

TABLE 9
ACT STUDENT OPINION SURVEY
SUMMARY REPORT
SECTION II: COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

RANK	ITEM NO.	ITEM TEXT	TOTAL GROUP		PUBLIC COLLEGES		SIZE 2000-9999	
			AVG	SD	AVG	SD	AVG	SD
5	1	Academic Advising Services	3.82	0.96	3.68	1.01	3.81	0.96
1	2	Personal Counseling Services	3.89	1.02	3.79	1.05	3.89	1.01
7	3	Career Planning Services	3.74	0.99	3.69	1.00	3.77	0.98
16	4	Job Placement Services	3.56	1.11	3.56	1.09	3.58	1.10
8	5	Recreational and Intramural Programs and Services	3.96	0.88	4.03	0.84	3.92	0.90
14	6	Library Facilities and Services	3.79	1.02	3.90	0.96	3.78	1.03
13	7	Student Health Services	3.57	1.13	3.63	1.12	3.60	1.11
19	8	Student Health Insurance Program	3.32	1.11	3.33	1.14	3.35	1.12
4	9	College-Sponsored Tutorial Services	3.87	0.98	3.82	1.01	3.89	0.97
23	10	Financial Aid Services	3.66	1.14	3.56	1.19	3.61	1.17
17	11	Student Employment Services	3.87	1.00	3.83	1.02	3.87	1.01
21	12	Residence Hall Services and Programs	3.45	1.04	3.42	1.03	3.36	1.06
20	13	Food Services	3.03	1.14	3.13	1.11	3.01	1.14
9	14	College-Sponsored Social Activities	3.69	0.89	3.71	0.86	3.67	0.89
6	15	Cultural Programs	3.77	0.91	3.83	0.88	3.80	0.89

TABLE 9 (Continued)
ACT STUDENT OPINION SURVEY
SUMMARY REPORT SECTION II: COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

RANK	ITEM NO.	ITEM TEXT	TOTAL GROUP		PUBLIC COLLEGES		SIZE 2000-9999	
			AVG	SD	AVG	SD	AVG	SD
12	16	College Orientation Program	3.77	0.90	3.72	0.90	3.75	0.90
11	17	Credit-By-Examination Program (PEP, CLEP)	3.87	1.00	3.83	1.03	3.86	1.00
3	18	Honors Programs	3.87	0.97	3.83	1.00	3.89	0.95
15	19	Computer Services	3.75	1.02	3.79	0.99	3.73	1.03
18	20	College Mass Transit Services	3.64	1.04	3.68	1.03	3.54	1.05
22	21	Parking Facilities and Services	2.66	1.28	2.45	1.25	2.71	1.29
2	22	Veterans Services	3.87	1.10	3.93	1.07	3.92	1.07
10	23	Day Care Services	3.74	1.18	3.79	1.07	3.80	1.16

TABLE 10
ACT STUDENT OPINION SURVEY
SUMMARY REPORT
SECTION III: COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

SATISFACTION WITH GIVEN ASPECTS OF THIS COLLEGE - SATISFACTION AVERAGES RANK ORDERED

RANK	# FOR AVERAGE	AVG	SD	ITEM NO.	ITEM TEXT	TOTAL GROUP		PUBLIC COLLEGES		ENROLLMENT 2000-9999	
						AVG	SD	AVG	SD	AVG	SD
1	2220	3.88	0.86	7	Class size relative to the type of course	4.15	.79	4.00	.81	4.16	.76
2	2189	3.82	0.96	3	Major field instructors	3.95	0.87	3.89	0.87	3.94	0.86
3	2220	3.81	0.93	2	Major field course content	3.91	0.88	3.87	0.87	3.92	0.86
4	2161	3.68	0.94	4	Out-of-class availability of instructors	3.94	0.86	3.83	0.87	3.90	0.87
5	2169	3.67	0.92	36	Racial harmony on college	3.61	0.91	3.52	0.90	3.64	0.88
6	2103	3.66	1.05	10	Value of the information provided by advisors	3.74	1.05	3.63	1.08	3.73	1.04
7	2127	3.60	1.05	9	Availability of advisors	3.82	1.00	3.69	1.04	3.79	1.04
8	2175	3.59	1.04	11	Preparation for future occupation	3.73	0.95	3.64	0.96	3.74	0.94
9	2186	3.50	1.03	1	Testing/grading system	3.81	0.75	3.78	0.75	3.82	0.75
10	2234	3.49	1.10	5	Attitude of the faculty toward students	4.01	0.88	3.87	0.90	3.96	0.89
11	2188	3.49	0.92	32	Academic calendar for the college	3.75	0.84	3.67	0.83	3.69	0.85
12	2052	3.41	1.02	8	Flexibility in designing individual program of studies	3.59	0.99	3.53	0.99	3.57	1.00
13	2222	3.36	1.04	6	Variety of courses offered by the college	3.59	1.01	3.60	1.02	3.57	1.01
14	1957	3.36	0.88	38	Opportunities for personal involvement in campus activities	3.68	0.84	3.59	0.82	3.61	0.84
15	2204	3.32	1.03	42	General college conditions	3.90	0.86	3.85	0.83	3.87	0.86

