USF Tampa Graduate Theses and Dissertations

USF Graduate Theses and Dissertations

2011

In the Midst of Organizational Change: A Survey of Employee Perceptions Toward Separate Accreditation for Regional Campuses at the University of South Florida

Rhonda S. Moraca
University of South Florida, rhondamoraca@gmail.com

In the Midst of Organizational Change: A Survey of Employee Perceptions Toward

Separate Accreditation for Regional Campuses

at the University of South Florida

by

Rhonda S. Moraca

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Adult, Career and Higher Education
College of Education
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Donald A. Dellow, Ed.D.
W. Robert Sullins, Ed.D.
William H. Young III, Ed.D.
Charles E. Michaels, Ph.D.

Date of Approval:
October 19, 2011

Keywords: multi-campus system, campus identity, employee relations, inter-campus
relationships, organizational structure

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband, Joe Moraca, my best friend and partner, who has encouraged me to pursue my dreams and supported me throughout all of my educational endeavors. It is also dedicated to my daughter, Rachel Moraca, who has taught me the true meaning of life and impressed me by her motivation to learn and experience the world as a whole. I truly could not have been successful without their support and belief in me that I could accomplish this work. Lastly, to my dog, Murillo, who was with me night and day through the writing process.

Table of Contents

ii

List of Tables

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify how employees in the University of
South Florida System (USF System) perceived changes in their organizations and the
system as a result of having separate accreditation for each campus in the USF System.
This survey research provided a "snapshot" of employee perceptions at a particular point
in time. The study was unique because it provided a picture of the perceptions of
employees while each campus was at a different point in the organizational change
process. The theoretical concept from Bolman and Deal's (2003) *four frame theory* was
used to develop the dependent variables and capture the perceptions of employees. The
four dependent variables were organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus
relationships, and campus identity. Quantitative data were collected using a survey
instrument. The data were analyzed by campus, employment category, gender, and years
of employment using multivariate analysis of variance to identify significant differences
in the means between the categories for each dependent variable. Additional comments
provided by the survey respondents were analyzed using qualitative analysis to identify
emerging themes during the organizational change process.

Chapter One

Introduction

Many postsecondary educational institutions have established regional or branch campuses throughout their history to provide students access to college courses and degrees in their surrounding communities. The growth of regional campuses became a reality as part of the structure of higher education institutions after World War II. Researchers indicate several reasons for the growth of regional or branch campuses. The branch campuses provided space for over-crowded institutions to educate men and women returning from World War II (Schindler, 1952). Institutions also built branch campuses to expand offerings in other communities. Relationships were created with community colleges to extend course offerings for junior and senior level classes so that students could continue their education. Institutions were also interested in establishing prestige in communities, and heading off competition from other higher education institutions (Sammartino, 1964).

Historically, researchers found the organizational structure of universities with branch campuses determined the relationships among employees. Specifically, the research indicates that faculty members at regional campuses often did not participate in faculty meetings or in the development of administrative policies. Faculty members often were not acknowledged by their department chairpersons on the main campuses. Moreover, researchers have identified beliefs that faculty at branch campus and their teaching were "inferior" to the main campuses. The researchers indicated the physical

distance between the main campus and the branch campus contributes to the friction, as the distance inhibits face-to-face communication and is less convenient for faculty to physically attend meetings (Sammartino, 1964; Schindler, 1952).

Despite these organizational challenges, Sammartino (1964) suggested that it is easier and more cost efficient for institutions to establish branch campuses in outlying communities than to establish new institutions. Often, institutions already own land in the area because they had been planning to expand. He stated over 40 years ago "[t]he multiple-campus college is a necessary part of the expansion of higher education, and my opinion is that it will become increasingly important in this growth" (p. 506). In addition, Schindler (1952) discovered high quality education being provided at those campuses, with engaged faculty and staff, and a low-cost way of providing courses and programs for students in a more convenient location. Sammartino also suggested that the branch campuses provided small learning communities with easy access to professors and resources.

Regional or branch campuses continue to be a significant part of higher education institutions today. Their structures evolved from simple extensions of classes offered at sites other than the main campuses, to branch campuses with physical structures and partial autonomy, and finally to independent campuses with developed governance structures.

The regional campuses of the University of South Florida System (USF System) have advanced and grown to the point where they were given a mandate from the state legislature to become individually accredited. This legislation has set in motion a major organizational change, not only for the regional campuses, but for the entire university as

2

it moves to reorganize into the *USF System*. The process of separately accrediting the branch campuses had produced operational changes throughout the USF System, including changing many of the daily routines of faculty, staff, and administrators. The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions of employees in the USF System about changes that may occur related to the separate accreditation of campuses, particularly as part of an organizational change that involves moving from a large university with multiple campuses to a university system with regionally accredited institutions.

To set the stage for the reader, this dissertation begins with an overview of the demographics of Florida. Next, the historical and recent changes in the governance structure for the State University System (SUS) of Florida are described. It is crucial for the reader to understand the constant state of change surrounding the University of South Florida (USF) and the SUS prior to the legislation for separate accreditation for USF's regional campuses. Organizational changes and the history of USF and its regional campuses were provided. All of these changes have an effect on the perceptions of employees of the university. Also included in this chapter is a description of the purpose, significance, theoretical framework, research questions, limitations, and operational definitions at the time of this study for this dissertation. In addition, chapter two includes a review of the literature to support this study on the event's history that led to the decision to move toward a university system, the organization and culture of higher education institutions, the leading of organizational change, literature related to attitudinal change, and finally, a summary of the development of the research instrument.

Chapter three includes a description of the research methods and includes a description of the population, survey instrument, data collection, and analysis process. Chapter four describes the results and chapter five contains the discussion of the findings and summary of the study.

Background

This section includes the demographics of Florida, an overview of the historical and current governance structure of the SUS, and the history and restructuring process for the USF System including its regional campuses.

Demographics of Florida. According to the 2009 U.S. Census, Florida is the fourth most populous state in the United States, and since the early 1900s has experienced significant growth. Currently, 18 million people live in the state, a significant increase over the one-half million people in 1900. The state's population tripled in size from 1950 to 1980, and this coincides with the increase in demand for public higher education institutions in the state. Prior to 1956, the state had three universities. From 1956 to 1997, the state added seven more universities. In 2001, the 11th institution was added as the state's honors college. Table 1 provides the U.S. Census data on population growth in Florida from 1900 up through 2008. Table 2 contains data on the 11 public universities in the state of Florida.

Table 1

Florida's Population and Percentage Increase from 1900 to 2008

Year	Population	Percent Increase
2008 Estimate	18,328,340	1%
2006 Estimate	18,089,888	4%
2005 Estimate	17,382,511	34%
1990	12,937,926	32%
1980	9,746,324	252%
1950	2,771,305	424%
1900	528,542	

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, (1995, 2008).

Table 2

State University System of Florida Institutions

Institution		Date Founded	Fall 2008 Headcount
Florida State University	FSU	1851	39,072
University of Florida	UF	1853	51,851
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University	FAMU	1887	11,848
University of South Florida	USF	1956	46,332
University of Central Florida	UCF	1963	50,275
Florida Atlantic University	FAU	1964	27,021
University of West Florida	UWF	1967	10,516
University of North Florida	UNF	1969	15,427
Florida International University	FIU	1972	39,146
Florida Gulf Coast University	FGCU	1997	10,238
New College of Florida	NCF	2001	787
Total			302,513

Source: SUS Board of Governors (2005) Quick Facts

State University System (SUS) of Florida. As the state's population increased and universities were added, the governance structure for the state evolved. As reported in the SUS history archive (Florida Department of State, 2011), in the early 1900s, Florida began its higher education system. "In 1905, the Buckman Act created the first system of higher education in the state" (¶ 1). The Board of Control was now in charge

of three institutions the University of Florida, Florida State University, and Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University. In 1965, the Board of Regents became the governing board for the State University System:

> The Board of Regents established the policies, rules and regulations for the universities in the State University System. The Board monitored the fiscal matters of the universities; approved instructional and degree programs; coordinated program development among the state universities; and planned for the future needs of the State University System. (Florida Department of State, 2011, ¶ 2)

In an effort to align the education institutions in the state, in 2000 the Florida Legislature created the "Florida Education Governance Reorganization Act of 2000." The act created the Florida Board of Education to govern the K-20 system. This included K-12, community colleges, and the university system. In 2001, the laws of Florida were changed, the Board of Regents was dissolved, and authority for the SUS was moved to the Florida Board of Education. Within this legislation, boards of trustees were established for each of the universities, and the 11th institution, New College of Florida was established. In addition, mandates for separate accreditation and separate budget authority were authorized for two of USF's regional campuses, USF St. Petersburg (USFSP) and USF Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM). Shortly after this legislation, the governance for the state's universities was changed again when in 2002, a Florida constitutional amendment was passed that created the Board of Governors to govern the SUS in Florida (Venezia & Finney, 2006).

With these major changes within the SUS, each university took on a new

autonomy, new boards of trustees, new financial and payroll systems, and moved away

from being managed centrally by the Board of Regents. In addition to these changes,

USF had to manage the exit of its honor's college, because it became the 11th institution

in the state, New College of Florida. USF had to begin planning and creating structures

for separately accredited regional institutions.

The University of South Florida (USF) System. USF was established in 1956

as the fourth university, and four-year institution of higher education in the state, and in

an effort to serve its surrounding communities, established regional campuses. Originally

USF had five campuses, including four regional campuses. USF's 1995-96 catalog

describes the purpose of its campuses: ". . . five campuses are within reach of more than

three million people, roughly one quarter of the state's population -- in a 15-county area

. . . [the regional campuses are] designed primarily to serve students of junior, senior, and

graduate standing" (USF, 2011, pp. 8-9). The main campus is located in Tampa (USFT)

and the four regional campuses described are USF Ft. Myers (USFFM), USF St.

Petersburg (USFSP), USF Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM), and USF Polytechnic (USFP),

the latter located in Lakeland.

For the USF System, organizational change has been constant for its regional

campuses. In the late 1990's, USFFM was closed, and the Florida Legislature established

the 10th university in the state, Florida Gulf Coast University, located in Ft. Myers

(Trombley, n.d.). USFSM had shared a campus with New College in Sarasota since

1975. In 2001, the Legislature moved New College from beneath the academic

"umbrella" of USF and created the 11th institution, New College of Florida. In 2006, USFSM relocated to a new facility and continues to serve the two-county community.

To ensure that USF and its remaining regional campuses continued as one *multi-campus university*, one of the first tasks of the new university president was to develop a plan to support the regional campuses. The USF President outlined a plan for the creation of independent regional campuses (Genshaft, 2000). In 2001, the Florida Legislature passed a bill to create the new structure for the USFSP and the USFSM. This included campus boards of trustees, campus executive officers, separate budget authorities, and a mandate for separate accreditation for each campus (Florida Statute 1004.33; Florida Statute 1004.34).

USFSP had been planning for eventual separate accreditation and became the first campus administrative structure to proceed with the application for separate accreditation. While working with USFSP, the USF administration began the process of reaffirmation of its accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). This is an extensive process of self-examination of the entire university's academic and administrative processes, including its regional campuses. During this process, SACS identified the need for changes in the organizational structure for the university because SACS accreditation is for one institution. The recommendation was for the university to change its governing structure and become a *university system* with four separately accredited institutions (K. Moore, personal communication, December 11, 2008).

During the reaffirmation process, the USFSP regional campus received its approval from the University Board of Trustees (UBOT) for academic autonomy. The

9

university president issued a memorandum of delegation and this document allowed USFSP to operate independently, implement policies and procedures, and establish the structure required for separate accreditation. The UBOT minutes state the following:

> On February 10, [2004], [The USF President] signed the USF/St. Petersburg Memorandum of Delegation, which formalized academic autonomy on the USF/St. Petersburg Campus. The degrees will read *USF- St. Petersburg*, and the [University] Board of Trustees will continue to oversee this as well as all of the campuses. The campus vice president's working title of the campus is now *Regional Chancellor*, which is consistent with titles of SACS universities' systems in other states. (February 26, 2004)

In addition, during the reaffirmation process, the UBOT approved the USF System consisting of all the campuses (USFBOT, 2004). The Board of Governors confirmed the change to a "university system for accreditation purposes" (Austin, 2005). This structure will allow for more than one separately accredited institution under the governance of one UBOT.

In 2006, USFSP was the first regional campus in the state to obtain separate accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). It is now referred to as an institution. In 2008, to align the structures of all three regional campuses at USF with the main campus, the Legislature passed a bill to authorize a separate budget and authority to seek separate accreditation to USF Polytechnic (Florida Statute 1004.345).

Table 3 describes the USF System, the dates of the changes that have occurred, and those anticipated to occur, since the 2001 legislative mandate for separate accreditation for the regional campuses.

Table 3

Organizational Changes for the USF System

Timeline: Summer 2010 Pilot Study → Fall 2010 Research Study →Fall 2011 Results

USF System	Year Founded	Headcount* Fall 2009	Legislation Authorizing Separate Accreditation	Org. Change Date	Organization Change Description
USFT	1956	39,852	NA	2005	Became USF System with multi-campus units
USFSP	1965	3,900	2001	2006	Received separate accreditation from SACS and became an "institution."
USFSM	1975	2,067	2001	2010	Submitted application to SACS. Received letter of delegation from USF President.
USFP	1981	1,303	2008	2010	Anticipating letter of delegation from the USF President and beginning to prepare initial application for separate accreditation.

Source: USF System Facts 2009-2010

Problem Statement

Separate accreditation has been mandated by the Legislature for the USF's regional campuses. This external action which occurred in 2001 has directly affected the internal university structure. It specifically affects the internal working relationships among the employees in the categories of faculty, staff, and administration on the individual campuses and between the campuses.

At the time of this study all four USF campuses were focused on changing policies and procedures to develop the individual campuses, and evolving the USF System with governance under one UBOT. Previously, the provost, colleges, and units at USFT had been the leading authorities in the academic areas for the regional campuses. With the new structure of separate accreditation for the regional campuses, this relationship has changed. Now each campus is working to formulate its own individual structures to function independently. For example, each campus now has a leader that reports to the university president. Campus colleges and departments are being created. Individual faculty governance associations have been organized to develop procedures for campus tenure and promotion, and curriculum. Also, new admissions and advising offices are being developed on individual campuses. These new processes require extensive time and effort from the faculty, staff, and administrators on all four campuses.

USFSP achieved separate accreditation in 2006 and has developed internal structures and is operating as the second institution within the USF System. Moreover, USFSM has received its letter of delegation, submitted its final application for separate accreditation, and is working in conjunction with USFT to develop structures for operating independently. At the time of this study, the USFP campus was anticipating its

12

letter of delegation from the USF System President and planning for its initial application to SACS. While in the process of developing their own campuses operating procedures, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP were also working to develop procedures to operate within the USF System.

The bureaucratic process of working through the details of campus autonomy affected faculty, staff, and administrators during this organizational change process. The change from one university with three regional campuses to a *university system* with four independent institutions will likely create both positive and negative reactions of employees about specific elements of the change. Of particular concern are the perceptions of faculty, staff, and administrators about how separate accreditation will change their individual jobs, campus structure, campus culture, and campus resources. This research study was undertaken to determine the perceptions of faculty, staff, and administrators by surveying their perceptions about the campuses becoming independent and separately accredited units within the USF System.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions of employees in the USF System about how separate accreditation will change key elements of their organizations.

Each campus has been affected by this organizational change and all are at various stages in the process to attain separate accreditation for their regional campus. An employee survey of perceptions while the employees are experiencing these changes was timely and may be helpful to campus leaders in identifying issues that may need to be addressed to minimize disruption of campus activities.

13

Significance of the Study

As described in the background, the change in the organizational structure for the university has been initiated externally by the Florida Legislature and the regional accrediting agency. Separate accreditation holds the promise of greater autonomy and the ability to develop individual missions to serve the educational needs of the local communities of each regional campus. The work environment for employees with the university had begun to change, and will continue to change as the regional campuses become more autonomous. Change can challenge employees within an institution as it disrupts the normal operational structure and flow of activities (Lueddeke, 1999). For successful change, recognizing and understanding employee perceptions and then responding to the negative perceptions is crucial during the reorganization process. Understanding the perceptions of faculty, staff, and administrators can assist leaders in effectively managing the organizational change process (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

As the demand for higher education increases in the state, regional campuses are economic development resources for the state. They have access to the infrastructure of the main campus, but are located separately and can serve additional populations. Identifying employee perceptions can assist leaders and managers in responding to attitudinal problems such as employee resistance, dissatisfaction, and cynicism (Bedeian, 2007) that may emerge as the organizational structure for regional campuses evolve.

