Data Overview

After data cleaning (removing missing data, careless responders), usable data from 501 participants

**AY 2023-2024**

- 501 participants total
- 146 faculty, 306 staff, 49 DNR
- 53 CASE, 41 CEC, 7 Kummer, 3 Library*, 37 PNR
- 222 Female, 141 Male, 4 Non-Binary*, 53 DNR, 81 PNR

**AY 2022-2023**

- 456 participants total
- 112 faculty, 302 staff, 42 DNR
- 40 CASE, 37 CEC, 6 Kummer, 29 PNR
- 207 Female, 148 Male, 36 DNR, 65 PNR

(582 participants AY 2021-2022)
## Overall Means for AY 2023-2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean (Scale)</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Org. Support</td>
<td>3.47 (1-7)</td>
<td>Individuals are neutral/somewhat disagree that S&amp;T supports/values them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Org. Commitment</td>
<td>3.91 (1-7)</td>
<td>Individuals are neutral on their emotional investment with S&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative Org. Commitment</td>
<td>3.66 (1-7)</td>
<td>Individuals are neutral/somewhat disagree that they should stay with S&amp;T out of obliged attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance Commitment</td>
<td>4.35 (1-7)</td>
<td>Individuals are neutral/somewhat agree that they are staying at S&amp;T out of necessity only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>3.71 (0-6)</td>
<td>Individuals sometimes to often feel engaged at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustion</td>
<td>3.46 (0-6)</td>
<td>Individuals are sometimes to often emotionally drained at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>4.11 (0-6)</td>
<td>Individuals often feel that they accomplish things at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>1.91 (0-6)</td>
<td>Individuals rarely feel detached from those they serve and work with at work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall Means for AY 2023-2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mean (Scale)</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>1.69 (0-5)</td>
<td>Individuals believe outcomes (e.g., raises, pay) are fairly shared across S&amp;T only to a small extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural Justice</td>
<td>2.38 (0-5)</td>
<td>Individuals believe procedures use to determine outcomes (e.g., raises, pay) are fairly followed to some extent at S&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice – Supervisor</td>
<td>3.95 (0-5)</td>
<td>Individuals believe they are treated with respect by their direct supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice – Supervisor</td>
<td>3.52 (0-5)</td>
<td>Individuals believe they receive fair and consistent communication from their supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Justice – Upper Admin.</td>
<td>2.82 (0-5)</td>
<td>Individuals believe they are treated with respect by upper administration only to some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational Justice – Upper Admin.</td>
<td>2.15 (0-5)</td>
<td>Individuals believe they receive fair and consistent communication from upper administration only small-some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Constraints</td>
<td>24.88 (11-55)</td>
<td>Individuals experience many constraints biweekly-weekly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missouri University of Science and Technology
Trends Across Years

Significant Differences Between SP2022 & Following Years

Missouri University of Science and Technology
Non-Significant Differences Overtime

Indicating no improvement but also no decline

Affective commitment (emotionally invested) – ranging 3.50-4.01 (somewhat disagree-neutral on average)

Normative commitment (committed due to felt obligation) – 3.56-3.78 (somewhat disagree-neutral on average)

Engagement (energized, absorbed in work) – 3.59-3.77 (sometimes-often engaged)

Personal accomplishment – 4.11-4.14 (often feel they are accomplishing things at work)

Depersonalization – 1.85-191 (rarely feel detached)
Interpersonal & Informational Justice Comparisons

Treated w/ respect/dignity; Fair & comprehensive communication

No changes between years, each year direct supervisors perform significantly better than upper administration.

AY 21-22
AY 22-23
AY 23-24
Supervisor Justice Perception Trend Lines – Colleges

Missouri University of Science and Technology
Upper Admin Justice Perception Trend Lines – College

AY 21-22  AY 22-23  AY 23-24

CASE Interpersonal
CASE Informational
CEC Interpersonal
CEC Informational
Kummer Interpersonal
Kummer Informational
PNR Interpersonal
PNR Informational
Fewer Tenure Status Differences This Year

T/TT more detached, have more stressors; PNR perceive lower justice; NTTs have most desirable scores
Faculty-Staff Sig. Differences This Year

Staff report better scores (except for continuance commitment) across metrics compared to faculty

Left – want higher scores; Right – want lower scores
Top Experienced Constraints

Overall: Interruptions by other people, too heavy of a workload, conflicting job demands; same 3 overall constraints as 2022 & 2023

Faculty Top 3 – Experienced Daily:
- Too heavy workload (39%)
- Interruptions by other people (37%)
- Inadequate equipment/resources (32%)
  • Followed closely by conflicting demands (29%)

Staff Top 3 – Experienced Daily:
- Interruptions by other people (38%)
- Too heavy workload (28%)
- Conflicting job demands (21%)

Staff % stable between years

Conflicting demands for faculty and faculty-experienced interruptions down 7% each
Inadequate equipment/resources for faculty up 8%
Improvements for Staff Plateaued, 3 Year Trends

With exception: Continuance commitment (want to decrease)
Staff Occupational Group Differences This Year
Crafts/Services staff struggle the most, across metrics
### Shared Governance Perceptions

**For Faculty Senate Only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean (Median)</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On the whole, rate the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the shared governance system at Missouri S&amp;T.</td>
<td>2.25 (2.00)</td>
<td>Shared governance at S&amp;T is somewhat ineffective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; administrators have equal say in governance matters.</td>
<td>1.79 (1.00)</td>
<td>Faculty predominately disagree that there is equal say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important institutional decisions are not made until consensus among faculty leaders and senior administrators is achieved.</td>
<td>1.66 (1.00)</td>
<td>Faculty predominately disagree that institutional decisions are based on shared governance consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the process by which I can express my opinions about institutional policies.</td>
<td>2.74 (3.00)</td>
<td>Faculty are predominately neutral about understanding the process of voicing opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how satisfied are you with shared governance at Missouri S&amp;T?</td>
<td>2.02 (2.00)</td>
<td>Faculty are dissatisfied with shared governance at Missouri S&amp;T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shared Governance Perception

For Faculty Senate Only

T/TT faculty (m = 1.7) disagree more than NTT faculty (m = 2.3) about whether faculty & administrators have equal say in governance matters

► Otherwise, no meaningful differences between groups (college or tenure status)

These items were an extension from the Spring 2023 COACHE survey, suggesting that by Spring 2024, negative perceptions about shared governance on campus remained relatively unchanged.
Next Steps

Discuss with Leadership – particularly trends

Analyze qualitative data this summer

Report on qualitative data in October meetings

Continue to build on & work towards improvements

Send any data analysis requests to Faculty Senate Personnel Committee or Staff Council Exec Board