	15	7%	13	5%
Not at All Satisfied	8	4%	2	1%
Totals as compared to all surveys returned	216 of 341	63%	282 of 331	85%

Percentages are rounded and may not sum correctly due to rounding error.

Comparing 2000 and 2001 Means by Item

Item	Year	Should Be Mean	Is Mean	Gap Mean
This institution listens to its students	2000	4.57	3.53	1.04
	2001	4.67	3.78	0.89
This institution involves its employees in planning for the future	2000	4.60	3.34	1.26
	2001	4.59	3.63	0.96
This institution regularly conducts surveys to evaluate the quality of its programs and services	2000	4.38	3.28	1.10
	2001	4.43	3.78	0.65
It is easy to get information at this institution	2000	4.60	3.17	1.42
	2001	4.62	3.40	1.22
Students have a way to provide feedback on their level of satisfaction with school programs and services	2000	4.52	3.49	1.03
	2001	4.57	3.63	0.95
Team efforts are effective in this organization	2000	4.53	3.24	1.29
	2001	4.57	3.56	1.01
Each department or work unit has written, up-to-date service expectations	2000	4.46	3.55	0.91
	2001	4.45	3.67	0.78
Processes for selecting, orienting, training, empowering and recognizing employees are carefully planned	2000	4.59	2.78	1.81
	2001	4.56	2.98	1.57
Employees receive special training in improving client service	2000	4.45	2.95	1.50
	2001	4.53	3.19	1.34
This institution has "user-friendly" computer systems to assist employees and students	2000	4.65	3.77	0.88
	2001	4.66	3.91	0.75
This institution promotes excellent employee-student relationships	2000	4.55	3.45	1.10
	2001	4.62	3.76	0.85
Established standards and procedures define job expectations for employees	2000	4.53	3.33	1.20
	2001	4.59	3.59	1.00
Job responsibilities are communicated clearly to employees	2000	4.59	3.24	1.34
	2001	4.62	3.52	1.10
This institution analyzes complaints to determine appropriate remedial actions	2000	4.51	3.13	1.38
	2001	4.56	3.43	1.13
Student input is systematically monitored and measured as a basis for improvement	2000	4.49	3.15	1.34
	2001	4.52	3.46	1.05
Student survey results are published and posted regularly	2000	4.27	2.70	1.57
	2001	4.36	3.12	1.24
This institution uses state and national data to compare its performance with that of other institutions	2000	4.36	3.44	0.92
	2001	4.38	3.72	0.67
This institution continually evaluates and upgrades its processes for collecting data	2000	4.39	3.38	1.01
	2001	4.44	3.68	0.76

Comparing 2000 and 2001 Means by Item, cont.		Should Be	Is	Gap
Item	Year	Mean	Mean	Mean
Employees are empowered to resolve problems quickly	2000	4.52	2.97	1.55
	2001	4.56	3.25	1.31
Administrators treat students as their top priority	2000	4.56	3.36	1.20
	2001	4.62	3.58	1.04
Administrators cultivate positive relationships with students	2000	4.48	3.37	1.11
	2001	4.55	3.58	0.97
Efforts to improve quality are paying off in this institution	2000	4.56	3.53	1.03
	2001	4.59	3.67	0.92
Guarantees of satisfaction are offered to students to ensure quality service	2000	4.18	3.22	0.96
	2001	4.30	3.43	0.87
Students believe faculty care about what they think	2000	4.60	3.76	0.83
	2001	4.63	3.69	0.94
Administrators are committed to providing quality service	2000	4.65	3.57	1.08
	2001	4.68	3.81	0.87
Employees are rewarded for outstanding job performance	2000	4.56	2.44	2.12
	2001	4.63	2.68	1.95
There are effective lines of communication between departments	2000	4.57	2.75	1.82
	2001	4.62	2.90	1.73
Employees are encouraged to provide suggestions on ways to improve the work flow	2000	4.53	3.16	1.37
	2001	4.63	3.40	1.23
Faculty and staff take pride in their work	2000	4.70	4.02	0.68
	2001	4.67	3.95	0.72
Administrators set examples of quality services in their day-to-day performance	2000	4.64	3.18	1.46
	2001	4.65	3.48	1.17
Administrators recognize faculty and staff when they do a good job	2000	4.62	2.85	1.77
	2001	4.62	3.04	1.58
Administrators pay attention to what I have to say	2000	4.59	3.13	1.45
	2001	4.60	3.28	1.32
My supervisor helps me improve my job performance	2000	4.57	3.69	0.88
	2001	4.67	3.79	0.88
This institution uses teams to solve problems	2000	4.42	3.40	1.02
	2001	4.52	3.62	0.90
Administrators have confidence and trust in me	2000	4.61	3.54	1.08
	2001	4.65	3.79	0.86
Administrators share information regularly with faculty and staff	2000	4.60	3.24	1.35
	2001	4.60	3.42	1.18