This research identified the perceptions of employees in the employment classifications of faculty, staff, and administration employed at the Tampa campus and the three regional campuses. It examined the differences in the perceptions of faculty, staff, and administration between the four campuses as the separate accreditation process

takes place across the system. The research study can be employed by other states and/or institutions considering this type of restructuring process. Also, this study adds to the research on organizational change within a university.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this case study is centered in the organizational *four frame theory* of Bolman and Deal (2003). There are a limitless number of perceptions that employees of the university could have concerning the move toward separate accreditation, so it is both practical and theoretically important to sample perceptions in a systematic way. Bolman and Deal (2003) suggest that it is helpful to view organizations from four different frames: (a) how they are structured (the Structural Frame), (b) how they treat their employees (the Human Resources Frame), (c) how they handle the politics of power and negotiation (the Political Frame), and finally, (d) how they address the cultural dimensions of their institutional activities (the Symbolic Frame). Bolman and Deal (2003) suggest that understanding an organization from these four dimensions may be helpful to leaders/administrators in addressing problems and issues that detract from an organization's productivity and success, and, thereby, manage them more effectively.

While keeping in mind the four frames of Bolman and Deal (2003), a survey was developed to query the perceptions of the USF System employees on the accreditation process across the four campuses. The perceptions queried will solicit responses to issues and activities that can be organized into the categories of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity. The independent variables will include the four campus locations and employee demographics. The

dependent variables are the perceptions of USF System employees grouped in the above four categories.

Research Questions

This research sought answers from the employees in the USF System for the following questions through a quantitative survey:

1. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of USF System employees on each of the four campuses in the areas of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity with respect to the implications of the separate accreditation of campuses with the USF System?

2. Are there any significant differences between the perceptions of employees in the areas organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity on selected demographic variables, including employee category (staff, faculty, administration), years of employment, gender, and campus location?

Delimitations

Delimitations are items that affect the external validity of the survey. This study is restricted to the population of one university. The researcher recognizes the possible bias in surveying the whole population and understands the results may not be generalized to the entire USF System population or to other populations (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009; Glass & Hopkins, 1996; Rea & Parker, 2005). A request for a complete list of employees was obtained from each campus's human resources department after permission to use human subjects was granted by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at

the USF System. Comparisons of the returned surveys were made to the list of employees by gender and employment classification to determine if the survey results could be generalized to the USF System population. Results are provided in chapter four.

Limitations

When measuring perceptions about separate accreditation for the regional campuses, the researcher acknowledges there are limitations for the research study and other factors affect the perceptions of employees. Some of the issues affecting perceptions for this study were as follows:

- The organizational change for the State University System (SUS) in 2000 may have some influence on employee perceptions. In addition to the legislative mandate for separately accredited regional campuses at USF, the SUS of Florida was totally reorganized with creation of the Florida Board of Education, devolution of the Board of Regents, and creation of individual university board of trustees.

- Florida's current economic situation, including budget cuts within the SUS and budget cuts within the USF System, may affect employee perceptions toward their employers.

- Change in leadership within departments at USF and at the regional campuses could have had an effect of employee perceptions.

- The length of employment at the campus, daily or personal situations for employees, and timing of the distribution of the instrument may have affected perceptions of employees.

- The survey items are perhaps too simplistic for complex issues for the organizational changes within the USF System.

- Researcher bias may exist because of being employed at one of the regional campuses.

The literature acknowledges the limitations specific to measurement of perceptions. One of the most difficult problems encountered is the respondents providing information that is not correct. In other words, the person taking the survey may tend to answer the questions with responses that are not truthful, but are more socially acceptable. Anderson (as cited in Dwyer, 1993) and others state there are problems with misreading the scale (Nardi, 2003; Nitko & Brookhart, 2007; Thurstone, 1928). All of the limitations are acknowledged with this research design. Thurstone (1928) states,

> All that we can do with an attitude scale is to measure the attitude expressed with the full realization that the subject may be consciously hiding his true attitude or that the social pressure of the situation made him really believe what he expresses. . . . All we can do is minimize as far as possible the conditions that prevent our subjects from telling the truth, or else to adjust our interpretation accordingly. (p. 534)

Operational Definition of Terms

The following operational definitions of terms are provided as of the time of the study in September 2010.

Administration. Formerly known as Administrative & Professional (A&P) employees. They are employees not covered by collective bargaining who provide salaried support to the institution. Positions range from coordinators to vice presidents,

18

within the university. Faculty employees with administrative assignments are not included in the administration employment category. The term *administration* will be referred to as *administrator* throughout the document.

Adjunct faculty. Faculty members who teach at the university on a part-time, course by course basis with no benefits. The adjunct faculty members are classified as Other Personnel Services (OPS) employees.

Branch (regional) campus. "A subsidiary campus of a university that is geographically distant from the main institution, but operates under the aegis of the central administration that may or may not be on the main campus. The campus may be officially called a branch or regional campus. The campus is a permanent facility, with resident administrators and faculty, which is created to serve a local or specific educational need in the area" (Hill, 1985, p. 10).

Campus. Term used throughout the document and will refer to the four campuses within the USF System (USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP).

Clerical/Administrative part-time employees. Temporary employees who work on an hourly or salaried basis in office support positions with no benefits. The employees are classified as OPS employees.

Employees. Faculty, staff, and administrative employees, employed in positions with benefits within the USF System.

Faculty. Includes teaching and faculty in administrative positions such as provost, vice provost, deans, etc., in benefited positions within the USF System. Also, includes tenured, non-tenured, visiting, continuous commitment, and administrative faculty positions.

Institution. USF System campuses are referred to as an *institution* and not a *campus* once they achieve separate SACS accreditation.

Memorandum (Letter) of Delegation. Letter issued from the university president delegating authority to the regional campus leader on behalf of the campus prior to the campus receiving separate accreditation.

Multi-campus system. A main campus and additional regional campuses located at varied geographic locations that define the entire university.

Organizational change. The process of changing the university into a *system* with four institutions, and changing the regional campuses' structure to separately accredited institutions.

Other Personnel Services (OPS). A classification of temporary employees who work on an hourly or salaried basis with no benefits.

Separate accreditation. Regional campuses become institutions and are independently accredited by SACS, a regional accreditation agency.

Staff. Support employees to the faculty and administration which are covered by the Collective Bargaining Unit. These employees were formally known as University Support Personnel System (USPS) employees.

University of South Florida Polytechnic (USFP). The newest of the three regional campuses at the university located in Lakeland. At the time of this study the campus was anticipating its letter of delegation from USF System president and was beginning the application process for separate accreditation.

University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM). The second oldest of the three regional campuses. At the time of this study, the campus had received its

letter of delegation and has submitted its final application to SACS for separate accreditation.

University of South Florida at St. Petersburg (USFSP). The oldest regional campus of the three campuses and in 2006, achieved separate accreditation from SACS. It is now the second institution within the USF System.

University of South Florida System (USF System). At the time of this study, the USF System was comprised of two separately accredited institutions, USF and USF St. Petersburg. USF includes the main campus in Tampa, its College of Marine Science in St. Petersburg, USF Health, and two regional campuses, USF Sarasota-Manatee and USF Polytechnic, located in Lakeland.

University of South Florida Tampa (USFT). The main campus established in 1956 consisting of the central services located in Tampa.

Chapter Summary

Regional campuses became a significant part of the higher education system in the mid 1950s and are a substantial part of the communities they serve. The growth of Florida's population demanded the establishment of the universities within the state system in the 1950s. The Florida Legislature and the USF System continue to contribute to this growth with the development of the multi-campus system including separately accredited regional campuses. Multi-campus universities are an economical resource for state postsecondary education systems because they can expand their expertise to surrounding communities while sharing central services.

As part of the university's development, attention to employee perceptions is critical as the employees provide the intellectual capital and support services for the

institutions' main product, teaching, research, and services for the community. The employees at the USF System have experienced much change in the organizational structure of their university, and identifying employee perceptions will enable management to make informed decisions during this time of organizational change. They are essential in making the change process work to the advantage of the newly formed institutions and the USF System. The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions of employees in the USF System about the most pressing changes that occur with the separate accreditation of campuses, particularly as part of an organizational change that involves moving from a large university with multiple campuses to a university system with regionally accredited institutions.

As an employee at the USFSM at the time of this study, I have had the opportunity to serve in staff and administration positions over the past 16 years. My experience has primarily been working with faculty and administrators in academic affairs. I became interested in pursuing this study in the Fall 2006, when I began my doctoral studies at USF. As an employee from the USFSM who has experienced the organizational change process since 2001, my hope is that this study will be helpful to the leaders at USF's system institutions in understanding the perceptions of employees while they are participating in this major organizational process.

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study was to identify how employees in the USF System perceive changes in their organizations and the system as a result of having separate accreditation for each campus in the USF System. Bolman and Deal (2003), Kotter (1996), Bennis (2003) and many others suggest that leaders are able to make better decisions when they have more accurate information about employees' perceptions about issues related to their work. This study identified administrators, faculty, and staff perceptions about the separate accreditation process that may be useful to the administration as the organization change unfolds.

Kezar (2001) suggests there is limited research on individual reactions to organizational change within higher education institutions. This study adds to the research literature in the area of organization change by surveying college employees during the process of changing a large urban university with branch campuses into a university system with separately accredited institutions. The unique feature of this research is that employee perceptions about organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity was surveyed while the change is occurring, and with the campuses in various stages of separate accreditation. In September, 2010, the USF System was five years old. USFSP had been a separately accredited institution for four years. USFSM had been operating under its letter of delegation for one year, and had submitted its final application to SACS. USFP was

anticipating receiving its letter of delegation from the university president and began preparation of its SACS application. This chapter describes the university, the history leading to the decision to move toward a university system, organization and culture of higher education institutions, leadership during organizational change, literature related to employee perceptions and organizational change, and concludes with a summary of the development of the research instrument.

History and Transformation to a University System

The history of the University of South Florida Tampa (USFT) dates back to 1956 when the institution was established as the fourth university in the state of Florida. As the state's population grew, the demand for higher education increased and USFT expanded its mission and added branch campuses. USF St. Petersburg (USFSP) was established in 1965, USF Fort Myers (USFFM) in 1974, USF Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM) in 1975, consisting of a two year upper level university program and sharing the campus with New College a four year liberal arts program, and USF Polytechnic (USFP) in 1981, located in Lakeland (Greenberg, 2006).

Throughout the history of USF, its campuses continued to grow and evolve to meet the higher education needs of the population in their respective communities. Two of USF's campuses have been restructured as independent education institutions within the State University System. The USFFM campus was dissolved in 1990 and this site became Florida Gulf Coast University, Florida's 10th university. In 2001, New College, the four year liberal arts college that shared the USFSM campus, became Florida's 11th institution, New College of Florida.

The transformation to a *university system* began in 2001. During this Legislative process, the USFSP campus leaders expressed their desire to have more autonomy and control over their budget and academic programs to meet the needs of their community. Therefore, the president of the university presented a plan for separately accredited campuses within USF to the State Legislature (Genshaft, 2000). This resulted in the State Legislature passing a law to require separate accreditation for the USFSP and the USFSM regional campuses of the USF (Florida Statute 1004.33 and 1004.34). In 2008, this Legislation was extended to USFP (Florida Statute 1004.345).

The 2001 Legislation mandating separate accreditation for the regional campuses at the university required the attention of the regional accreditation agency and set in motion a transformation in the organizational structure of the University of South Florida. In December, 2002, the regional accreditation agency, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) approved a policy statement titled "Separate Accreditation for Units of a Member Institution." This document provides the accreditation guidelines for *extended units* which are mature and have the ability to be autonomous from the parent institution. The extended units are required to have degree granting authority, a governing board, a chief executive officer, an institutional mission, institutional effectiveness, continuous operation, program length, program content, general education, contractual agreements for instruction, faculty, learning resources and services, and student support services and resources (SACSCOC, 2002).

As USF moved forward with its plans for separate accreditation for its campuses during its reaffirmation process, the accrediting agency recommended the governance

structure for the university be changed to a USF System with four separately accredited

institutions. The reason for this change was because SACS views each institution as

separately accredited, and each institution must meet SACS regional accreditation

standards on its own merit (K. Moore, personal communication, December 11, 2008). In

2004, the University of South Florida Board of Trustees (USFBOT) approved the USF

System (USFBOT, 2004). In 2005, the Florida SUS recognized USF as the USF System

for accreditation purposes (Austin, 2005). This provided the university governance

structure for more than one institution to be separately accredited. In 2006, the USFSP

achieved all of the stated requirements by SACS and was granted separate accreditation

and became the second institution within the USF System (USFSP, 2006).

Much was learned in the five years it took for USFSP to achieve separate

accreditation about the organizational structure that needed to occur within the university,

and within each of the regional campuses. The USF System had to be created to include

new system policies and procedures for the two regional campuses, USFSM and USFP,

and the two separately accredited institutions, USFT and USFSP. Policies and

procedures and organizational structures had to be created for each campus. A multitude

of decisions and changes had to be made, and are in the process of being made, about

centralized services for the system, and independent services for each campus.

To illustrate, prior to the legislation, all USF System faculty members, including

those on the regional campuses were members of centralized academic units and reported

to their respective academic deans and department chairs at USFT. The staff followed

the rules and academic policy directives from the university college deans and

administrators. With the new structure, faculty and administrators at each campus have

the ability to act independently with regards to academics. New academic colleges and departments are forming for each campus. Each campus has or is developing a faculty governance organization and a tenure and promotion plan which directly affect the faculty members of the institution. New admission policies and criteria are being developed for each campus. All of these changes require the effort of the employees and affect their day-to-day work environment as the institution transforms into a university system with four separate institutions. Commitment and dedication from employees are essential.

Organization and Culture of Higher Education Institutions

Making organizational changes within a large, public higher education institution requires a strong, committed leader that understands the dynamics of the organizational structure and culture, and has the ability to communicate effectively throughout the change process to all constituents. The major reasons for change are a crisis, outside pressure, and strong leaders (Rowley, Lujan, & Dolence, 1997). External and internal pressures are also reasons for change (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999; Kezar, 2001). Kezar (2001) states, "although planned change is often a response to external factors, the impetus for the changes is usually internal" (p. 15).

Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1997) and Guskin (1996) surmise that higher education institutions are slow to change. Multiple governance layers, internal and external, to the institution enable the slow change process. States are responsible for providing higher education to the public and have the governing authority over public institutions with laws and legislation (Birnbaum, 1988). Within higher education institutions, faculty members and administrators participate in shared governance and can

27

influence and slow the change process. Keller (2001) defines this as "the part teaching

scholars play in the administration, control, standards, and long-term management of the

institution at which they work" (p. 304).

Another important concept to understand within the higher education structure as

higher education institutions move through organizational change is explained by

Birnbaum (1988). He describes departments within higher education as "loosely

coupled" and uses the terms to describe how the departments and units within higher

education systems are connected. He explains that some units are tightly coupled,

meaning that each change from one unit has an equal reaction in another unit. With loose

coupling, units work independently while at times the coupling meets another department

and there is a reaction between the units. Birnbaum (1988) states that loose coupling

creates the appearance leaders are indecisive, wasteful and inefficient. In contrast, loose

coupling allows each department within the institution to focus and specialize on their

discipline and not be affected by what is happening in other areas. Loose coupling allows

departments to react to external forces more independently, while providing the ability

for the departments to be an integral part of the higher education institution.

Birnbaum's (1988) circular system's model explains the influence loosely

coupled units have on each other during organizational change. He states "change in one

part of the organization may affect other parts through a sequence of relationships, rather

than directly. . .(s)mall initial actions may have extremely large consequences, and

because the interaction is non-linear, the outcomes may not be predictable and are often

quite different from those originally intended" (p. 52). Leading an organization

undergoing major change like the reorganization at USF requires an understanding of the organizational structure, culture and communication process.

Collaboration between the faculty and the administration in higher education institutions is part of the culture. Leaders must understand faculty governance and provide opportunities for discussion about the changes among the faculty and staff. The ability to communicate and participate in conversations about change allows faculty and staff to understand the concepts behind the change. Weick and Wheeton (1995) defines sensemaking as "the making of sense" (p. 4). "When people put stimuli into frameworks, this enables them "to comprehend, understand, explain, attribute, extrapolate, and predict" (Starbuck & Milliken, 1988, p. 51, as cited in Weick & Wheeton, (1995). Senge (1990) describes communication and sharing of information as *reflective openness* with this being the ability of individuals to reflect upon their own ideas and open up their minds to examine other's ideas. The challenge for leaders to provide avenues for communication within higher education institutions is compounded by loose coupling and the diverse functions within the institution.

Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence (1997) remind us that higher education institutions are slow to change because of "traditions stretching back to the medieval days in European history" (p. 6). Communication among faculty about change is essential to bringing the faculty on board with the change efforts. Bolman and Deal's (2003) symbolic frame emphasizes the importance of ceremonies, rituals, and events during organizational change. They describe Mangham and Overington's (1987) theory of *theatre* with employees as the actors playing out the drama during the organizational change process. Meetings, ceremonies, and events become a *theatre* and the place where

29

symbols and cultures are formed while allowing employees to participate in the events of the organizational change.

