

Brief Summary of Results
Faculty/Staff Communication Survey

The two main purposes of the faculty/staff communication survey were to (1) assess frequency of use and satisfaction with institutional communication content and strategies; and, (2) assess the perception of the congruence between institutional commitment to inclusion and current communication methods. The survey was open November 2016-January 2017.

The survey focused on the frequency of use of communication channels, level of satisfaction with communication channels, how informed respondents feel about topics, types of information participants want more/less of, representativeness of diversity and inclusiveness of communication, and overall satisfaction. The survey also included open-ended questions allowing respondents to provide suggestions for improvement. Question prompts are presented in Table I.

Table I	
Frequency of Use	➤ “Please rate the frequency with which you receive institutional news and information from the following channels...”
Level of Satisfaction	➤ “Please rate your level of satisfaction with how well information is communicated through the following channels...”
How Informed	➤ “Please rate how informed you feel about the following topics:”
Types of Information More/Less	➤ “What types of information would you like to receive more/less of?”
Representative of Diversity	➤ “Please indicate whether you feel the words/images used to communicate to the campus community are representative of the diverse groups of students, faculty, and staff who make up the campus community.”
Representative of Inclusiveness	➤ “Please indicate whether you feel the words/images used to communicate to the campus community are inclusive and respectful of all members of the campus community.”
Open-Ended Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ “Please indicate any specific suggestions you might have for improving communication in reference to being more inclusive of the campus community.” ➤ “Please indicate any additional specific suggestions you might have on how Clayton State could better facilitate

	communication within the campus community.”
--	---

Demographics

One hundred and forty-nine (149) full- and part-time faculty, staff, and administrators provided input. The sample primarily consisted of full-time faculty (36%), full-time staff (44%), and administrators (13%). Sample demographics are presented in Table II.

Table II	
Role	% of Respondents/# of Respondents
Staff-FT	44%(66)
Faculty-FT	36% (53)
Administrator	13% (20)
Staff-PT	3% (5)
Faculty-PT/Adjunct	3% (5)

Overall Satisfaction

Overall, the majority of the respondents (66%) indicated they were “Extremely Satisfied,” “Moderately Satisfied,” or “Slightly Satisfied” with communication at Clayton State University. Twenty-six percent (26%) reported being “Extremely Dissatisfied,” “Moderately Dissatisfied,” or “Slightly Dissatisfied” with communication while 8% reported being “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.”

Table III	
Level of Satisfaction	% of Respondents/# of Respondents
Extremely Satisfied	9% (13)
Moderately Satisfied	36% (53)
Slightly Satisfied	21% (31)
Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied	8% (12)
Slightly Dissatisfied	14% (21)
Moderately Dissatisfied	7% (11)
Extremely Dissatisfied	4% (6)

Communication Channels-Frequency of Use & Satisfaction

Respondents were asked to rate the frequency with which they receive institutional news and information from various channels. Frequency of use was quantified using “Always,” “Often,” “Sometimes,” “Rarely,” and “Never.” As might be expected, 99% of the respondents identified “email” as the most frequent source of information. “Person-to-person” communication and the “campus website” were second and third, respectively, with 88% and 78% of respondents identifying these as frequent sources of information. In contrast, a majority of the sample indicated “digital signage” (77%) and “mobile/text” (71%) as rarely used sources of information. Frequency of utilization of all sources are presented in Table IV.

Table IV		
Communication Type	Always-Sometimes	Rarely-Never
Email	99%	1%

Person-to-Person	88%	12%
Campus Website	78%	22%
Printed Publications	52%	48%
Mobile/Text	29%	71%
Digital Signage	23%	77%

In addition to rating the frequency with which respondents received information via these channels, they also rated their level of satisfaction with each communication channel. Overall, respondents indicated satisfaction with the channels from which they receive the most information (i.e., email, person-to-person, and the campus website). On average, approximately 21% of respondents reported dissatisfaction with the channels; however, almost a third of respondents (28%) reported being neither satisfied nor dissatisfied. Level of satisfaction with each type of communication channel is presented in Table V.

Communication Type	*Satisfied	**Dissatisfied	Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied
Email	80%	18%	3%
Person-to-Person	59%	23%	18%
Campus Website	52%	24%	23%
Printed Publications	47%	17%	37%
Mobile/Text	42%	20%	38%
Digital Signage	26%	28%	47%

*Satisfied = Extremely Satisfied/Moderately Satisfied/Slightly Satisfied

**Dissatisfied = Extremely Dissatisfied/Moderately Dissatisfied/Slightly Dissatisfied

Perception of Being Informed

Respondents were asked to rate how informed they feel about varying topics. Of the seven topic areas provided (listed in Table VI), a majority of respondents rated themselves “informed.” A slight majority of respondents rated themselves “not informed” on only two topics (i.e. “Staff News/Achievements” & “Student News/Achievements”). Results are presented in Table VI.