TABLE 10 (Continued)
ACT STUDENT OPINION SURVEY
SUMMARY REPORT SECTION III: COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

SATISFACTION WITH GIVEN ASPECTS OF THIS COLLEGE - SATISFACTION AVERAGES RANK ORDERED

RANK	# FOR AVERAGE	AVG	SD	ITEM NO.	ITEM TEXT	TOTAL GROUP		PUBLIC COLLEGES		ENROLLMENT 2000-9999	
						AVG	SD	AVG	SD	AVG	SD
16	2205	3.30	1.09	12	General admissions procedures	3.71	0.86	3.61	0.89	3.69	0.88
17	2160	3.29	1.06	25	Study areas	3.65	0.92	3.64	0.91	3.65	0.91
18	1970	3.28	0.92	41	Campus media (student newspaper and campus radio)	3.47	0.93	3.48	0.91	3.45	0.90
19	2108	3.27	0.94	17	Rules governing student conduct in college	3.41	0.94	3.44	0.85	3.41	0.92
20	2215	3.26	1.06	27	Campus bookstore	3.52	1.03	3.55	1.02	3.48	1.05
21	1742	3.24	0.82	40	Religious activities and programs	3.50	0.83	3.39	0.76	3.44	0.81
22	2192	3.23	1.07	15	College catalog/admissions publications	3.86	0.82	3.81	0.81	3.83	0.83
23	1720	3.22	0.90	19	Academic probation and suspension policies	3.40	0.85	3.43	0.79	3.41	0.83
24	1614	3.16	0.98	24	Athletic facilities	3.52	1.01	3.63	0.94	3.44	1.01
25	1825	3.16	0.94	26	Student union	3.47	0.91	3.54	0.87	3.47	0.89
26	1848	3.16	0.88	39	Student government	3.33	0.84	3.24	0.82	3.31	0.82
27	1756	3.14	0.98	37	Opportunities for student employment	3.42	0.93	3.32	0.91	3.38	0.93
28	2231	3.08	1.09	22	Classroom facilities	3.72	0.87	3.66	0.87	3.74	0.87
29	2196	3.05	1.13	14	Accuracy of college information you received before enrolling	3.69	0.94	3.61	0.92	3.67	0.93
30	1117	3.04	0.91	18	Residence hall rules and regulations	3.13	1.05	3.13	1.00	3.07	1.04

TABLE 10 (Continued)
ACT STUDENT OPINION SURVEY
SUMMARY REPORT
SECTION III: COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