Bolman and Deal (1991) state, "faced with uncertainty and ambiguity, human beings create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, and provide direction" (p. 244). Within their *four frame theory*, the symbolic frame "express[es] an organizations' culture as the interwoven patterns of beliefs, values, practices, and artifacts that defines for members who they are and how they are to do things. . .[the] culture is the glue that holds an organization together and unites people around shared values and beliefs" (Bolman & Deal, 2003, pp. 242-243).

The organizational structure and culture within higher education institutions add to the complex nature and leisurely progression of change within the institution. USF employees have been experiencing the change process of moving toward a USF System with separately accredited campuses since 2001. Within this large organization, a survey of employee perceptions during organizational change can provide an avenue to examine the opinions of employees. The next section of this literature review examines other research studies on employee perceptions during organization change.

Employee Perceptions During Organizational Change

Change in the workplace creates uncertainty for employees and administration and the empirical studies of employees during organizational change are described as follows. Isabella (1990) describes four interpretive stages for employees as anticipation, confirmation, culmination, and aftermath. Denial, resistance, exploration, and commitment are the four stages described by Jaffee, Scott, and Tobe's (1994) study. Their research identifies the beginning stages where employees share information and

rumors develop as employees speculate on the upcoming change. Uncertainty and

rumors cause anxiety, denial, and uneasiness among employees. Resistance may be

expressed with employees becoming ill or insecure. Some employees may choose to

leave the organization, while others may call in sick more often, or not engage in work

activities. Moving to the next stages employees receive reliable information about the

upcoming changes and this relieves some of the tension, and steers employees to begin

the process of concentrating on changing their work structures, including their tasks and

job responsibilities. Finally the change is complete. Employees return to normal and

settle into their new work environment and reflect on the new, versus the old, way of

operating.

Bolman and Deal (2003) address barriers to change for employees within their

four frame theory. For the structural frame, "loss of clarity and stability, confusion and

chaos" are felt by employees. For the human resources frame, the employees feel

"anxiety, uncertainty, [and] people feel incompetent and needy." The barriers for the

political frame are "disempowerment, [and] conflict between winners and losers."

Employees feel a "loss of meaning and purpose; clinging to the past" within the symbolic

frame (p. 372). The *four frame theory* divides the feelings from employees about the

change process into four areas to explain the multiple barriers within the change process.

As the researchers (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Isabella, 1990; Jaffee, Scott, & Tobe, 1994)

have shown, change is difficult for employees. Leaders are challenged with calming and

motivating employees while instilling trust and security among employees to ward off

negative implications from employees' post-organizational change.

However, employee cynicism can develop during the organizational change process. Employee cynicism is defined as positive and negative within the research. Bedeian (2007) defines the term positively as "an attitude resulting from a critical appraisal of the motives, actions, and values of one's employing organization. . .the word critical is not meant to denote a readiness to find fault, but rather to imply careful evaluation and judgment" (p. 11). In contrast, Dean, Brandes, and Dharwadkar (1998) define cynicism as "a negative attitude toward one's employing organization, comprising of three dimensions: (1) a belief that the organization lacks integrity; (2) negative affect toward the organization; and (3) tendencies to disparaging and critical behaviors toward the organization that are consistent with those beliefs and affect" (p. 345).

Organizational cynicism describes employees as uncommitted, unmotivated, unhappy, and untrusting of their leaders during and after the change in the organizations (Bedeian, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Reichers, Wanous, & Austin, 1997; Schweiger & DeNisi, 1991). In addition, other studies showed the intent of employees to undermine the organizational change efforts (Clarke 1983; Gioia & Thomas, 1996; Schabracq & Cooper, 1998). Also, researchers argued that employees experiencing cynicism during organizational change become ill, and sick leave usage increases (Wahlstedt & Edling, 1997).

Bedeian's (2007) survey of 2,640 faculty members revealed "faculty with higher levels of cynicism are less apt to experience a sense of oneness with their employing university and be less psychologically intertwined with its fate" (p. 24). They also discovered that faculty members who are not satisfied tend to seek employment at other

institutions. Employee cynicism expresses negative perceptions and behaviors among employees during organizational change.

Indeed, the above studies manifest the importance of understanding the perceptions of employees and describe the struggles employees and leaders face during the change process. Guskin (1996) points out that "change is difficult, painful and an uncertain leap into an unknown future. . .challenges the comfort of the group. . . [and employees] bristle at having the will of others imposed on them" (p. 4-5). Attitudes are an integral part of each employee and can be positive or negative. An employee's perception is formed by information provided to them whether it is hearsay or facts. Rajecki (1982) describes a person's attitude as "the private experiences [that] develop along the way from single or multiple experiences" (p. 4-5). Surveying employees within the USF System as they are experiencing a significant change within the institution provides an avenue for communication between leaders and employees of the large institution.

Sharing information and involving employees in the decision making process was found as a positive strategy in Brown and Cregan's (2008) survey of a large public employer in Australia. Reichers, Wanous, and Austin's (1997) study revealed that a buy-in from employees is often necessary for change to be successful. Communication is essential during organization change especially within a large public institution such as the USF System.

In an organization such as the USF System, change cannot be mandated from the top because of a strong culture of faculty governance and *loosely coupled* units.

33

Experienced leaders recognize the need to understand leading change in this type of environment along with understanding employee perceptions during the change process.

Leading Organizational Change

As described in the research studies, cynicism involves a lack of trust among leaders from employees involved in organizational change. Leading change requires attention to detail within the organization and outside of the organization. Researchers (Bennis, 2003; Bolman & Deal, 2003; Collins, 2001; Kotter, 1996; and Kouzes & Posner, 2003) have developed leadership models and practices for leading change in organizations and they are reviewed below.

Kouzes and Posner (2003) have developed five practices for leading change. They are as follows: (a) modeling the way, (b) inspiring a shared vision, (c) challenging the process, (d) enabling others to act, and (e) encouraging the heart. These practices involve building trust and integrity among employees during the organizational change process. Kouzes and Posner describe communicating and listening as important attributes of leaders. In addition, telling stories, celebrating victories, visiting employees in their work environments, listening to their suggestions, and collecting ideas can benefit leaders and build trust among employees. Educating employees and finding ways to renew employees during the change process is essential. Also, being a cheerleader and expressing sincere appreciation can make the process smoother for leaders and employees during the change process. Conducting a survey about perceptions of employees reveals an interest in the positive and negative perceptions of employees and suggests that leaders are interested in the opinions of employees. Finding out about the

perceptions can assist leaders in determining the right balance to move employees through the change process.

Kotter's (1996) theoretical approach to leading change and making transformation in an institution is described in the following eight stages: (a) establishing a sense of urgency, (b) creating the guiding coalition, (c) developing a vision and strategy, (d) communicating the change vision, (e) empowering employees for broad-based action, (f) generating short term wins, (g) consolidating gains and producing more change, and (h) anchoring new approaches in the culture. His research is based on the considerable amount of change in the corporate world and evaluation of successes and failures within organizations. Specifically, leaders need to communicate the importance and "urgency" of the need to make changes and provide assistance and guidance to make the changes. Leaders are dependent upon the behavioral changes of employees at all levels throughout an institution to instill new ways of doing business in order to make the change successful. Without this support, the change will not happen. Recognizing the soft skills needed by leaders is important. Kotter expresses the importance of talking with employee and celebrating victories, while not breaking the momentum of the change process. This can be a delicate balance for leaders. He reminds leaders to reward employees, change job descriptions, and not let the old ways of doing business get in the way of making changes. Successful leaders acknowledge the people within the organization are the driving force for successful change and understanding perceptions, and gauging employee throughout the change can assist leaders in managing the change process.

Collins's (2001) *Good to Great* research compares the leadership of good companies to the leadership of great companies. One aspect is the emphasis on hiring the right people for the job and then listening and understanding the facts in an effort to know the truth during organizational change. His research describes creating culture where employees are free to provide input and be heard by the leaders. Communication within a large institution experiencing organizational change such as the USF System can open up conversations and provide valuable input during the transition process.

Bennis (2003) describes successful leadership in a changing environment with the following four concepts: (a) engaging others by creating shared meaning, (b) distinctive voice, (c) integrity, and (d) adaptive capacity. He emphasizes that "every organization's primary resource is its people" (p. 172). Communicating and listening to employees provides an avenue for sharing the meaning of the transformation within an institution. The ability of leaders to ask for input so that they can receive information during a transformation is essential to managing the change.

Bolman and Deal's (2003) *four frame theory* provides four lenses for leaders to view and understand the concept of change. The *four frame theory* includes structural, human resources, political and symbolic. They explain that "reframing requires an ability to understand and use multiple perceptions, to think about the same thing in more than one way" (p. 5). In their research they address specific leadership styles for each of the frames. For the structural frame the leader is an analyst or architect; human resource frame the leader is catalyst and/or servant; political frame leader is advocate and/or negotiator; and the symbolic frame the leader is a prophet and/or poet.

36

In summary, all of the models (Bennis, 2003; Bolman & Deal, 2003; Collins, 2001; Kotter, 1996; and Kouzes & Posner, 2003) emphasize communication, integrity, and supporting employees during the organizational change process. They each focus on the importance of employees and leaders during the change process. As USF transforms itself into a university system with separately accredited campuses, this is an opportune time to study the perceptions of employees who are experiencing a significant change process within a large public university and add to the research in this area. Surveying employees is an efficient mechanism to reach the large number of employees and acquire their opinions about this transformation process. The following section describes the background and model used to develop the survey for this research study.

Development of the Perception Survey

The new structure within the university provides for an opportunity to study the change and add to the research on the perceptions of employees during this organizational change process within a university. In an effort to capture the perceptions of employees during this organizational change process, the researcher has developed a survey instrument using the Bolman and Deal's (2003) *four frame theory* as a guide. Bolman and Deal's model is divided into *four frames*. The structural frame addresses the patterns of work flow throughout the organization. The human resources frame addresses the institutional need for quality employees, and the need of employees to have a place to work and use their talents. Scarce resources, power, and internal and external forces describe the political frame, while the culture and perceptions of an institution are addressed in the symbolic frame. The assumptions of these frames were used to develop the survey items to identify the perceptions of employees within the four categories of

organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity for each of the four campuses at their present stage of organizational transformation.

The part of the survey that represents the structural frame seeks to determine the perceptions of employees about how separate accreditation will change decision making, campus goals and objectives, and effective operations for campuses and the USF System as a whole. Bolman and Deal (2003) suggest that if an organization's structure is aligned properly, then its operations will be smoother, more efficient, and more productive.

The human resource frame addresses how employees perceive their working conditions and the institutions appreciation of its employees within an institution. Bolman and Deal (2003) explain that an organization is made up of people who need jobs and an institution that needs employees to accomplish its goals. Employees can be a good fit or not a good fit within an organization. Employees need to feel as if they are part of the organization and have a sense of value and worth within the working environment (Maslow, 1954). The survey for this study was designed to determine the perceptions of employees about meaningful and satisfying work, working conditions, feelings of isolation, workload, and job responsibilities for separately accredited campuses.

The political frame of Bolman and Deal addresses power, negotiating and finance acquisition issues of employees. Bolman and Deal (2003) describe "organizations as living, screaming political areas that host a complex web of individual and group interests" (p. 186). The political frame perspective of the survey was designed to determine USF System employees' perceptions about how separate accreditation would

38

change support for local communities, create the potential for increased competition for scarce resources, and change the potential for independent decisions by campuses.

The symbolic frame "express[es] an organizations' culture, the interwoven patterns of beliefs, values, practices, and artifacts that define for members who they are and how they are to do things" (p. 243). With the new change in the organization, the survey sought to determine whether employees felt that campus cultures would change for the USF System and for the individual campuses. Specifically, the last section of the survey instrument addressed issues of prestige, and campus/community perceptions of quality and the benefits of serving local communities.

Chapter Summary

In summary, the literature review examined the history that lead to the decision to move toward a university system, the organization and culture of higher education institutions, leadership during organizational change, and literature related to attitudinal change, and concluded with a summary of the development of the research instrument. This literature supports this study to identify the perceptions of employees in the USF System about the separate accreditation of campuses as part of an organizational change that involves moving from a large university with multiple campuses to a university system with regionally accredited institutions. The next chapter will explain the methods used in this research study.

Chapter Three

Methods

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions of employees in the USF System about the most pressing changes that occur with the separate accreditation of campuses, particularly as part of an organizational change that involves moving from a large university with multiple campuses to a university system with regionally accredited institutions. This chapter will present the methods that were used to address the following research questions for this study.

1. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of USF System employees on each of the four campuses in the areas of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity with respect to the implications of the separate accreditation of campuses with the USF System?

2. Are there significant differences between the perceptions of employees in the area's organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity on selected demographic variables, including employee category (staff, faculty, administration), years of employment, gender, and campus location?

The chapter is organized as follows: setting, population, research design, instrument description and development, distribution of the survey instrument, and data collection and analysis.

Setting

The USF System was approved by the University of South Florida Board of Trustees (UBOT) in 2004 and by the Board of Governors (BOG) in 2005 for accreditation purposes. The USF System is one of eleven public universities in the State University System of Florida. In 2001, the Florida Legislature passed a bill authorizing separate accreditation for the regional campuses at the USF to allow the campuses to plan individual missions, and develop full academic programs to better serve their communities. This legislative action initiated a change in the structure of the regional campuses, and in the USF's organizational structure as a whole. Austin's (2005) letter summarizes the organizational change and states that for more than one campus to be separately accredited by SACS, the university needs to become a *system*.

At the time of this survey in September 2010, the USF System had four locations in Florida. The main campus, USFT is located in Tampa and was established in 1956. It is a highly research intensive institution and a residential campus serving over 39,000 undergraduate, graduate and doctoral students. USFSP is the second largest institution within the USF System and is located in St. Petersburg. Established in 1965, it serves over 3,900 students, is a residential campus, and offers undergraduate and graduate degrees. Moreover, in 2006, USFSP received its separate SACS accreditation and operates as an independent institution. In 1975, the USFSM campus was established and it now serves over 2000 students with junior and senior upper division classes and graduate programs. The campus is located in Sarasota. This campus has received its letter of delegation from the USF System president and has authority to act as an independent regional campus while proceeding with its SACS application process.

USFSM has submitted its application to SACS and is seeking separate accreditation. The newest of the four campuses is USFP, located in Lakeland. It was established in 1981 and currently serves over 1300 students with upper level undergraduate and graduate programs. The campus is anticipating receipt of its letter of delegation and is preparing its SACS application.

The organizational change has definitely affected the university employees. Prior to separate accreditation, all authority for work processes and academic units for USFSP, USFSM, and USFP flowed through the USFT administration. With separate accreditation for the regional campuses, the work processes are changing for all four campuses. For example, when USFSP achieved separate accreditation, the responsibility for student services and academic programs shifted to the faculty, administration, and staff at USFSP, while the business systems remain centrally located at USFT. Thus, student records, personnel, and purchase systems are housed at USFT. Previously, the faculty members at USFSP were members of the academic departments in Tampa, but now are members of new departments and colleges at USFSP. The USFSP administrative and staff employees report directly to the regional chancellor of the institution and function more autonomously.

Work processes and responsibilities were still being refined at the time of this study. They continue to change as USF becomes a *system* and the two other regional campuses achieve separate accreditation. All of this change creates stress on the employees including frustrations with new procedures or lack of them. Employees at all four campuses are experiencing these issues.

The researcher was interested in employee perceptions pertaining to issues of separate accreditation for the regional campuses, specifically during the university's organizational change. The change of separate accreditation for the regional campuses is a slow process, and each campus was at a different point in time as described earlier. Perceptions can be positive or negative as a person learns and moves through the change process (Rajecki, 1982). Thurstone (1928) describes the concept *attitude* as "the sum total of a man's inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specific topic" (p. 531).

Kezar (2001) describes the need for studies on organizational change within higher education institutions. She specifically states that there is a lack of research during the organizational change process. This study added to this research base. The next section will describe the employees in the USF System and the population for the study.

Population

The population for this study was the employees within the USF System. There were four subgroups, one from each of the four campuses. The USF Health employees were excluded because they are considered a separate entity from USFT. The employee classifications of faculty, staff, and administration at each of the four campuses made up the population. These specific classifications were chosen based on the fact that the majority of these employees are full-time. Moreover, they are regularly involved in the university's decisions and work processes. Temporary and student employees were not included in the population.

The faculty classification included faculty in teaching and administrative positions. The administration category, formerly known as Administrative & Professional (A&P), consisted of salaried employees on yearly contracts. Throughout this document, the administration category employees may be referred to as *administrators*. These positions include directors, coordinators, and mid-level employees that provide administrative support to the institution. The third classification was staff, and is formerly known as University Support Personnel System (USPS). These employees are exempt and non-exempt clerical and support staff and are covered by collective bargaining within the university.