Comparing 2000 and 2001 Means by Item, cont

		Should Be	Is	Gap
Item	Year	Mean	Mean	Mean
There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation in this organization	2000	4.64	3.06	1.58
	2001	4.64	3.44	1.20
I know what is expected of me	2000	4.67	4.04	0.64
	2001	4.70	4.20	0.50
Our services to students are "user-friendly"	2000	4.64	3.58	1.06
	2001	4.68	3.80	0.88
My department meets as a team to plan and coordinate work	2000	4.63	3.79	0.85
	2001	4.66	3.83	0.83
This institution analyzes all relevant data before making decisions	2000	4.55	2.97	1.59
	2001	4.57	3.32	1.25
Quality improvement tools and methods are used regularly to solve problems	2000	4.43	3.14	1.30
	2001	4.55	3.54	1.01
This institution believes in continuous quality improvement	2000	4.57	3.85	0.72
	2001	4.66	4.08	0.57
Employees are involved in the development and improvement of performance measures	2000	4.57	3.51	1.06
	2001	4.57	3.72	0.86
Written procedures clearly define who is responsible for each operation and service	2000	4.54	3.26	1.28
	2001	4.60	3.47	1.13
Quality improvement teams have been established in this organization	2000	4.46	3.53	0.93
	2001	4.53	3.71	0.82
This institution plans carefully	2000	4.60	3.06	1.55
	2001	4.64	3.53	1.11
Employee suggestions are used to improve our institution	2000	4.55	3.00	1.55
	2001	4.62	3.33	1.30
The mission, purpose and values of this institution are familiar to employees	2000	4.62	4.08	0.54
	2001	4.65	4.02	0.63
Prof. development training programs are available to assist employees in improving their job performance	2000	4.63	3.90	0.72
	2001	4.67	3.87	0.80
I trust my supervisor to stand up for me when I need their support	2000	4.82	3.71	1.11
	2001	4.76	3.79	0.98
The pace of work here is reasonable	2000	4.52	3.34	1.18
	2001	4.52	3.59	0.93
STCC adequately prepares students for employment and/or further education	2000	4.72	3.79	0.93
	2001	4.74	3.93	0.82

Comparing 2000 and 2001 Means by Item, cont

		Should Be	Is	Gap
Item	Year	Mean	Mean	Mean
My pay is reasonable for my job	2000	4.61	3.04	1.56
	2001	4.63	3.07	1.56
My benefit package is satisfactory	2000	4.62	3.46	1.16
	2001	4.63	3.42	1.21
I would want to work at a place like STCC for a long time	2000	4.70	3.80	0.89
	2001	4.68	3.97	0.72
I am proud to say I work at STCC	2000	4.81	4.07	0.74
	2001	4.75	4.31	0.44
Everyone here is working toward the same goal(s)	2000	4.64	3.20	1.44
	2001	4.62	3.41	1.21
Everyone here takes responsibility for doing the best job possible	2000	4.70	3.28	1.42
	2001	4.67	3.44	1.24

Means and Gap reflect rounding

Comparisons of Rank and Mean Scores for Programs, Activities and Services for 2000 and 2001 Administrations of the CQS

	2000 Rank	2000 Mean	2001 Mean	2001 Rank		Change in Mean	Direction of Change
Payroll services	1	3.90	4.01	1	Payroll services	0.11	<i>f</i>
Relationships with private sector and business community	2	3.60	3.69	2	Media, audio visual, technology services	0.38	<i>f</i>
Communicating with legislators and other politicians	3	3.59	3.63	3	Affirmative action	0.18	<i>f</i>
Financial aid assistance and services	4	3.46	3.61	4	Relationships with private sector and business community	0.01	<i>f</i>
Computer information services and systems	5	3.46	3.58	5	Maintenance and custodial services	0.33	<i>f</i>
Affirmative action	6	3.45	3.58	6	Computer information services and systems	0.12	<i>f</i>
Basic skills/ developmental/ alternative programs	7	3.38	3.55	7	Financial aid assistance and services	0.09	<i>f</i>
Marketing, advertising and public relations	8	3.36	3.54	8	Communicating with legislators and other politicians	-0.05	"
Continuing education and community programs and services	9	3.32	3.50	9	Basic skills/ developmental/ alternative programs	0.12	<i>f</i>
Media, audio visual, technology services	10	3.31	3.49	10	Marketing, advertising and public relations	0.13	<i>f</i>
Security/police services	11	3.30	3.48	11	Research and planning services	0.29	<i>f</i>
Maintenance and custodial services	12	3.25	3.43	12	Switchboard and telephone services	0.21	<i>f</i>
Curriculum planning, design and coordination	13	3.23	3.42	13	Business office services	0.21	<i>f</i>
Bookstore services	14	3.22	3.41	14	Continuing education and community programs and services	0.09	<i>f</i>
Switchboard and telephone services	15	3.22	3.39	15	Curriculum planning, design and coordination	0.16	<i>f</i>
Business office services	16	3.21	3.34	16	Personnel/human resource services	0.41	<i>f</i>
Research and planning services	17	3.19	3.32	17	Relations with other educational institutions	0.14	<i>f</i>
Relations with other educational institutions	18	3.18	3.31	18	Career information and planning services	0.20	<i>f</i>
Career information and planning services	19	3.11	3.30	19	Student admissions and registration services	0.32	<i>f</i>
Student activities	20	3.01	3.25	20	Security/police services	-0.05	"
Student admissions and registration services	21	2.98	3.24	21	Bookstore services	0.02	<i>f</i>
Parking for faculty and staff	22	2.96	3.23	22	Recruitment and orientation of new employees	0.36	<i>f</i>
Personnel/human resource services	23	2.93	3.22	23	Student activities	0.21	<i>f</i>
Counseling and student advisement services	24	2.9	3.21	24	Counseling and student advisement services	0.31	<i>f</i>
Budget planning and coordination	25	2.88	3.21	25	Budget planning and coordination	0.33	<i>f</i>
Recruitment and orientation of new employees	26	2.87	3.17	26	Library and learning resources	0.41	<i>f</i>
Cafeteria and food services	27	2.86	2.97	27	Parking for faculty and staff	0.01	<i>f</i>
Library and learning resources	28	2.76	2.81	28	Communication with other departments	0.15	<i>f</i>
Communication with other departments	29	2.64	2.71	29	Cafeteria and food services	-0.05	"

TAKE CARE IN READING AND INTERPRETING THIS TABLE! Some items changed in rank from 2000 to 2001. "Change in Mean" and "Direction of Change" refer to the same item as the right hand group (green) compared to itself from 2000 (purple) to 2001(green).