SATISFACTION WITH GIVEN ASPECTS OF THIS COLLEGE - SATISFACTION AVERAGES RANK ORDERED

RANK	# FOR AVERAGE	AVG	SD	ITEM NO.	ITEM TEXT	TOTAL GROUP		PUBLIC COLLEGES		ENROLLMENT 2000-9999	
						AVG	SD	AVG	SD	AVG	SD
31	1898	2.99	1.11	23	Laboratory facilities	3.56	0.92	3.56	0.89	3.56	0.92
32	1233	2.99	0.95	28	Availability of student housing	3.42	0.96	3.40	0.93	3.34	0.95
33	2184	2.95	1.13	21	Personal security/safety on campus	3.65	0.98	3.61	0.94	3.65	0.97
34	2186	2.92	1.13	34	Individual concerns for students	3.50	1.00	3.28	0.99	3.48	0.98
35	2064	2.87	1.04	16	Student voice in college policies	3.13	0.96	3.07	0.91	3.12	0.94
36	2144	2.83	1.18	35	Attitude of college nonteaching staff toward student	3.58	0.96	3.44	0.96	3.54	0.95
37	2176	2.79	1.15	31	Availability of the course upon demand	3.11	1.17	2.93	1.19	3.09	1.17
38	2188	2.78	1.10	29	General condition of buildings and grounds	3.68	0.96	3.65	0.95	3.71	0.95
39	2192	2.77	1.19	33	Billing and fee payment procedures	3.50	0.98	3.52	0.97	3.47	1.00
40	2029	2.71	1.21	13	Availability of financial aid information prior to enrolling	3.52	1.05	3.36	1.07	3.48	1.06
41	2203	2.64	1.19	30	General registration procedures	3.56	1.00	3.48	1.06	3.50	1.04
42	2130	2.57	1.06	20	Purposes for which student activity fees are used	3.00	1.00	2.91	1.01	2.99	0.99

Faculty Survey

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness, in collaboration with the Self-Study Committee on Evaluation, developed the Faculty Survey to collect data on the opinions and perceptions of faculty relative to major institutional functions, processes, support services, governance, workloads, and new initiatives. Administration of the survey took place during the beginning of the Spring 1998 Semester. Surveys were distributed during school or college scheduled opening meetings.

The strategy for the administration of the surveys was effective in that the response rate was 32%. More important, the number of responses was a balanced representation for each of the schools and colleges, and the responses by gender roughly approximated that the total faculty.

The objectives for the study were twofold: (1) to identify issues of interest or concern to faculty and (2) to gauge satisfaction levels concerning processes, functions, services, and other pertinent university issues.

Statistical analyses were applied to determine if there were significant relationships between variables. Initially, the survey was analyzed by frequency of responses and secondly by frequency of responses by demographic categories. Significant relationships were further analyzed to ascertain more accurate conclusions.

Generally, satisfaction levels were consistent across schools and colleges. However, regardless of the level of satisfaction, there was overwhelming consensus that the University embodies its purpose in the delivery of academic and non-academic programs and services. Relative to operations, this conclusion validates the University's being driven by its mission.

Population

Of the 386 faculty members, 123 or 32% responded to the Spring Semester 1998 survey. Full-time faculty represented 94% of the respondents; part-time represented 5%, and 1% was unidentifiable. The median length of service at the University for respondents was between 16-20 years, with a median length of college teaching experience between 21-25 years. More than half or 54% of the respondents was tenured, 11% was on tenure track, 15% was on non-tenure track, and 20% was not identifiable. The composition of the sample by gender was 54% male and 38% female, with 8% unidentified. Fifty-three percent of the respondents indicated graduate faculty status.

Composition of the sample by School/College

School/College	Percent of Sample	Response Rate of Schools/Colleges
Arts and Sciences	36%	27%
Business	12%	65%
Education	20%	58%
Law	11%	28%
Pharmacy and Health Sciences	7%	30%
Technology	10%	57%

Sample by Rank

Rank	Percent Responding
Professors	28%
Associate Professors	30%
Assistant Professors	24%
Instructors	11%
Other	2%
Unidentifiable	4%

Instrument

The Institutional Self-Study Evaluation Sub-committee prepared the 73 multiple-choice survey. The questions were developed to obtain information required to address relevant issues associated with the SACS criteria for accreditation. The questions selection was based upon issues relevant to SACS criteria for accreditation.

Procedures

The survey was distributed in general faculty meetings for all schools and colleges, except pharmacy. In the School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences, secretarial staff members distributed the survey to the pharmacy faculty.

Analysis of results

Bar graphs were used to summarize the results of the survey. Statistical non-parametric procedures using demographic variables as controls for each of the questions were performed.