Table 4 provides the population divided by the subgroups for each of the campuses. The subgroups for the three regional campuses were significantly smaller than the USFT subgroup. To be consistent in the survey procedures for the regional campus subgroups and USFT, all employees received a survey and random sampling was not used. Gay, Mills and Airasian, (2009) state, "for smaller populations, say, N=100 or fewer, there is little point in sampling: survey the entire population" (p. 133). While the entire population was large, the subgroups for selected campuses were small.

Table 4

Population for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP

Employees	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP
Faculty	2026	139	62	62
Staff	1853	96	41	26
Administration	1793	83	53	36
Total	5672	318	156	124

Research Design

A case study using a survey instrument to collect the data was used as the research design. The use of the survey instrument allows the researcher to request and gather data from the population and examine the perceptions of employees about the issue of separate accreditation for the regional campuses.

The self-report, survey instrument was used to collect data on the perceptions of employees from the four campuses at the USF System about *separate accreditation* for the three regional campuses. Each survey contained the same items. An electronic survey was used to collect data from employees at USFSP, USFSM and USFP at their particular point in the organizational change process of separate accreditation. An electronic survey was used to collect data from the USFT employees on the issues of separate accreditation for the regional campuses.

The research design was based on Bolman and Deal's (2003) *four frame theory* and was used as a guide to develop the categories of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity for measurement of the perceptions of employees toward separate accreditation for each subgroup.

Instrument Description

There were four survey instruments, one specifically for each of the four campuses within the USF System. The four instruments are titled as follows:

- USF Tampa (USFT) Employee Survey of Perceptions towards Separate Accreditation for USF's Regional Campuses/Institutions

- USF St. Petersburg (USFSP) Employee Survey of Perceptions towards Separate Accreditation for USFSP

- USF Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM) Employee Survey of Perceptions towards Separate Accreditation for USFSM

- USF Polytechnic (USFP) Employee Survey of Perceptions towards Separate Accreditation for USFP

The survey instruments are provided in Appendices 23 through 26. Additionally, the survey instruments are organized into sections. Section one is the demographic information and includes classification of employees, gender, number of years employed at the campus, and previous campus employment. Sections two through six contain 25 survey items using the Likert-type scale. There are seven items for organizational structure, seven items for employee relations, six items for inter-campus relationships, and five items for campus identity. Section seven contains five open ended items. They address major strengths, major limitations, communication, support for separate accreditation, and benefits to personal situations because of separate accreditation.

Research supports the layout and description of the instrument. Spector and Michaels (1983) state that the order of the demographic variables and the survey items within the survey do not affect the validity of the survey results. The Likert-type scale

was used in the survey instrument as it allows for each response to be measured positively or negatively on a numerical scale (Dwyer, 1993). Nardi (2003) describes Likert-type scales as intensity measures that allow perceptions or opinions to be measured based on the degree of intensity of the response. An additional alternative of "don't know" was added for employees that did not know or did not have any knowledge about the specific survey item. Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007) state ,"One method of dealing with the issue of respondents who lack familiarity with a topic is to include a 'no opinion' option as the response alternative for each perception item" (p. 235).

Instrument Development

The researcher began the development of the instrument by randomly listing items about feelings and beliefs of separate accreditation, specifically related to Bolman and Deal's (2003) *four frame theory*. Individual meetings with faculty administrators from each of the four USF System campuses were set up to review and gather input on the survey items of the instrument. At each meeting, the researcher explained the purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions of employees in the USF System about the most pressing changes that occur with the separate accreditation of campuses, particularly as part of an organizational change that involves moving from a large university with multiple campuses to a university system with regionally accredited institutions.

The researcher explained the Bolman and Deal (2003) *four frame theory* and the organization of the research instrument. The following questions were used as a guide for discussion:

- Would this survey be helpful to you as an administrator of your campus?

- What are the issues you would like to have addressed in the survey instrument?

- Would you suggest being more specific about particular items within these categories?

- Would it be useful to have two surveys—one for faculty and one for staff?

- Would it be useful to have a separate survey for the Tampa campus?

- Would it be useful to add the area of employment on the campuses?

- Are there any problematic items that should not be included in the instrument?

- Could you suggest a staff and faculty member to meet with to get their input on the survey instrument?

Each faculty administrator provided input and comments on the survey items and these suggestions were incorporated into the survey instrument. This provided content validity for the instrument. In addition, approval and support were received for administering the survey to all of the USF System employees.

To further validate the contents of the survey instrument, selected faculty, staff and administrators reviewed the instrument for content clarity. Two reviewers were knowledgeable about the Bolman and Deal's (2003) *four frame theory*, and provided content validity on the items. All suggestions and comments were considered, and adjustments were made to the items on the instrument.

Next, the survey instrument was input into an electronic format and distributed to doctoral students to gather further input on the content, clarity, and ease of use of the survey instrument. Survey items containing more than one issue and spacing issues were identified and the researcher incorporated revisions into the instruments for clarity.

Pre-Testing

After fine-tuning the instrument, cognitive interviews were used to validate and reduce measurement error on the survey instrument. Collins (2003) describes the cognitive interview question and answer model which includes the four areas of comprehension, retrieval, decision or judgment, and responses. The following provides definitions of each of the terms:

- Comprehension is "whether the respondent understands the question in the same way as the researcher intended" (p. 232).

- Retrieval is defined as "having comprehended the question the respondent then (usually) has to retrieve the relevant information from long-term memory, be it factual or attitudinal" (p. 232).

- Judgment or decision is "seen as the process by which respondent formulate their answers to a survey question. . .whether they understand the question [or] whether the question applies to their situation" (p. 233).

- Response is divided into two areas. *Formatting Response* is "having formed a judgment the respondent then often has to fit his or her answer into one of the pre-specified answers being offered. This response formatting process is required where a closed answer is required, with the predefined answers having already been designed by the researcher" (p. 234). *Editing the response* allows "respondents. . .to edit their answers before they communicate it because they may want to conform to notions of social desirability and self-presentation. These effects may be more profound in

face-to-face interviews than telephone or self-completion data collection

methods." (p. 234)

Cognitive interviews. To apply the theory, the researcher developed cognitive

interview questions based on the content of the survey instrument. The questions were

modeled after questions provided by Collins (2003) and from Hogarty, Vasquez and

Laframboise (personal communication, October 23, 2009) cognitive interview process.

Table 5 provides the list of questions used in the interviews.

Table 5

Cognitive Interview Questions

Area	Question
Comprehension	1. What does the term "separate accreditation" mean to you?
	2. What do you think the survey items are asking you about?
	Follow up for survey items OS1-OS8 (organizational structure)
	a. Accelerate
	b. Effectively
	c. Independent decisions
	d. University system
	Follow up for survey items ER1-ER7 (employee relations)
	a. Meaningful and satisfying work
	b. Improve working conditions
	c. Increase responsibilities
	Follow up for survey items ICR1-ICR5 (inter-campus relationships)
	a. Increase competition
	b. Scarce resources
	Follow up for survey items CI1-CI6 (campus identity)
	a. Prestige and perception
	b. Isolation
	c. Separate identity
	d. Enhance public understanding
Retrieval	1. Can you provide examples of work issues or descriptive words that come to mind when answering the items?
Decision/ Judgment	1. Do the survey items apply to you as an employee?
	2. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the most confident, how confident did you feel when you assigned a score to the item?
	3. What was your strategy when answering the items?
	Follow up questions
	a. How did you arrive at that answer?
	b. Did you think of a specific event?
Response	1. How did you feel about answering the item?
	2. Was there a clear choice, or did you need to evaluate your response to the item?

The researcher contacted fourteen employees by email and explained the process and requested their participation in the cognitive interviews. Ten of the employees were available for the interviews. Face-to-face interviews were set up with each participant by the researcher. The interviewees included staff, faculty, and administrators from the four campuses within the USF System. The units represented throughout the USF System were health sciences, facilities, registration, and academic teaching departments.

The following table provides an overview of the interview participants.

Table 6

Cognitive Interview Participants

Campus	Staff**	Administration	Faculty
USFT	1	1	1
USFSP	0	3*	0
USFSM	1	1	1
USFP	0	1	0
Total	2	6	2

Note. *One administrative employee also has teaching responsibilities.
**Two staff employees who were contacted were not available for interviews.

Each interview was recorded and began with an explanation of the cognitive interview process. The participants were asked to speak aloud while completing the survey instrument. Approximately ten minutes was required by each participant to complete the survey.

The data collected from the interviews were transcribed and organized by each individual interview. Then the data were reorganized by each question and answer from the 10 participants. Appendices 1 through 9 provide the data.

Data analysis. Qualitative methods were used to analyze the data. The questions were used as the pre-assigned coding system described by Bogdan and Biklen (2003). Each response was reviewed and specific words or phrases were highlighted that related to the specific question being asked. The following is an overview of the results.

Comprehension. All ten interviews, or 100% of the interviewees, expressed comprehension and an understanding of the term *separate accreditation*. An external requirement for USF by the accreditation agency was expressed by 60% of the interviewees, while 40% viewed this internally with changes to structures such as academics and hiring decisions for USF.

Specific terms or phrases were selected from the survey items for each of the categories being measured, and the participants were asked what the terms meant to them. The answers for the *organizational structure* items revealed a consistent understanding of the terms *accelerate*, *effectively*, *independent decisions*, and *university system*. Only two of the twenty-nine responses indicated a "don't know" or not sure for the *employee relations* items of meaningful and satisfying work, improve working conditions, and increased responsibilities. The term *increased responsibilities* was expressed as an increase in tasks and an increase in levels of responsibility.

Increased competition and scarce resources were understood for the *inter-campus relationship* category. Only one participant indicated "don't know." The phrases for the *campus identity* category revealed an understanding of the terms and phrases, *prestige and perception*, *isolation*, *separate identity*, and *enhance public understanding* for all but one of the forty responses.

53

Retrieval. All except one of the interviewees revealed through their answers they were retrieving information from memory about items and work experiences. Some examples included committees, faculty, and students.

Decision/judgment. Decision and judgment relates to how the interviewees make decisions on how to answer the item. All but one interviewee stated that the items applied to them as an employee in their current role or in past roles. Overall, they were confident when answering the items. There was one rating less than two while all others were greater than three. The interviewees used specific events, reflection, and analysis to answer the items. Only one person did not provide data for this item.

Response. Eighty percent of the respondents were comfortable with responding and answering the items. Two of the interviewees responded that they were not comfortable answering because of not having the knowledge or experience in the specific area. The second response question asked if there was a clear choice or did the interviewee need to evaluate his/her response. Sixty percent of the respondents revealed they did not have a clear choice on some of the items. Some indicated that they selected "neutral" because they did not know the answer to the item. One person indicated that the items were simple for very complex issues.

Comments when completing survey instrument. The interviewees were asked to talk aloud while completing the survey. The consistent theme throughout the data was the implication that the "neutral" item served as both "neutral" and "don't know." The words *system organization structure* and *isolation* were not understood by two of the interviewees. The demographic item about working on other campuses was confusing if

54

the employee worked as a part-time faculty on a different campus. Also, it was revealed that the word *campus* should be changed to *institution* for USFSP.

Instrument revisions. Based on the results of the cognitive interview process the following items were changed on the survey instruments.

1.   The "don't know or DK" item was added as a response category.

2.   The demographic items regarding employment on other campuses was changed to "Please select other USF campuses where you have been employed including adjunct or part-time employment" to clarify adjunct or part-time teaching on other campuses.

3.   The word *campus* on the USFSP survey was changed to *institution*.

4.   Item ER7 was changed on the surveys to include the word *tasks* to clarify workload.

5.   Item OS3 "can be achieved within the USF System organizational structure" was removed.

Reliability of the Instrument

Pilot study. To assure the consistency of the results and identify other potential problems with the survey instrument, a pilot study was conducted prior to the actual survey. The population for the pilot study was one subgroup of Other Personnel Service (OPS) employees. This included adjunct faculty and part-time clerical and administrative employees at USFSM. This subgroup was chosen because of the convenience to the researcher. In addition, no other populations exist within the State University System of Florida experiencing organizational change specific to separate accreditation for regional campuses within a university system.

The OPS employee categories are similar to the three categories of employees used in the population for the research study. They are continuous part-time employees and receive the same informational emails, live in the communities, and are privy to the same public information relating to separate accreditation for the regional campuses. Table 7 provides the population for the OPS employees for USFSM.

The pilot study survey instrument was distributed electronically to the USFSM OPS employees and the results are displayed in chapter four. The survey instrument is located as Appendix 13. The data collection procedures described below for the actual survey were replicated for the pilot study. The results were analyzed and adjustments made to the instrument to assure reliability in the instrument.

Table 7

Pilot Study Population – USFSM OPS Employees

Classification	Number
OPS Clerical and Administrative	10
OPS Adjunct Faculty	119
None of the Above*	2

Note. The population received from USFSM Human Resources departments for Fall 2010. *There were two employees that participated in the study that were not classified as adjunct or clerical and administrative. One was a graduate assistant, and one was a faculty member from another USF campus.

Data Collection Procedures

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved the human subjects for this study on July 31, 2010. The researcher prepared a cover memo and made a formal request to each of the campus administrators requesting permission to proceed with the survey on each of the four campuses. The letter is provided in Appendix 19. After approval was received, a request for an employee list of names, including gender, employment

classification and email addresses was made to the human resource departments for each campus.

The researcher submitted a cover memorandum (Appendix 21) introducing the survey with an embedded link of the instrument, and each campus administrator assisted in the distribution of the email to their respective campus employees. Follow up emails were sent until a significant return rate had been received. The individual data were kept confidential, but the aggregated data were presented in the results.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed to answer the following research questions:

1. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of USF System employees on each of the four campuses in the areas of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity with respect to the implications of the separate accreditation of campuses with the USF System?

2. Are there any significant differences between the perceptions of employees in the areas organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity on selected demographic variables, including employee category (staff, faculty, administration), years of employment, gender, and campus location?

Descriptive statistics, including the mean, standard deviation, percentages, skewness and kurtosis are provided for the dependent variables for each of the four subgroups. Cronbach's alpha was used to test the inter-rater reliability for each item within the survey instrument. To determine if there were differences in the means of the dependent variables for the four campuses, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) and analysis of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to identify differences

57

between groups. Significant differences were found, and pairwise comparisons were conducted to determine more precisely which groups differed from each other.

Type I errors are described by Stevens (1999) as "saying the groups differ when they don't" (p. 9). Additional statistical analyses were made to control for errors with the multiple comparisons and adjust for differences in the population sizes among the subgroups.

The open ended question responses were analyzed using qualitative coding methods and themes were identified from the comments. Each response was reviewed and specific words or phrases were identified that related to the specific question being asked (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003).

Timeline

The pilot study was conducted and the data analyzed in the Summer 2010 semester. The survey was conducted in Fall 2010 and the results were analyzed in the Spring 2011 semester. The final writing of the results was in Fall 2011.

Chapter Summary

Chapter three described the methods used to identify perceptions of employees at USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP about separately accreditation for regional campuses. The setting described each campus at their point in time of the organizational change. The survey population, research design, and instrument was described. The instrument development included pre-testing, cognitive interviews and data analysis, and instrument revisions. The reliability of the instrument included a pilot study. To conclude data collection procedures, data analysis and the timeline for the study were described.

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of the study was to identify the perceptions of employees in the USF System about the changes that occur with the separate accreditation of campuses, particularly as part of an organizational change that involved moving from a large university with multiple campuses to a university system with regionally accredited institutions. The pilot survey was conducted in July, 2010, and the research study was conducted in September, 2010. The participants of the study included employees in the classifications of faculty, administration, and staff at the University of South Florida System with four campuses. This chapter describes the results of the pilot study, modifications to the survey instrument, and the results from the research study.

Pilot Study

Setting. The pilot study was conducted at the USF Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM) campus to identify potential problems with the survey instrument. This campus was chosen because of the convenience to the researcher. The part-time employees who participated in the pilot study received email communications and were exposed to the same information about separate accreditation as the full-time employees.

Population. The population for the pilot study consisted of 131 part-time employees at USFSM. There were 10 clerical employees, 119 adjunct faculty members, one graduate assistant, and one faculty member from another USF campus teaching as a

part-time employee at USFSM. There were 81 females and 50 males. All 131 part-time employees were invited to participate in the survey. (See Appendix 16)

Instrument. The data were collected using an electronic survey instrument, and distributed by email to the employees at USFSM. Section 1 included the demographic information including employment classification, gender, number of years employed at USFSM, and employment at other USF System campuses. The employment classifications were OPS clerical, OPS adjunct faculty, and none of the above. The survey contained 25 Likert-type scale items divided into the categories of organizational structure (seven items), employee relations (seven items), inter-campus relationships (six items), and campus identity (five items). The researcher added a "don't know" (DK) item to identify the percentages of employees who did not have enough information to answer the survey items. Another section of the survey included three open-ended items to address strengths, limitations and communication about separate accreditation, and two nominal scale items to address support and benefits for employees' personal situation due to separate accreditation. The pilot instrument is located in Appendix 13.