Information Topic	*Informed	**Not Informed
CSU News	72%	28%
CSU Events	67%	33%
Administrative Policies/Procedures	67%	33%
CSU History/Culture	61%	39%
Faculty News/Achievements	55%	45%
Student News/Achievements	48%	52%
Staff News/Achievements	43%	57%

*Informed = Completely Informed/Very Informed/Moderately Informed

**Not Informed = Slightly Informed/Not At All Informed

In addition to indicating how informed they feel, respondents were provided an opportunity to provide input on types of information they would like to receive more or less of. Of the sixty-three (63)

Submitted J. Celeste Walley-Jean
Spring 2017

respondents who provided comments, “events” were identified as the type of information in which respondents wanted more of (n = 32). An example statement from this category was *“Upcoming student or community events on campus.”* In reference to information respondents would like to receive less of, thirty-one (31) respondents provided feedback, “email” was identified as the category in which respondents wanted less of (n = 11); however, what this category meant to respondents varied. For example, sample statements included *“Mass email REPLYs on controversial topics”* and *“Notices informing us that we will eventually be informed when...”*

Reflection of Institutional Commitment to Inclusion

Respondents indicated to what extent they agreed that words/images used to communicate to the campus community are representative of diversity and inclusion. The majority of the respondents reported agreed the words/images used to communicate were representative of diversity (75%) and inclusion (77%).

Table VII			
	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
Diversity	75%	15%	10%
Inclusion	77%	10%	13%

When asked to provide specific suggestions on how to improve communication in reference to being more inclusive of the campus community, of the eleven (11) responses two themes garnered the most comments (n = 5): *“Students”* and *“Race/Ethnicity.”* Summarily, comments centered on images in publications not being representative of students in general nor the full diversity of our student population. Additional comments specifically referenced race/ethnicity.

“Fewer photographs of campus as decoration—replace with images of students”

“I don’t feel that the older generation of students is presented in publications.”

“Include representatives of all minorities.”

“The posters provided by Auxillary Services, particularly Sodexo corporate images, use mostly models with blonde hair and blue eyes.”

“We are turning into a campus in which students are not exposed to enough men, Caucasian, or Asian-Pacific Islands.”

Rather than an active lack of representation of diversity/inclusion, two comments broadly provided suggestions specific to creating an appreciation/celebration of our diversity/inclusion via words/images:

“You can start with appreciating who our student population is and where our students come from.”

"I would like to see our campus move from what I would describe as 'benign' indifference toward our campus demographics to active, public, explicit celebration of our campus demographics."

Suggestions for Improved Communication

Thirty-eight (38) respondents provided specific suggestions on how Clayton State could better facilitate communication within the campus community. The largest number of responses focused on three primary themes: *Events (12)*, *Email (10)*, and the *Office of Marketing & Communications (7)*. Respondents' comments in these thematic areas were often intertwined. Generally, suggestions focused on events provided ideas for increased and a more streamlined dissemination of information about campus events and utilization of email. Respondents generally voiced comments describing negative perceptions of the Office of Marketing and Communications leading to suggestions of a reduced role of this office in campus communication strategies. Sample comments are listed below.

Events

"Announce events further in advance!"

"An open campus events calendar."

"Weekly or bi-weekly digest of the events for the upcoming week or month."

Email

"Restrict the 'reply all' feature."

"Clearer and more concise subject headings for emails."

"Email is probably the best method of communication, but needs to be streamlined and regulated. Relying on one department to send out mass mailings is helpful, but its' disappointing when the desired message gets lost or miscommunicated because it's forced through an additional channel."

Office of Marketing & Communications

"Stop restricting all communication through marketing."

"Don't send out important communications with the heading 'Office of Marketing and Communication.' Please use a subject heading instead."

Summary & Recommendations

Based on the current findings there appears to be an overall positive perception of communication at Clayton State University. Yet, as with any organization's activity, there are areas of improvement. Email remains the primary mode of communication utilized and respondents seem generally satisfied with this method of communication. In contrast, digital signage and mobile/text to obtain information are under-utilized. The relatively elevated levels of neutrality around satisfaction/dissatisfaction with these modes of communication suggest, rather than discontent with the methods, there may be opportunity to increase the community's exposure to these modes of campus communication. For instance, respondents voiced a desire to have more information about campus

events. The use of digital signage may be a point where sharing of this type of information could be easily increased. It may also be a place where the dissemination of faculty/staff/student news and achievements could be strengthened.

In reference to Clayton State's communication that reflects our commitment to diversity and inclusion, again it seems there is a sense that we are communicating effectively. However, there are areas where we can improve. Increasing utilization of images that are more reflective of the full diversity of our campus is a practical and relatively easy action. When communicating, utilizing images that directly reflect our campus diversity (i.e., images of women of color, ethnic minorities, older people, etc.) may also more clearly reflect the representation that the institution is "appreciative" of who we are as a campus community.

Internal Communications Audit Committee:

J. Celeste Walley-Jean, Chair
Krystle Coombs
Maritza Ferreira
Norman Grizzell
Emily Harbert
Jeff Jacobs
Elaine Manglitz

Shandra McDonald
Erin Nagel
Roger Poore
Caroline Sheppard
Toni Simmons
Wanda Zellars