Summary

Responses to questions in the Processes and Functions Section disclose significant information. While the respondents generally revealed that the budget process was enrollment driven, 88% noted that allocations for equipment and operational supplies were inadequate.

Communications between faculty and administrators appear to be a problem since 66% felt that the faculty is not kept abreast of news and events, and 76% indicated being

uninformed about new institutional policies and procedures. The follow-up question designed to probe possible reasons for their opinions offered multiple sources of the problem in communications, including inadequate lines of communications, no formal communications infrastructure, and administrators' operating on "a need to know basis only."

Basically, the responses disclosed that current challenges, such as financial aid, regaining public trust, maintaining the quality of academic programs, retention, and graduation rates, confronting the University impinged upon the faculty's ability to provide quality instructions. However, there was a consensus that the University embodied its mission in the delivery of programs and services.

Responses to questions on satisfaction with selected support services revealed low satisfaction levels with the central administration, availability of technology to aid instruction; registration; admissions; recruitment and building; and classroom and laboratory maintenance. It should be noted that satisfaction with department and school/college administration was higher since most of the respondents were satisfied with departmental administration.

More than two-thirds of the respondents have been active with the Faculty Assembly/Senate at some point in time although the same percentage of faculty members indicated that they are not currently active. Similarly, 66% of the respondents were of the opinion that the Faculty Assembly/Senate was not influential in regards to policy decisions affecting academic affairs. Nonetheless, 80% voted in the selection of their schools' or colleges' representatives to the assembly.

More than half or 52% of the respondents have never attended a Board meeting, but did reveal the importance of faculty's input at the Board level. The perception of the importance of faculty's input was highest (85%) at the departmental level and nearly the same (65%) at the Provost and executive levels.

An equal number of respondents indicated that they taught 6 to 11 hours (41%) and 12 to 14 hours (41%) last semester. A third of the respondents reported having three course preparations last semester, while 28% had four or more preparations. There was a consensus that the number of course preparations conformed to standards set by accrediting agencies for respective programs. Responding to questions concerning instructional modes of delivery, 63% of the respondents indicated using a combination of conventional lectures and computer technology.

During the Fall 1997, 40% of the respondents indicated that they had 51 or more advisees, and 85% reported they communicated with advisees at times other than registration.

In regard to faculty development, 29% reported some activity in the last 12 months; most faculty members presented scholarly papers or attended workshops. Sixty percent of the respondents reported publishing at least one article in a refereed journal over the past five years, and 26% reported publishing books.

The majority of respondents (79%) indicated that they had personal computers in their offices. However, 90% of all respondents expressed a need for more computer training and support services for the faculty.

With regards to new initiatives, most of the respondents (54%) indicated some level of familiarity with the President's vision for an Urban Academic Village. Others

expressed an interest in learning more about it since the general opinion was that faculty would be an important resource.

Finally, the majority (55%) of the respondents did not perceive the evaluation process for academic programs and services to be continuous or leading systematically to institutional effectiveness. When asked to identify the major reason for this perception, 57% of the respondents disclosed various reasons, including the following: academic evaluation process not systematic, planning process not comprehensive, and planning and evaluation not integrated functions.

The information garnered from the survey will serve as the springboard for on-going planning in academic and non-academic areas as efforts are expended to improve university conditions and increase the level of satisfaction of these valued stakeholders.

PLANNING ASSUMPTIONS

External factors

1. The impact of the anti-affirmative action movement, including the Hopwood decision, will result in more minorities both African American and Hispanic students enrolling at Historically Black Colleges and Universities.
2. New State of Texas regulatory changes regarding TASP will not affect enrollment.
3. State of Texas funding for higher education will remain constant over the next five years.
4. Accountability requirements at both the federal and state levels will continue to increase, resulting in increased reporting of student performances, outcomes, and financial reporting.
5. The availability of research funds from external sources should remain constant, while faculty efforts to attract such funding will increase.
6. The Houston economy is diverse. Although it continues to be fueled by the exploration and production of energy, the largest growth has been in the areas of health care services, electronics, and engineering technologies.
7. Enrollment will be affected by both the local and state economies. Enrollments usually expand when unemployment increases and students prepare or retrain for increased employability. Current economic indicators for the City of Houston show sustained growth in the numbers of jobs, low unemployment rates, and an increase in construction, sales, and services.