Sample/Participation rate. The sample for the pilot survey results was n = 46, a 35% response rate. The respondents included four clerical employees, 39 adjunct faculty members, and three none of the above. There were 17 males and 29 females who participated in the pilot study. Descriptive statistics for the data and variables are located in Appendix 16. The sample means do not include "don't know" (DK) responses.

Inter-rater reliability. Cronbach's alpha was used to calculate reliability of the scores for each of the sub-scales. The literature states that at least a .70 score or greater is acceptable for reliability (Cronbach, 1951). Reliability was greater than .70 for the

organizational structure, employee relations, and campus identity categories. It was less

than .70 for the inter-campus relationships category.

Modifications to the survey instrument. The pilot study revealed two issues

with the survey instrument. First, the demographic variable requesting the number of

years employed at USFSM was not easily measurable using the format of "less than 3

years, 3 to 9 years, 10 to 15 years, and greater than 16 years" because it did not allow for

the years to be counted in the analysis. This demographic item was changed to a self-

reported item for the number of years employed at each campus/institution. This allowed

the researcher to analyze the data by years of employment.

The second problem identified was the reliability score for the inter-campus

relationships category. The Cronbach's alpha standardized score of .51 was significantly

lower than the acceptable score of .70. To correct this issue, the researcher added

additional survey items, to the six original items within the inter-campus relationships

category and reviewed these items with experts familiar with Bolman and Deal's (2003)

four frame theory. This action was undertaken in an attempt to improve the validity for

the inter-campus relationships category. Twelve of these items were agreed upon by the

experts to be included in a second pilot survey.

Second pilot survey. An electronic survey was developed containing the original

demographic information used in the pilot survey, plus the 12 items for the inter-campus

relationships category. After IRB approval, the survey was distributed to the USFSM

part-time employee pilot group, the same population as the original pilot survey. The

survey is located in Appendix 15.

This second survey resulted in a sample of 39 responses. The 12 survey items were measured on a Likert-type scale. The "don't know" (DK) responses were not included in the means. Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the reliability or internal consistency of items. For all 12 items, Cronbach's alpha standardized measure was .83. Further analysis revealed items 1, 2, 9, 10, 11 and 12 produced a Cronbach's alpha of .91. These items were selected to be included in the final survey for the inter-campus relationships category. Appendix 17 displays the descriptive statistics for the survey and Appendix 18 displays the 12 survey items for the inter-campus relationships category.

Research Study

Setting. The research study was conducted at the University of South Florida System (USF System), a large urban, research institution with multiple campus locations. The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions of employees in the USF System about changes that occur with the separate accreditation of campuses, particularly as part of an organizational change that involved moving from a large university with multiple campuses to a university system with regionally accredited institutions. The USF System was formed in 2004 by the University Board of Trustees (UBOT) and approved by the Board of Governors (BOG) in 2005 "for accreditation purposes only" (USF, 2011). At the time of this study, in September, 2010, the USF System included two separately accredited institutions, USF Tampa (USFT) and USF St. Petersburg (USFSP), and two campuses seeking separate accreditation, USF Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM) and USF Polytechnic (USFP).

USFT is a doctoral granting, research intensive institution serving more than 40,000 students. USFSP, the second largest institution that was granted separate regional

accreditation in 2006, is a four-year institution and serves over 3,900 students granting bachelor's and master's degrees. The third largest campus, USFSM, is an upper level campus granting bachelor and master's degrees that serves more than 1900 students. At the time of this study, USFSM had submitted its final application to SACS. The newest campus, USFP, at the time of this study, was an upper level campus serving more than 1,200 students in the Lakeland area granting bachelor and master's degrees. USFP was anticipating its letter of delegation from the USF System President and preparing its SACS application. Each of the regional campuses was at a different point in time in the organizational change process of separate accreditation at the time of this survey.

Population. The participants of the study were employees in the classifications of administration, faculty, and staff on each of the four campuses. At the time of this study, USFT had the largest number with 5,672 employees, USFSP had 318 employees, USFSM had 156 employees, and USFP had 124 employees. Table 4 located in the third chapter provides descriptive statistics of the population for each campus.

Instrument. Electronic surveys were used to collect data, and were distributed by email to the employee subgroups at each of the four campuses. Demographic information in Section 1 of the survey instrument included employment classification, gender, number of years employed, and employment at other campuses. The rest of the survey instrument included 25 Likert-type survey items ranging from strongly agree (SA) to strongly disagree (SD). Each of the survey items was segregated into the categories of organizational structure (seven items), employee relations (seven items), inter-campus relationships (six items), and campus identity (five items). A "Don't Know" (DK) response was added to allow employees who did not have enough information to rate the

63

item or decline to answer for other reasons. The items with DK were not included in the means for the samples. There were also three self-report items to address perceptions of strengths, limitations and communication about separate accreditation, and two items that addressed support for separate accreditation of regional campuses and benefit to the survey respondent's personal situation because of separate accreditation. The survey instruments are located in the appendix section as follows: USFT (Appendix 23), USFSP (Appendix 24), USFSM (Appendix 25), and USFP (Appendix 26). The organization of the survey instruments is described in Appendix 22.

Sample/Participation Rate. Individual surveys were distributed electronically to administrators, faculty, and staff employees at each campus over a two week period. Participant rates from survey respondents differed between the campuses. USFSM participants produced the highest participation rate, USFP the second highest participation rate, USFSP the third highest participation rate, and USFT participants produced the lowest participant rate. The descriptive statistics for the demographic information for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP are described in the following sections.

USF Tampa (USFT). The sample size for USFT was n = 422, with a participation rate of 7%. Of those responding, administrative employee participation was 39%, faculty 38%, and staff 23%, with 56% being female and 44% male. The percentage of USFT respondents who had been employed at USFT for 10 or fewer years was 55%. The percentage of those who had been employed at USFT from 10 to 21 years was 28%. The percentage of those who had been employed at USFT for more than 21 years was 17%. The survey showed that 3% of current USFT respondents had worked at USFSP,

3% had worked at USFSM, 3% had worked at USFP, and 91% of the respondents had not

worked at any other USF System campus/institution. Table 8 provides the descriptive

statistics for USFT.

Table 8

USFT Demographic Descriptive Statistics

Variable	*n*	*%*	*N*	*%*
Total	422	7	5672	100
Section 1				
Employment Classification				
Administration	165	39	1793	32
Faculty	161	38	2026	35
Staff	96	23	1853	33
Gender				
Female	236	56	3213	57
Male	186	44	2459	43
Number of Years Employed at USFT				
0 to 10	231	55	-	-
>10 to 21	118	28	-	-
>21	72	17	-	-
Employment at Other USF campuses/institutions				
USFSP	11	3	-	-
USFSM	12	3	-	-
USFP	14	3	-	-
None of the Above	385	91	-	-

Note. n= sample size, N = total population

USFT St. Petersburg (USFSP). USFSP's sample size was n = 69 with a

participation rate of 22%. Respondents reported their classification and gender as

follows: administration 36%, faculty 48%, and staff 16%, with 57% female and 43%

male. The percentage of USFSP respondents who had been employed at USFSP for 10

or fewer years was 69%. The percentage of those who had been employed at USFSP

from 10 to 21 years was 25%. The percentage of those who had been employed at

USFSP for more than 21 years was 6%. The survey participants revealed they had

worked at other campuses as follows: USFT 35%, USFSM 3%, USFP 0%, and 62%

reported they had not worked at another campus/institution. The data is displayed in

Table 9 for USFSP.

Table 9

USFSP Demographic Descriptive Statistics

Variable	*n*	*%*	*N*	*%*
Total	69	22	318	100
Section 1				
Employment Classification				
Administration	25	36	83	26
Faculty	33	48	139	44
Staff	11	16	96	30
Gender				
Female	39	57	148	47
Male	30	43	170	53
Number of Years Employed at USFSP				
0 to 10	48	69	-	-
>10 to 21	17	25	-	-
>21	4	6	-	-
Employment at Other USF campuses/institutions				
USFT	24	35	-	-
USFSM	2	3	-	-
USFP	0	0	-	-
None of the Above	43	62	-	-

Note. n= sample size, N = total population.

USFT Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM). USFSM's sample was n = 89 with a

participation rate of 57%. This was the largest response rate and also the employment

site of the researcher. The employee classification of participants included 27%

administration, 46% faculty, and 27% staff, with 66% female and 34% male. The

percentage of USFSM respondents who reported they had been employed at USFSM for

10 or fewer years was 83%. The percentage of those who reported they had been

employed at USFSM from 10 years to 21 years was 14%. The percentage of those who

reported they had been employed at USFSM for more than 21 years was 2%. The survey

participants revealed they had worked at other campuses as follows: USFT 20%, USFSP

0%, USFP 1%, and 79% had not worked at any other campuses/institutions. The results

are displayed in Table 10 for USFSM.

Table 10

USFSM Demographic Descriptive Statistics

Variable	*n*	*%*	*N*	*%*
Total	89	57	156	100
Section 1				
Employment Classification				
Administration	24	27	53	34
Faculty	41	46	62	40
Staff	24	27	41	26
Gender				
Female	59	66	100	64
Male	30	34	56	36
Number of Years Employed at USFSM				
0 to 10	74	83	-	-
>10 to 21	12	14	-	-
>21	2	2	-	-
Employment at Other USF campuses/institutions				
USFT	18	20	-	-
USFSP	0	0	-	-
USFP	1	1	-	-
None of the Above	70	79	-	-

Note. n= sample size, N = total population

USF Polytechnic (USFP). USFP's sample size was n = 53, a 43% participation

rate. The participation rate for each employee category was as follows: administration

34%, faculty 45%, and staff 21%. Fifty-five percent were female, and 45% male. The

percentage of USFP respondents who reported they had been employed at USFP for 10 or

fewer years was 87%. The percentage of those who reported they had been employed at

USFP from 10 to 21 years was 11%. None of the employees reported they had been

employed at USFP for more than 21 years. Participants who revealed they had worked at

other campuses/institutions are reported as follows: USFT 26%, USFSP 2%, and USFSM

2%. Seventy percent reported they had not worked at any other campus/institution. The

results are displayed in Table 11 for USFP.

Table 11

USFP Demographic Descriptive Statistics

Variable	*n*	*%*	*N*	*%*
Total	53	43	124	100
Section 1				
Employment Classification				
Administration	18	34	36	29
Faculty	24	45	62	50
Staff	11	21	26	21
Gender				
Female	29	55	71	57
Male	24	45	53	43
Number of Years Employed at USFP				
0 to 10	46	87	-	-
>10 to 21	6	11	-	-
>21	0	0	-	-
Employment at Other USF campuses/institutions				
USFT	14	26	-	-
USFSP	1	2	-	-
USFSM	1	2	-	-
None of the Above	37	70	-	-

Note. n= sample size, N = total population.

Generalizability of findings. Chi square (χ^2) Goodness-of-Fit test was conducted to determine if generalizations could be made to the population from the sample data. Gall, Gall, & Borg (2007) define generalizability as "The extent to which the findings of a quantitative research study can be assumed to apply not only to the sample studies, but also to the population that the sample represents" (p. 641). First, the test was conducted for each campus by employment category (administration, faculty, and staff). The results revealed the sample sizes for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP were not representative of the population by employment category. A second test was conducted by gender for each campus and the results revealed the sample for USFT,

USFSP, USFSM, and USFP could be generalized to the population based on gender.

Appendix 35 provides the results.

Quantitative analysis. Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), interaction effects, main effects, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Tukey pairwise comparisons were used to answer the two research questions.

MANOVA assumptions. Before conducting the analysis, the assumptions of level of measurement, independent observations, random sampling, multivariate normality, and homogeneity of covariance matrices were examined (O'Rourke, Hatcher, & Stepanski, 2005). The level of measurement assumption was met because the dependent variables were measured on an interval Likert-type scale of one to five, and the independent variables were categorical. Independent observations were met because the survey was sent out by email to all employees on the four campuses and employees responded voluntarily.

For campus, the Shapiro-Wilks test of normality revealed non-normality for three of the dependent variables in the USFP sample, and all four of the dependent variables in the USFSM and USFT samples. It may be assumed that if the dependent variables are univariately non-normal, they would also be multivariately non-normal. The sample size was large (n = 633) for all four sub-groups, therefore, it is reasonably robust to violations of non-normality (O'Rouke, Hatcher, & Stephanski, 2005).

There were no violations for homogeneity of covariance matrices for employment category. Violations were found for the assumption of homogeneity of covariance matrices for campus groups, number of years of employment, and gender. However, based on the Box M test results, the campus groups are robust to violations of this

69

assumption because the larger variance is associated with the group with the larger sample size. This was not the case for the number of years employed group, and the gender group. The larger variance associated with these groups was associated with the smaller sample sizes. The reader should interpret the results with caution given that the Type I error rate is inflated and results could be falsely rejecting more than the original α = .05 because of non-normal distributions (Stevens, 1999).

Findings for research questions. There were two research questions for this study. Results from the MANOVAs, ANOVAs, and Tukey pairwise comparisons were used to answer questions one and two for the dependent variables of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity. Cohen's (1992) f was used to calculate the ANOVA effect sizes in this study. Cohen states a small effect size is .10, a medium effect size is .25, and a large effect size is .40 (p. 157). Findings for questions one and two are reviewed in the following sections.

Research question one. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of USF System employees on each of the four campuses in the areas of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity with respect to the implications of separate accreditation of campuses with the USF System?

Dependent variable descriptive statistics. A summary of the descriptive statistics for each campus is provided in Table 12 for the dependent variables organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity. The highest scores were reported from USFP (4.35) survey respondents, followed by the USFSM (4.31) survey respondents in the organizational structure category. Both campuses were seeking separate accreditation at the time of this study. The lowest scores

70

were reported from survey participants in the campus identity category from USFT (3.24) and USFSP (3.24). Both campuses are currently separately accredited. Appendix 27 provides the dependent variable descriptive statistics for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP for each survey item.

Table 12

Descriptive Statistics for each Campus by the Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	USFT n=422(7%)			USFSP n=69(22%)			USFSM n=89(57%)			USFP n=53(43%)		
	M(SD)	*SK*	*KU*	*M(SD)*	*SK*	*KU*	*M(SD)*	*SK*	*KU*	*M(SD)*	*SK*	*KU*
Organizational Structure	3.57(.90)	-.54	.08	3.41(.95)	-.34	-.49	4.31(.63)	-.96	.56	4.35(.58)	-.81	.48
Employee Relations	3.35(.86)	-.27	-.05	3.31(.78)	-.88	.22	4.07(.74)	-.85	.77	3.97(.59)	-.70	1.35
Inter-campus Relationships	3.33(.92)	-.35	-.26	3.26(.95)	-.25	-.79	3.96(.76)	-.29	-.79	4.29(.56)	-.44	-.63
Campus Identity	3.24(.93)	-.15	-.45	3.24(1.05)	-.16	-.60	3.85(.85)	-.31	-.52	4.10(.59)	.024	-1.27

Note. n = sample; M = mean; SD = standard deviation; SK = skewness; KU = kurtosis; Outliers were found in the following categories = USFT Organizational Structure, Employee Relations, Inter-campus relationships; USFSP Employee Relations; USFSM and USFP Organizational Structure, Employee Relations.

MANOVA and ANOVA analysis. Results were analyzed using a one-way

MANOVA, between the campuses (USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP) on the

dependent variables of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus

relationships, and campus identity to determine if there were significant differences in the

means. The one-way MANOVA revealed a significant multivariate effect for all

campuses, Wilks' Lambda (λ) = .822 [$F(12, 1548) = 9.90\ p = .0001$]. Therefore, further

analysis was conducted.

The univariate ANOVA results revealed statistically significant differences

between the means for each campus for the four dependent variables of organizational

structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity,

respectively, [$F(3, 588) = 31.16\ p = .0001$, $F(3, 588) = 26.85\ p = .0001$, $F(3, 588) = 27.67$

$p = .0001$, $F(3, 588) = 20.87\ p = .0001$]. Cohen's (1992) *f* was used to calculate the effect

size, and when compared to Cohen's standards, a large effect size was identified for the

dependent variables organizational structure (.3974), employee relations (.3689), inter-

campus relationships (.3745), and campus identity (.3252). The summary of the results

are displayed in Table 13.

Table 13

Q1. ANOVA Summary Table for Campus by Dependent Variable

Source	SS	df	MS	F	f	p
Organizational Structure						
Between Campus	66.33	3	22.11	31.16	.3974	.0001
Error	417.18	588	.7095	-	-	-
Total	483.51	591	-	-	-	-
Employee Relations						
Between Campus	52.53	3	17.51	26.85	.3689	.0001
Error	383.43	588	.6521	-	-	-
Total	435.96	591	-	-	-	-
Inter-campus Relationships						
Between Campus	64.30	3	21.43	27.67	.3745	.0001
Error	455.49	588	.7747	-	-	-
Total	519.80	591	-	-	-	-
Campus Identity						
Between Campus	51.72	3	17.24	20.87	.3252	.0001
Error	485.82	588	.8262	-	-	-
Total	537.54	591	-	-	-	-

Note. SS = Type III Sums of Squares; *df* = Degrees of Freedom; MS = Mean Squares, *f* = Cohen *f* Effect Size; F = Statistic derived from Wilks' Lambda; *p* < .05.

For each dependent variable, where *p* values were less than .05 resulting in statistical significance, the post-hoc Tukey test of all pairwise comparisons was conducted to determine more precisely which groups differed from each other. The confidence intervals reveal that USFP participants had significantly higher mean scores than USFT and USFSP for the following dependent variables: organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity. USFSM participants had significantly higher perception mean scores than USFT and USFSP for the following dependent variables: organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity.

74

The data indicate that survey respondents from the two campuses (USFP and USFSM) that did not have separate accreditation at the time of this survey were more positive about the benefits of accreditation for their campus. It might be assumed that the survey respondents from the two institutions that had separate accreditation (USFSP and USFT) had found that separate accreditation alone would not improve conditions, whereas the survey respondents from the other two campuses (USFP and USFSM) had a higher expectation for improved conditions for their campuses. Results for the individual survey items were reviewed for each dependent variable to provide further description of the perceptions of participants.

Organizational structure survey items. There were seven survey items for the dependent variable organizational structure. They addressed "accelerated decision making process," "goal and objective achievement," "effective operations," "support for the design of the USF System," "independent hiring decisions," and "independent decisions for 'student' and 'business' services." The respondents from USFSP, USFSM, and USFP replied to each item with regard to the expected benefits of separate accreditation for their campus. The respondents from USFT replied to each item in terms of how separate accreditation would change things for the three regional campuses. Respondents' perceptions were the highest from USFP (4.60) and USFSM (4.53) for Item 5, "will allow their campus to make hiring decisions based on its campus mission and goals." Survey participants from USFSP provided the lowest means for Item 3 (2.98), "has allowed USFSP to operate more effectively" and for Item 7 (2.85), "has enabled USFSP to make independent decisions regarding business services." The data are displayed for each campus in Table 14. Hence, the survey respondents from the two

75

campuses seeking separate accreditation (USFP and USFSM) produced the two highest

averages, while the survey respondents from the separately accredited regional

institutions (USFT and USFSP) produced the lowest scores. This supports the

assumption that on the campuses seeking separate accreditation there seems to be greater

support from the survey respondents for the idea that separate accreditation will improve

their organizational structure. Respondents on these campuses anticipate that separate

accreditation may bring about greater efficiency and greater autonomy regarding

independence in making business decisions.

Table 14

Q1. Organizational Structure Dependent Variable Survey Item Averages

Survey Item*	USFT n=422 (7%) M(SD)	USFSP** n=69 (22%) M(SD)	USFSM n=89 (57%) M(SD)	USFP n=53 (43%) M(SD)
Organizational Structure	3.57(.90)	3.41(.95)	4.31(.63)	4.35(.58)
1. will accelerate the decision making process for regional campuses/institution	3.55(1.14)	3.36(1.26)	4.51(.75)	4.38(.83)
2. will enable regional campuses/institution to achieve its individual goals and objectives	3.72(1.09)	3.42(1.28)	4.36(.81)	4.51(.62)
3. will allow regional campuses/institution to operate more effectively	3.25(1.20)	2.98(1.40)	4.28(.92)	4.28(.90)
4. supports the design of the four campuses/institutions as a university system	3.07(1.37)	3.67(1.24)	4.03(.97)	4.40(.69)
5. will allow regional campuses/institution to make hiring decisions based on its campus mission and goals	3.89(1.01)	3.70(1.12)	4.53(.78)	4.60(.61)
6. will enable regional campuses/institution to make independent decisions regarding student services	3.79(1.00)	3.61(1.03)	4.32(.78)	4.42(.71)
7. will enable regional campuses/institution to make independent decisions regarding business services	3.61(1.12)	2.85(1.28)	4.07(.98)	4.04(1.03)

Note. n = sample size, M= Mean, SD = standard deviation. *The respondents from USFSP, USFSM, and USFP replied to each item in relation to their campus. The respondents from USFT replied to each item in relation to the three regional campuses. **USFSP survey items began with "has" instead of "will." See Appendices 23-26 for survey items for each campus.

Employee relations survey items. The seven employee relations survey items addressed "more meaningful and satisfying work experiences," "improved working conditions for employees by not having to report/coordinate work through the USFT departments," "alleviating feelings of isolation," and "increases in 'job responsibilities' and 'workloads' with regards to separate accreditation" for regional campuses/institutions. The highest score was from survey participants from USFSP (4.50) for Item 7, "has increased workload (tasks) for employees at USFSP." The next highest score was from USFSM (4.47) for Item 6, "will increase job responsibilities for

employees at USFSM." Several of the lowest scores were from survey respondents from USFSP. For Item 1, "has created a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at USFSP" the respondents' score was 2.58. Their score for Item 5 "has alleviated feelings of isolation at USFSP" was 2.51. The data indicate there is less support by respondents at the accredited institutions (USFSP and USFT) for the belief that separate accreditation will create a more satisfying work experience and reduce a sense of isolation from the largest campus, USFT.

The survey responses on survey items two, three, and four, support the belief that improved working conditions for staff, faculty and administrators will improve when there is less reporting to USFT for faculty, and less coordination for staff and administrators, except from USFSP survey respondents. Results imply that respondents on the non-accredited campuses have a belief that improved working conditions for employees will improve with separate accreditation. For items six and seven, survey respondents from all four campuses indicated job responsibilities and workloads would increase with separate accreditation. Data are presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Q1. Employee Relations Dependent Variable Survey Item Averages

Survey Item*	USFT n=422 (7%) M(SD)	USFSP** n=69 (22%) M(SD)	USFSM n=89 (57%) M(SD)	USFP n=53 (43%) M(SD)
Employee Relations	3.35(.86)	3.31(.78)	4.07(.74)	3.97(.59)
1. will create a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.18(1.15)	2.58(1.30)	3.86(1.14)	3.83(1.05)
2. will improve the working conditions for faculty at regional campuses/institution by not having to report to the USF Tampa academic departments	3.17(1.22)	3.06(1.28)	4.33(.86)	4.27(.86)
3. will improve the working conditions for staff at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	3.23(1.21)	3.05(1.34)	4.15(1.03)	4.07(1.00)
4. will improve the working conditions for administration at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	3.29(1.22)	2.92(1.16)	4.26(.96)	4.30(.70)
5. will alleviate feelings of isolation at regional campuses/institution	2.82(1.22)	2.51(1.09)	3.33(1.28)	3.00(1.14)
6. will increase job responsibilities for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.80(1.07)	4.45(.89)	4.47(.68)	4.23(.96)
7. will increase workloads (tasks) for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.70(1.13)	4.50(.82)	4.42(.82)	4.25(.94)

Note. n = sample size, M= Mean, SD = standard deviation. *The respondents from USFSP, USFSM, and USFP replied to each item in relation to their campus. The respondents from USFT replied to each item in relation to the three regional campuses. **USFSP survey items began with "has" instead of "will". See Appendices 23-26 for survey items for each campus.

Inter-campus relationships survey items. There were six items in the inter-campus relationships category that include "support from local communities," "greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising, and local community support," "equitable distribution of scarce resources," "ability to create academic programs to respond locally," "leverage unique identities within the USF System," and "recognition among state and national politicians to facilitate regional goals." The campuses seeking

separate accreditation, USFP and USFSM, survey respondents' averages were higher than USFT and USFSP, the separately accredited institutions. USFP survey participants were the most optimistic about the improvements that separate accreditation could bring. They await separate accreditation and appear more convinced that their campus will be able to "position USFP to leverage a unique identity within the USF System" (4.69, Item 5), and "enable USFP greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs" (4.60, Item 4). It should be noted that the respondents on the USFP campus had the most positive responses to Item 5, which emphasizes their desire to be a more technologically oriented campus. Lower responses from all four campuses were received for Item 3, "will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system" with the lowest means being from USFT (2.55) and USFSP (2.17).

Given the USFSM and USFP survey respondents' means, tenable conclusions reveal the respondents on the campuses seeking separate accreditation demonstrate stronger support for the belief that separate accreditation will provide more autonomy for institutions to create unique identities and advance community support at the local level. This would enhance their own identity and create academic programs to respond to local needs. In contrast, the lower responses from the survey respondents from the accredited institutions (USFT and USFSP) for distribution of scarce resources, suggests there is less support for the idea that separate accreditation will allow the equitable distribution of scarce resources within the USF System. Table 16 provides the data for the inter-campus relationships dependent variable.

Table 16

Q1. Inter-campus Relationships Dependent Variable Survey Item Averages

Survey Items*	USFT n=422 (7%) M(SD)	USFSP** n=69 (22%) M(SD)	USFSM n=89 (57%) M(SD)	USFP n=53 (43%) M(SD)
Inter-campus Relationships	3.33(.92)	3.26(.95)	3.96(.76)	4.29(.56)
1. will allow local communities to support regional campuses/institutions	3.36(1.07)	3.36(1.18)	3.99(.85)	4.00(.98)
2. will allow regional campuses/institutions to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support	3.61(1.13)	3.50(1.18)	4.09(.98)	4.42(.76)
3. will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system	2.55(1.18)	2.17(1.16)	3.00(1.32)	3.50(1.14)
4. will enable regional campuses/institutions greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs	3.59(1.10)	3.55(1.05)	4.39(.72)	4.60(.61)
5. will position regional campuses/institutions to leverage a unique identity within the USF System	3.47(1.11)	3.50(1.22)	4.09(.95)	4.69(.47)
6. will allow regional campuses/institutions recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals	3.22(1.20)	3.29(1.23)	3.84(.95)	4.36(.71)

Note. n = sample size, M= Mean, SD = standard deviation. *The respondents from USFSP, USFSM, and USFP replied to each item in relation to their campus. The respondents from USFT replied to each item in relation to the three regional campuses. **USFSP survey items began with "has" instead of "will". See Appendices 23-26 for survey items for each campus.

Campus identity survey items. There were five survey items that addressed "prestige and perception of education quality," "furtherance of the goals of USFT AAU status," "campus sense of community," "separate identities," and "public understanding of regional campuses/institutions." The highest score was from USFP (4.44) for Item 4, "will allow USFP to create a separate identity." The second highest score was also from survey participants from USFP (4.19) for Item 3, "will promote the campus sense of community at USFP. Lower scores were from USFT participants for Item 1 (2.75), "will

81

enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality at regional

campuses/institutions" and Item 5 (2.90) "will enhance public understanding of the value

of regional campuses/institutions." Again, the descriptive data provides support for the

assumption that the separately accredited institutions (USFT and USFSP) are less likely

to believe that separate accreditation will enhance the education quality, increase the

probability of obtaining AAU status for USFT, or enhance public understanding of the

regional campuses. Respondents on the campuses (USFSM and USFP) seeking separate

accreditation anticipate advantages from accreditation for enhancing educational quality,

developing an improved sense of campus community, and creating a better understanding

of the role of the regional campuses. Data are provided in Table 17 for the campus

identity survey items.

Table 17

Q1. Campus Identity Dependent Variable Survey Item Averages

Survey Item*	USFT n=422 (7%) M(SD)	USFSP** n=69 (22%) M(SD)	USFSM n=89 (57%) M(SD)	USFP n=53 (43%) M(SD)
Campus Identity	3.24(.93)	3.24(1.05)	3.85(.85)	4.10(.59)
1. will enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality at regional campuses/institutions	2.75(1.27)	3.20(1.26)	3.53(1.22)	4.13(.99)
2. will further the goal of achieving the AAU status for USF Tampa	2.92(1.31)	3.00(1.26)	3.81(1.10)	3.73(1.04)
3. will promote the campus sense of community at regional campuses/institutions	3.61(1.02)	3.44(1.33)	4.13(.85)	4.19(.82)
4. will allow regional campuses/institutions to create a separate identity	3.73(.98)	3.35(1.31)	4.09(.93)	4.44(.68)
5. will enhance public understanding of the value of regional campuses/institutions	2.90(1.23)	3.02(1.28)	3.67(1.15)	3.93(.99)

Note. n = sample size, M= Mean, SD = standard deviation. *The respondents from USFSP, USFSM, and USFP replied to each item in relation to their campus. The respondents from USFT replied to each item in relation to the three regional campuses. **USFSP survey items began with "has" instead of "will". See Appendices 23-26 for survey items for each campus.

In summary, based on the results of the first research question, there is a consistent theme that the two non-accredited campus respondents anticipated more advantages for their campuses by being separately accredited. The respondents on the accredited campuses were less positive about the impacts of separate accreditation. These results would seem to support the common sense view that the anticipation of something may be more positive than the reality of the event.

Research question two. Are there significant differences between the perceptions of employees in the areas of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity on selected demographic variables, including

employee category (staff, faculty, and administration), years of employment, gender and campus location?

Dependent variable descriptive statistics. A review of the descriptive statistics means are provided for employment category, years of employment, and gender. The descriptive data for campus location was provided earlier in this chapter as part of question one and the data are located in Table 12.

Employment category. The employment classifications for employees within the USF System include administration, faculty, and staff. The administration category includes professional employees and mid-to-high level managers on annual contracts. The faculty classification includes teaching faculty and faculty with administrative assignments. The staff category includes support personnel in exempt and non-exempt positions. A summary of the descriptive statistics for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP for each of the dependent variables for employment category is reviewed below. Again, those employees on the campuses seeking separate accreditation (USFSM and USFP) were anticipating greater benefits from separate accreditation than those campuses (USFT and USFSP) with accreditation.

The staff (4.51) participants from USFP produced the highest mean, and the staff (4.39) at USFSM produced the second highest mean in the organizational structure category. USFSP staff (3.29) participants produced the lowest mean, and administrators (3.37) produced the second lowest mean for organizational structure. For the dependent variable, employee relations USFT administrators (3.24) and USFSP staff (3.13) produced the lowest means, while USFSM (4.25) and USFP (4.06) faculty survey participants reported the highest means. For inter-campus relationships, USFP faculty

(4.27) and staff (4.49) survey respondents produced the highest means. USFT faculty

(3.23) and USFSP staff (3.04) produced the lowest means. For campus identity, the

lower means were reported from USFT faculty (3.13) and USFSP faculty (3.18). The

higher means were reported by survey respondents from USFP administrators (4.07) and

faculty (4.03). Descriptive data are described for employment category in Table 18.

Years of employment. Survey data were collected by the number of years

employed at each campus. This category was organized by those employed from 0 to 10

years, greater than 10 years to 21 years, and greater than 21 years of employment.

Consistently, those employees on the campuses seeking separate accreditation (USFSM

and USFP) were anticipating greater benefits from separate accreditation than those

campuses (USFT and USFSP) with accreditation.

For organizational structure USFSM participants employed more than 21 years

(4.76) produced the highest means, with USFP participants employed from 0 to 10 years

(4.36) producing the second highest score. The organizational structure dependent

variable revealed that USFSP survey participants employed 0 to 10 years (3.40) produced

the lowest score with those respondents employed greater than 10 to 21 years (3.42)

producing the second to the lowest score.

The employee relations dependent variable higher averages were reported from

the survey participants from the campuses seeking separate accreditation. USFP survey

respondents' employed greater than 10 to 21 years produced the second highest score

(4.31), while USFSM survey respondents employed greater than 21 years reported the

highest score (4.71). Consistently the lower scores were reported from the separately

accredited institutions. USFSP survey respondents employed from 0 to 10 years average

was 3.27, while USFT survey respondents employed greater than 10 to 21 years average was 3.31.

Those survey participants with the highest scores for inter-campus relationships were from USFSM employed greater than 21 years (4.83) and from USFP employed 0 to 10 years (4.29). The survey respondents that revealed the lowest score were employed 0 to 10 years from USFSP (3.22) for inter-campus relationships, and the second lowest score was from survey respondents employed greater than 10 years to 21 years from USFT (3.26).

Finally, survey respondents revealed the highest means for campus identity from USFSM employed greater than 21 years (4.53) and from USFP survey respondents employed 0 to 10 years (4.12). The lower responses were reported from those employed greater than 10 to 21 years (3.09) and employed greater than 21 years (3.17), from USFT.