8. During the last five years, headcount enrollment at Texas public universities declined by 1.63 %, while public and community technical college enrollment increased by 4.4%. However, over the same period, the number of African-American and Hispanic students at public universities increased by 13.8%.
9. Enrollment in Texas Colleges and Universities is expected to increase by nearly 4% during the period from 2000 to 2005, which represents an average annual increase of <1 %.
10. Anticipated changes in the State of Texas' demographic structure and student age distribution patterns are likely to influence growth at all institutions of higher education.
11. The total population will grow at an average annual rate of 1.3%. Hispanics will continue to be the fastest growing ethnic group; by 2010, they will constitute 34% of the state's population; African Americans will remain constant at 11.6%, while Caucasians will experience a 6% decline, resulting in 51.4% of the state's population.
12. The number of traditional high school graduates in the 15 to 19 year old groups is projected to increase by 12 % from the period 1997 to 2010. This represents an annual average growth of <1 %.

Internal factors

1. Over the next five years, enrollment will increase to 10,000 students by fall 2003, which will require an average annual increase of 7 percent.

2. Full compliance with federal financial aid guidelines will enhance the University's ability to provide comprehensive financial aid services to students. The availability of financial aid is a major factor in a student's decision to enter, return, or continue at the University.
3. Large numbers of first-time entering students, both first-time freshmen and transfers, will require developmental education.
4. Distance education will be a major initiative to reach more students in rural parts of the State.
5. The Urban Academic Village will provide a more conducive learning environment by offering vanguard educational experiences and new campus community housing that will aid in national and international recruitment for graduate and undergraduate students.
6. Increasing retention and progression and graduation rates will be of highest priority.
7. Graduate and professional school enrollment will increase as an unintended benefit from the Hopwood ruling.
8. Accreditation of academic programs will remain a high priority to promote academic excellence and the marketability of TSU'S graduates.
9. Research opportunities will increase for faculty.
10. Computer technology and training will be upgraded to support more efficiently instruction, research, and administrative applications.
11. Tuition increases over the next five years will keep pace with inflation in order to provide quality programs and services.
12. Texas Southern University will maintain a viable and ethnically diverse faculty.

13. Texas Southern University will maintain a competitive advantage for offering the Phar.D, the Ph.D. in Environmental Toxicology, Master of Professional Accountancy, Master of Science in Transportation and Planning, and the Bachelor of Science in Airway Science as stipulated in the Texas Plan.
14. Texas Southern University will continue its commitment to Historically Underutilized Businesses in its awarding of contracts.
15. Assessment of programs and service satisfaction will be ongoing, and the results of such assessment will lead to improvements in service delivery.
16. Priorities for resource allocations will reflect planning priorities.
17. Attainment of legislative benchmarks for output, efficiency, and explanatory measures will be of highest priority.
18. Management priorities over the next five years will result in systematic planning, evaluation, and budgeting, which will increase efficiency of resource allocations, improve communications, and accountability for achievement of all institutional goals and objectives.
19. The University's development and implementation of innovative strategies for service delivery will keep pace with local and regional competition for students.

STRATEGIC GOALS 1999-2003

- Goal 1. Provide Instruction:**
We will offer high quality programs leading to our respective degrees.
- Goal 2. Conduct Research:**
We will seek solutions to the problems of the urban environs and the urban populace, particularly in the areas of education, health, the physical and social environment, domestic safety and world hunger and peace.
- Goal 3. Provide Public Service:**
We will provide quality service to the community.
- Goal 4. Provide Institutional Support and Ancillary Operations:**
We will provide institutional support, facilities, and operational units for the purpose of enhancing the ability of the University to meet its academic and service-oriented goals.
- Goal 5. Achieve Institutional Effectiveness:**
We will accomplish institutional effectiveness through an appropriate plan that includes planning and evaluation processes which integrate educational, physical, and financial development resulting in institutional improvement.
- Goal 6. Create a Positive Institutional Culture:**
We will cultivate an environment that fosters esprit de corps and pride among students, faculty, staff, alumni, the Board, and the community.