Descriptive data for the years of employment are provided in Table 19. It is interesting to note that from all four campuses the largest number of survey participants were employed from 0 to 10 years, the next largest number of participants was for those employed 10 to 21 years, and the least number of participants was for those employed greater than 21 years for each of the campuses. No survey respondents from USFP reported that they had been employed for greater than 21 years, since that campus was created in 1981.

Gender. Survey data were collected for the gender of respondents. The survey participants from the campuses seeking separate accreditation produced the higher means. For organizational structure female respondents from USFP (4.39) produced the highest scores, while USFSM (4.32) female survey respondents produced the second

highest score. For employee relations the male survey respondents from USFSM (4.17) and USFP (4.08) produced the higher means. Survey respondents from USFP produced the higher means for inter-campus relationships and campus identity. The male scores were (4.31 and 4.24) and the female scores were (4.27 and 3.99), respectively. Table 20 displays the descriptive statistics for gender.   For each of the campuses, the female survey participant sample size was larger than the male survey participant sample size.

Table 18

Q2. Employment Category Descriptive Statistics for Campus by Dependent Variable

	USFT			USFSP			USFSM			USFP		
	n = 422			n = 69			n= 89			n = 53		
	A	F	S	A	F	S	A	F	S	A	F	S
	n = 165	*n* =161	*n* =96	*n* =25	*n* =33	*n* =11	*n* =24	*n* =41	*n* =24	*n* =18	*n* =24	*n* =11
	(39%)	(38%)	(23%)	(36%)	(48%)	(16%)	(27%)	(46%)	(27%)	(34%)	(45%)	(21%)
Dependent Variable	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*
Organizational Structure	3.49(.91)	3.56(.92)	3.72(.86)	3.37(.88)	3.48(.94)	3.29(1.17)	4.14(.63)	4.37(.63)	4.39(.61)	4.20(.73)	4.40(.47)	4.51(.48)
Employee Relations	3.24(.87)	3.38(.86)	3.50(.82)	3.30(.76)	3.38(.76)	3.13(.93)	3.82(.66)	4.25(.66)	4.01(.88)	3.85(.57)	4.06(.62)	3.94(.59)
Inter-campus Relationships	3.26(.91)	3.23(.94)	3.62(.87)	3.31(.84)	3.31(1.01)	3.04(1.07)	3.65(.73)	4.06(.79)	4.09(.69)	4.18(.57)	4.27(.57)	4.49(.52)
Campus Identity	3.20(.94)	3.13(.96)	3.53(.84)	3.31(1.00)	3.18(1.03	3.27(1.31)	3.57(.78)	3.91(.87)	4.01(.84)	4.07(.65)	4.03(.54)	3.62(.58)

Note. Employment Categories: A = Administration, F = Faculty, and S = Staff; n = sample, M = mean; SD = standard deviation.

Table 19

Q2. Years of Employment Descriptive Statistics for Campus by Dependent Variable

	USFT			USFSP			USFSM			USFP		
	n = 422			n = 69			n = 89			n = 53		
	0 to 10	>10 to 21	> 21	0 to 10	>10 to 21	> 21	0 to 10	>10 to 21	> 21	0 to 10	>10 to 21	> 21
	n = 231	*n* =118	*n* =72	*n* =48	*n* =17	*n* =4	*n* =74	*n* =12	*n* =2	*n* =46	*n* =6	*n=0*
	(55%)	(28%)	(17%)	(69%)	(25%)	(6%)	(83%)	(14%)	(2%)	(87%)	(11%)	(0%)
Dependent Variable	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*
Organizational Structure	3.65(.85)	3.44(.97)	3.56(.93)	3.40(.96)	3.42(.90)	3.53(1.20)	4.33(.59)	4.30(.61)	4.76(.10)	4.36(.52)	4.20(.99)	--
Employee Relations	3.38(.82)	3.31(.90)	3.35(.91)	3.27(.83)	3.41(.74)	3.41(.35)	4.11(.72)	3.83(.82)	4.71(.40)	3.90(.57)	4.31(.58)	--
Inter-campus Relationships	3.37(.96)	3.26(.86)	3.31(.89)	3.22(1.01)	3.34(.87)	3.43(.65)	3.95(.77)	3.93(.71)	4.83(.24)	4.29(.54)	4.18(.73)	--
Campus Identity	3.35(.92)	3.09(.92)	3.17(.97)	3.21(1.10)	3.22(1.00)	3.65(.96)	3.83(.86)	3.95(.81)	4.53(.39)	4.12(.59)	4.01(.63)	--

Note: M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation.

Table 20

Q2. Gender Descriptive Statistics for Campus by Dependent Variable

Dependent Variable	USFT n = 422 Female n = 236 (56%) M(SD)	Male n = 186 (44%) M(SD)	USFSP n = 69 Female n = 39 (57%) M(SD)	Male n = 30 (43%) M(SD)	USFSM n = 89 Female n = 59 (66%) M(SD)	Male n = 30 (34%) M(SD)	USFP n = 53 Female n = 29 (55%) M(SD)	Male n = 24 (45%) M(SD)
Organizational Structure	3.68(.84)	3.43(.97)	3.54(.92)	3.24(.97)	4.32(.58)	4.31(.72)	4.39(.57)	4.31(.60)
Employee Relations	3.46(.82)	3.22(.89)	3.32(.68)	3.30(.90)	4.02(.66)	4.17(.88)	3.89(.64)	4.08(.51)
Inter-campus Relationships	3.50(.83)	3.11(.98)	3.41(.89)	3.08(1.01)	3.96(.74)	3.94(.83)	4.27(.51)	4.31(.63)
Campus Identity	3.39(.85)	3.07(1.00)	3.35(1.07)	3.10(1.04)	3.87(.79)	3.81(.97)	3.99(.61)	4.24(.54)

Note. n = sample size, M= Mean, SD = Standard Deviation.

MANOVA, ANOVA interaction and main effects. MANOVA was used to investigate mean differences on the dependent variables organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity. ANOVA interaction effects for campus and employee category, campus and years of employment, and campus and gender were conducted. In addition, MANOVA was conducted for all main effects. They are campus, employment category, years of employment, and gender, to determine if there were any statistically significant differences in the perceptions of employees who participated in the survey. Violations in the MANOVA assumptions were noted earlier in this chapter. The reader should interpret the results with caution given that the Type I error rate may be inflated and results could be falsely rejecting more than the original $\alpha = .05$ (Stevens, 1999).

ANOVA interaction effects were analyzed for campus and employment category, campus and number of years employed, and campus and gender. The results indicated that there were no statistically significant differences in means across these categories.

The main effects results for the MANOVAs revealed a significant main effect for campus and employment category, respectively, Wilks' Lambda (λ) =.931, [$F(12,1490) = 3.40\ p = .0001$], and λ =.967, [$F(8,1126) = 2.42\ p = .0137$]. It was tenable to assume that a significant difference in the perceptions of employees between campuses and between employment categories existed. Therefore, further analysis was conducted. A summary of the MANOVA main effects are provided in Table 21.

Table 21

Q2. Campus Location: MANOVA Main and ANOVA Interaction Effects

Source	λ	F	df_{num}	df_{den}	η^2	p
Campus	.931	3.40	12	1490	.069	.0001
Employment Category	.967	2.42	8	1126	.003	.0137
Number of Years Employed	.995	.35	8	1126	-	.9450
Gender	.999	1.46	4	563	-	.2119
Campus * Employment Category	.973	.65	24	1965	-	.8984
Campus * Number of Years Employed	.970	.87	20	1868	-	.6274
Campus * Gender	.981	.91	12	1490	-	.5362

Note. λ = Wilks' Lambda; F = statistic for Wilks' Lambda df_{num} = degrees of freedom between; df_{den} = degrees of freedom error; η^2 = *eta squared effect size; p < .05.*

<u>*Campus main effect.*</u> The univariate ANOVA results revealed significant differences between the means for campus location for the four dependent variables organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity, respectively, [F(3, 610) = 30.04 *p* = .0001, F(3, 603) = 24.33 *p* = .0001, F(3, 606) = 28.22 *p* = .0001, F(3, 605) = 21.57 *p* = .0001]. Cohen's (1992) *f* was calculated for each dependent variable and are reported in Table 22. Specifically, all effect sizes were large, with the mean differences between campuses on the organizational structure dependent variable being the largest with an *f* of .38.

Table 22

Q2. Summary Table for Campus and Employment Category ANOVA Main Effects by the

Dependent Variables

Source	SS	*df*	MS	F	*f*	*p*
Organizational Structure						
Between Campus	65.13	3	21.71	30.04	.3844	.0001
Between Employment Category	3.65	2	1.82	2.52	-	.0810
Error	440.77	610	.7226	-	-	-
Total	511.98	615	-	-	-	-
Employee Relations						
Between Campus	48.06	3	16.02	24.33	.3479	.0001
Between Employment Category	4.87	2	2.43	3.70	.1107	.0254
Error	397.11	603	.6585	-	-	-
Total	452.85	608	-	-	-	-
Inter-campus Relationships						
Between Campus	64.49	3	21.50	28.22	.3738	.0001
Between Employment Category	8.71	2	4.36	5.72	.1377	.0035
Error	461.65	606	.7617	-	-	-
Total	536.86	611	-	-	-	-
Campus Identity						
Between Campus	53.31	3	17.77	21.57	.3270	.0001
Between Employment Category	9.91	2	4.96	6.02	.1413	.0026
Error	498.33	605	.8237	-	-	-
Corrected Total	562.18	610	-	-	-	-

Note. SS = Type III Sums of Squares; *df* = Degrees of Freedom; MS = Mean Squares, F = Wilks' Lambda statistic; *f* = Cohen Effect Size; *p* < .05.

For the main effect campus, Tukey pairwise comparisons were conducted to determine more precisely which groups differed from each other. For the dependent variables organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity, the mean scores of respondents participating in the survey for USFP were higher than USFT and USFSP. USFSM survey respondents' mean scores were higher than USFSP and USFT.

Employment category main effect. For employment category, the univariate

ANOVA results revealed significant differences between the means for administrators,

faculty, and staff for three of the dependent variables, employee relations, inter-campus

relationships, and campus identity, respectively, [$F_{(2, 603)} = 3.70$ $p = .0254$, $F_{(2, 606)} =$

4.36 $p = .0035$, $F_{(2, 605)} = 6.02$ $p = .0026$]. Cohen's (1992) *f* was used to calculate the

following small effect sizes for the dependent variables: employee relations (.11), inter-

campus relationships (.14), and campus identity (.14). The summary of the results are

described in Table 22.

Tukey pairwise comparisons were conducted for employment category to

determine more precisely which groups differed from each other. For the dependent

variable employee relations, the faculty and staff survey respondents' means were higher

than the administrators survey respondents. For the inter-campus relationship and

campus identity dependent variables, the staff participants' means were higher than

faculty and administrators survey participants. Table 23 displays the results. Descriptive

results for the employment category survey items are describe below for the three

dependent variables with significant differences in the means.

Table 23

Employment Category Main Effect Means for Statistically Significant Dependent

Variables

Dependent Variable	Administration n=217 M(SD)	Faculty n=242 M(SD)	Staff n=130 M(SD)
Employee Relations	3.34(.85)	3.59(.89)	3.60(.92)
Inter-campus relationships	3.38(.86)	3.47(.98)	3.73(.99)
Campus Identity	3.30(.83)	3.35(.88)	3.67(.88)

Employee relations survey items. The seven employee relations survey items addressed "more meaningful and satisfying work experiences," "improved working conditions for employees by not having to report/coordinate work through the USFT departments," "alleviating feelings of isolation," and "increases in job responsibilities and workloads with regards to separate accreditation" for regional campuses/institutions. Average scores and the percentage of survey responses for each campus by employment category are displayed in Table 24.

Of the employees responding to the survey classified as "administration" from USFSP, the highest score was for Item 7, "has increased workloads (tasks) for employees at USFSP" because of separate accreditation, and the lowest score (2.41) for Item 5, "has alleviated feelings of isolation at USFSP" because of separate accreditation.

Again, USFSP faculty (4.59) participants produced the highest mean for "increased job responsibilities for employees at USFSP" (Item 6), and the lowest mean (2.58) for Item 5, "has alleviated feelings of isolation at USFSP." Staff from USFSM produced the highest average for Item 7 (4.63) believing that separate accreditation will result in increased workloads for employees at USFSM. USFSP "staff" survey respondents produced the lowest score (2.50) for Item 1, relating to creation of more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at USFSP because of separate accreditation.

Table 24

Q2. Employment Category -- Employee Relations Dependent Variable Survey Item Averages

Survey Item	Administration				Faculty				Staff			
	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP
	n = 165 (39%) *M(SD)*	*n* =25 (36%) *M(SD)*	*n* =24 (27%) *M(SD)*	*n* =18 (34%) *M(SD)*	*n* =161 (38%) *M(SD)*	*n* =33 (48%) *M(SD)*	*n* =41 (46%) *M(SD)*	*n* =24 (45%) *M(SD)*	*n* =96 (23%) *M(SD)*	*n* =11 (16%) *M(SD)*	*n* =24 (27%) *M(SD)*	*n* =11 (21%) *M(SD)*
Employee Relations	3.24(.86)	3.30(.76)	3.82(.66)	3.85(.57)	3.38(.86)	3.38(.76)	4.25(.66)	4.06(.62)	3.50(.82)	3.13(.93)	4.01(.88)	3.94(.59)
1. will create a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.06(1.14)	2.42(1.35)	3.67(.92)	3.76(1.20)	3.15(1.19)	2.74(1 21)	4.00(1.21)	3.86(.85)	3.43(1.11)	2.50(1.51)	3.81(1 25)	3.89(1.27)
2. will improve the working conditions for faculty at regional campuses/institution by not having to report to the USF Tampa academic departments	3.02(1.22)	3.33(1.23)	4.08(.86)	4.07(.80)	3.20(1.27)	3.00(1.31)	4.40(.93)	4.43(.81)	3.35(1.12)	2.86(1.35)	4.38(.72)	4.22(1.09)
3. will improve the working conditions for staff at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	3.00(1.23)	3.15(1.27)	3.81(.98)	4.00(.76)	3.33(1.23)	3.14(1.38)	4.39(.95)	4.18(1.05)	3.44(1.09)	2.60(1.43)	4.05(1.18)	3.89(1.27)

96

Table 24 (Continued)

Q2. Employment Category -- Employee Relations Dependent Variable Survey Item Averages

	Administration				Faculty				Staff			
	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP
Survey Item	n = 165 (39%) $M(SD)$	n =25 (36%) $M(SD)$	n =24 (27%) $M(SD)$	n =18 (34%) $M(SD)$	n =161 (38%) $M(SD)$	n =33 (48%) $M(SD)$	n =41 (46%) $M(SD)$	n =24 (45%) $M(SD)$	n =96 (23%) $M(SD)$	n =11 (16%) $M(SD)$	n =24 (27%) $M(SD)$	n =11 (21%) $M(SD)$
4. will improve the working conditions for administration at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	2.98(1.23)	2.91(1.23)	3.82(1.05)	3.94(.68)	3.48(1.23)	3.04(1.07)	4.45(.92)	4.53(51)	3.48(1.11)	2.50(1.38)	4.44(.73)	4.44(.88)
5. will alleviate feelings of isolation at regional campuses/institution	2.68(1.17)	2.41(1.18)	2.86(1.01)	2.50(.82)	2.76(1.25)	2.58(1.03)	3.60(1.31)	3.17(1.23)	3.15(1.21)	2.50(1.18)	3.32(1 39)	3.50(1.20)
6. will increase job responsibilities for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.79(1.05)	4.39(1.03)	4.30(.76)	4.24(.97)	3.77(1.14)	4.59(.56)	4.50(.70)	4.50(.76)	3.87(.99)	4.11(1.36)	4.60(.50)	3.43(1.13)
7. will increase workloads (tasks) for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.69(1.10)	4.57(.73)	4.27(.94)	4.38(.89)	3.73(1.21)	4.57(.73)	4.40(.85)	4.40(.88)	3.67(1.06)	4.11(1.27)	4.63(.60)	3.63(1.06)

Note. n = sample size, M= Mean, SD = standard deviation. *The respondents from USFSP, USFSM, and USFP replied to each item in relation to their campus. The respondents from USFT replied to each item in relation to the three regional campuses. **USFSP survey items began with "has" instead of "will". See Appendices 23-26 for survey items for each campus.

Inter-campus relationships survey items. There were six items in the inter-campus relationships category that depict "support from local communities," greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising, and local community support," "equitable distribution of scarce resources," "ability to create academic programs to respond locally," "leverage unique identities within the USF System," and "recognition among state and national politicians to facilitate regional goals." The averages for the administration employment category for each campus are displayed in Table 25.

The highest scores in the "administration" (4.76) and "staff" (4.70) employment categories were from the USFP respondents for Item 5, "will position USFP to leverage a unique identity within the USF System." USFP participants also had the highest means from "faculty" (4.70) for Item 4, "enabling USFP greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs." Noteworthy, the higher mean trends from participants from USFP, a campus seeking separate accreditation, from all three employment classifications indicate the greatest degree of anticipation of separate accreditation creating a unique identity and creating academic programs that respond to local needs. Item 3, "will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system" produced the lowest means for all three employment categories.

Table 25

Q2. Employment Category – Inter-campus Relationships Dependent Variable Survey Item Averages

Survey Item	Administration				Faculty				Staff			
	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP
	$n = 165$ (39%) M(SD)	$n = 25$ (36%) M(SD)	$n = 24$ (27%) M(SD)	$n = 18$ (34%) M(SD)	$n = 161$ (38%) M(SD)	$n = 33$ (48%) M(SD)	$n = 41$ (46%) M(SD)	$n = 24$ (45%) M(SD)	$n = 96$ (23%) M(SD)	$n = 11$ (16%) M(SD)	$n = 24$ (27%) M(SD)	$n = 11$ (21%) M(SD)
Inter-campus Relationships	3.26(.91)	3.31(.84)	3.65(.73)	4.18(.57)	3.22(.94)	3.31(1.01)	4.06(.79)	4.27(.57)	3.62(.87)	3.04(1.07)	4.09(.69)	4.49(.52)
1. will allow local communities to support regional campuses/institution	3.33(1.09)	3.37(1.38)	3.67(.86)	3.82(1.13)	3.28(1.10)	3.46(.96)	4.21(.77)	3.88(.93)	3.55(.98)	3.00(1.41)	3.95(.89)	4.56(.53)
2. will allow regional campuses/institution to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support	3.39(1.23)	3.42(1.18)	3.60(.99)	4.28(1.02)	3.72(1.10)	3.65(1.08)	4.33(.96)	4.48(.60)	3.81(.95)	3.22(1.56)	4.09(.90)	4.55(.52)
3. will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system	2.46(1.14)	2.00(1.07)	2.83(1.10)	3.15(1.21)	2.29(1.13)	2.50(1.17)	2.96(1.48)	3.71(1.07)	3.14(1.13)	1.50(1.07)	3.24(1.30)	3.80(1 10)
4. will enable regional campuses/institution greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs	3.62(1.06)	3.76(.89)	4.22(.80)	4.41(.80)	3.43(1.18)	3.48(1.12)	4.35(.77)	4.70(.47)	3.79(1.00)	3.30(1.16)	4.63(.49)	4.70(.48)
5. will position regional campuses/institution to leverage a unique identity within the USF System	3.37(1.14)	3.71(1.04)	3.55(.96)	4.76(.44)	3.43(1.15)	3.45(1.34)	4.24(.95)	4.64(.49)	3.71(.96)	3.18(1.25)	4.35(.71)	4.70(.48)
6. will allow regional campuses/institution recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals	3.16(1.21)	3.43(1.04)	3.42(.90)	4.47(.62)	3.06(1.24)	3.10(1.32)	3.91(1.06)	4.16(.83)	3.60(1.01)	3.57(1.51)	4.10(.70)	4.56(.53)

Note. n = sample size, M= Mean, SD = standard deviation. *Respondents from USFSP, USFSM, and USFP replied to each item in relation to their campus. USFT respondents replied to each item in relation to the three regional campuses. **USFSP survey items began with "has" instead of "will". See Appendices 23-26 for survey items for each campus.

Campus identity survey items. There were five survey items that addressed "prestige and perception of education quality," "furtherance of the goals of USFT AAU status," "campus sense of community," "separate identities," and "public understanding of regional campuses/institutions." The survey participants' averages for the employment category are displayed in Table 26.

For the campus identity category, again USFP administrators (4.59) and faculty (4.36) produced the highest means for Item 4, which addressed the creation of a separate identity for USFP. USFP staff (4.56) respondents' highest average was for Item 1, "will enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality at USFP." USFT administrators (2.75) and faculty (2.40) respondents reported the lowest means for Item 1, relating to enhancement of the prestige and perception of educational quality because of separate accreditation for regional campuses/institution. Faculty at USFT produced the lowest mean (2.72) for Item 5, "will enhance public understanding of the value of regional campuses/institution." In comparison, USFT administrators and faculty respondents' lower means and USFP higher means reveal different perceptions about enhancing the prestige and perception of education quality because of separate accreditation (Item 1). USFP survey respondents' higher means reflect greater anticipation for the creation of a separate identity, as indicated with the unique name of the campus, USFT Polytechnic.

Table 26

Q2. Employment Category – Campus Identity Dependent Variable Survey Item Averages

Survey Item	Administration				Faculty				Staff			
	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP
	n = 165 (39%) *M(SD)*	*n* =25 (36%) *M(SD)*	*n* =24 (27%) *M(SD)*	*n* =18 (34%) *M(SD)*	*n* =161 (38%) *M(SD)*	*n* =33 (48%) *M(SD)*	*n* =41 (46%) *M(SD)*	*n* =24 (45%) *M(SD)*	*n* =96 (23%) *M(SD)*	*n* =11 (16%) *M(SD)*	*n* =24 (27%) *M(SD)*	*n* =11 (21%) *M(SD)*
Campus Identity 1. will enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality at regional campuses/institution	3.20(.94)	3.31(1.00)	3.57(.78)	4.07(.65)	3.13(.96)	3.18(1.03)	3.91(.87)	4.03(.54)	3.53(.84)	3.27(1.32)	4.01(.84)	4.36(.58)
2. will further the goal of achieving the AAU status for USF Tampa	2.75(1.28)	3.52(1.16)	3.29(1.01)	4.19(.98)	2.40(1.25)	3.00(1 24)	3.43(1.36)	3.90(1.07)	3.27(1.11)	3.10(1.52)	3.95(1.10)	4.56(.73)
3. will promote each regional campus/institution sense of community	2.91(1.22)	3.17(1.53)	3.75(.97)	3.58(1.00)	2.79(1.50)	2.77(1.19)	3.79(1.29)	3.67(1.14)	3.17(1.03)	3.50(.84)	3.92(.64)	4.14(.90)
4. will allow each regional campus/institution to create a separate identity	3.57(1.06)	3.32(1.46)	3.95(.67)	4.06(1.00)	3.58(1.02)	3.48(1.18)	4.25(.93)	4.29(.56)	3.71(.97)	3.64(1.57)	4.09(.87)	4.22(.97)
5. will enhance public understanding of the value of regional campuses/institution	3.60(1.06)	3.38(1.35)	3.82(.80)	4.59(.62)	3.79(.94)	3.39(1.27)	4.20(1.04)	4.36(.58)	3.84(.90)	3.18(1.47)	4.17(.82)	4.33(1.00)
	2.80(1.23)	3.13(1.04)	3.40(1.05)	3.94(1.03)	2.72(1.24)	2.97(1.30)	3.74(1.24)	3.79(.92)	3.37(1.12)	2.91(1.45)	3.80(1.11)	4.29(1.12)

Note. n = sample size, M= Mean, SD = standard deviation. *The respondents from USFSP, USFSM, and USFP replied to each item in relation to their campus. The respondents from USFT replied to each item in relation to the three regional campuses. **USFSP survey items began with "has" instead of "will". See Appendices 23-26 for survey items for each campus.

Qualitative Data.

Data analysis. In Section 7 of the survey, participants from each campus were asked five questions. The first three questions were open-ended and allowed the respondent to write in comments about the item. For questions one and two, USFT survey respondents were asked to provide additional comments on "major strengths and major limitations of separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution." USFSP, USFSM, and USFP survey participants were asked to provide additional comments on "major strengths and major limitations of separate accreditation for their individual campuses/institution." Next the survey participants from the four campuses were asked, "To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?" Qualitative methods were used to analyze the data and the questions were used as the pre-assigned coding system described by Bogdan and Biklen (2003). Each response was reviewed and specific words or phrases were highlighted that related to the specific question being asked. Themes were developed and the themes and the response rates were reported in the findings.

In addition, the fourth and fifth questions from Section 7 asked survey respondents from USFT if they supported separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution, and if they felt their personal situation as an employee would be benefited by separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institutions. USFSP, USFSM, and USFP participants were asked the same questions, but the questions were directed toward their individual campuses. The responses were nominal with a "yes" or "no" response. The number and percent of responses were reported for support for separate accreditation, and benefits to personal situation. Appendix 31 through 34

102

provides a summary of this data. Table 27 displays the descriptive data for the five

questions from Section 7.

Table 27

Section 7 Additional Comments Descriptive Statistics

Questions/Comment*	USFT N=5672		USFSP N=318		USFSM N=156		USFP N=124	
	n	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*	*n*	*%*
1. Major strengths of separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution	203	3.5	36	11	58	37	41	33
2. Major limitations of separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution	220	3.8	36	11	61	39	29	23
3. To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?	210	3.7	35	11	58	37	32	26
4. I support separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution.	366	6	65	20	86	55	50	40
5. I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution.	368	6	63	20	82	53	48	39

Note. n = sample size. *The respondents from USFSP, USFSM, and USFP replied to each item in relation to their campus. The respondents from USFT replied to each item in relation to the three regional campuses. (See Appendix 23-26 for surveys)

Findings.

Major strengths for regional campuses from USFT. The sample size for USFT

was n = 203, a 3.5% response rate from survey participants about separate accreditation

for the regional campuses. The major strengths were coded and selective words and

phrases were grouped together. The themes identified as major strengths of separate

accreditation for the regional campuses and percentages of the sample from USFT survey

respondents are as follows:

Greater individual identity and prestige (24%)

Greater autonomy, independence, accountability, and responsibility (23%)

103

More community and political support (12%)

Increased ability to create individual academic programs (10%)

Ability to operate more efficiently with less bureaucracy (7%)

Benefits the USF System organizational structure (7%)

Ability to create tenure and promotion process (.4%)

Major strengths for USFSP. The sample size from USFSP survey respondents for major strengths was n = 36, an 11% response rate. The themes identified as major strengths for USFSP and percentage of the sample identified by the participants are as follows:

Greater autonomy and independent decisions (50%)

More independence for academic decisions (36%)

Greater ability to create identity, prestige and mission (8%)

Ability to hire and evaluate faculty (5%)

Major strengths for USFSM. The sample size from USFSM survey respondents was n = 58, a 37% response rate. The themes identified as major strengths for USFSM and percentage of the sample identified by respondents were the following:

Greater autonomy and independence (48%)

Greater independence to create academic programs (34%)

Ability to react to community needs (8%)

Ability to make independent hiring decisions (5%)

Ability to create campus identity (3%)

Major strengths for USFP. The sample size from USFP survey respondents was n = 41, a 33% response rate. The themes identified as major strengths by survey

respondents for USFP separate accreditation and percentage response rates were identified as follows:

Greater ability to make independent decisions (46%)

Greater ability to make academic program decisions (32%)

Greater autonomy (17%)

Ability to create tenure and promotion process (5%)

Major limitations for regional campuses from USFT. The sample size for USFT was n = 220, a 3.8% response rate from survey respondents on major limitations about separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution. After qualitative coding the themes identified as major limitations and percentage of the sample were as follows:

Lack of budget, resources, and competition (25%)

Lack of USF System infrastructure, collaboration, shared services, and communication (19%)

Loss of USF identity as a whole (15%)

Duplication of services (13%)

Increased workload and responsibility, less expertise (8%)

Less perceived quality and prestige (6%)

Lack of understanding for students, public and employees (6%)

Lack of branding (2%)

Ability to develop tenure and promotion for faculty (1%)

Major limitations for USFSP. Of those responding from USFSP, the sample size was n = 36, an 11% response rate. The themes identified from survey participants as major limitations for USFSP are as follows:

Lack of USF System infrastructure (50%)

Increases in workload (28%)

Lack of budget and resource needs (19%)

Less student involvement in USFT events (3%)

Major limitations for USFSM. Of those responding from USFSM, the sample

size was n = 61, a 39% response rate. The themes identified from survey respondents as

the major limitations for USFSM are as follows:

Lack of budget and resources (43%)

Lack of USF System infrastructure (33%)

Lesser USFSM degree prestige (13%)

Greater increases in workloads (6%)

Lack of USFSM infrastructure (5%)

Major limitations for USFP. USFP's sample size was n = 29, a 23% response

rate from survey participants. The themes identified from the data as major limitations

for USFP are as follows:

Lack of USF System infrastructure (45%)

Loss of identity with USFT (21%)

Increases in workload (17%)

Lack of USFP infrastructure (10%)

Communication. Participants from each of the campuses were asked "To what

degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an

employee?" USFT's sample size from respondents as n = 210, a 3.7% response rate, with

25% indicating details about separate accreditation had been communicated to them,

while 75% indicated they had not received communication about separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution. USFSP's sample size was n = 35 from participants, an 11% response rate. Of those responding, 66% indicating there was adequate communication, while 34% of the participants indicated that they had not received communication regarding separate accreditation. USFSM's sample size from respondents was n = 58, a 37% response rate. Of those responding, 76% indicated that they had received communication, while 24% indicated they had not received communication about the implications of separate accreditation. USFP's sample size from respondents was n = 32, a 26% response rate. Of those responding, 72% indicated they had received communication, and 28% indicating that the implications of separate accreditation had not been communicated to them. The survey data implies that there is less communication about separate accreditation for USFT survey participants, and there is more communication about separate accreditation on the regional campuses. It may be assumed that the employees on the regional campuses are more involved in conversation about separate accreditation because it directly affects their work environment because of seeking separate accreditation. (See Appendix 31-34)

Support for separate accreditation. Each campus was asked to respond "yes" or "no" to the following comment: "I support separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution." Of those responding from USFT, the sample size was n = 366, a 6% response rate with 56% indicating they supported separate accreditation, while 44% indicated they did not support separate accreditation. The sample size was n = 65, a 20% response rate from survey respondents from USFSP with 78% indicating they supported separate accreditation, while 22% indicated they did not support separate accreditation.

107

The sample size was n=86, a 55% response rate from USFSM survey respondents.

Ninety-three percent indicated they supported separate accreditation, while 7% indicated

they did not support separate accreditation. Of those responding from USFP, the sample

size was n = 50, a 40% response rate with 98% indicating they supported separate

accreditation, while 2% indicated they did not support separate accreditation. In

summary, more than half of the survey respondents reported they were supportive of

separate accreditation for the regional campuses from all four campuses. (See Appendix

31-34)

Benefits for personal situation. Each campus participant was asked to answer

"yes" or "no" to the following item: "I feel my personal situation as an employee will be

benefited by separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution." Of those

responding from the sample size n = 368, a 6% participation rate from USFT, 21%

indicated their personal situation would benefit because of separate accreditation, while

79% indicated their personal situation would not benefit because of separate

accreditation. Of those responding from the sample size n = 63, a 20% participation rate

from USFSP, 48% indicated their personal situation would benefit because of separate

accreditation, while 52% indicated their personal situation would not benefit because of

separate accreditation. The sample size from USFSM participants was n = 82, a 53%

response rate with 70% indicating their personal situation would benefit because of

separate accreditation, while 30% indicated their personal situation would not benefit

because of separate accreditation. USFP's sample size n = 48, a 39% participation rate.

Seventy-five percent of the respondents indicated their personal situation would benefit

because of separate accreditation, while 25% indicated their personal situation would not

benefit because of separate accreditation. In summary, the campuses seeking separate accreditation (USFSM and USFP) survey respondents indicate they are anticipating benefits to their personal situations and this may be because they are still in the process of restructuring because of seeking separate accreditation. For USFSP, more than half of the survey respondents reported there would be no benefit to their personal situation. This may indicate the organizational change for their institution may have become more settled now that they have achieved separate accreditation. (See Appendix 31-34)

Chapter Summary

To conclude, this chapter included the results of the pilot and research study. Pilot study demographic and descriptive statistics were reviewed and the pilot study results were provided and included a description of the survey instrument, sample and reliability. Modifications to the survey instrument were discussed as a result of the pilot study, along with a review of the development of new survey items for the inter-campus relationships dependent variable.

Demographic and descriptive statistics were provided for the research study. Generalizations were made along with analysis of the qualitative data. The research study survey instrument was described and the results were analyzed using quantitative and qualitative methods. MANOVA, ANOVA, and Tukey pairwise comparisons were used to answer the two research questions for the study. Qualitative research methods were used to analyze the three opened ended questions. The next chapter will conclude the study and provide an overview of the study, summary of the research findings, implications, limitations, and recommendations for further research studies.

Chapter Five

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions of employees at the University of South Florida System (USF System) about the most pressing changes that occur with the separate accreditation of three regional campuses, particularly as part of an organizational change that involved moving from a large university with multiple campuses to a university system with regionally accredited institutions, during the time the organizational change was occurring. Organizational change for USF began shortly after the President began her leadership role at the USF. In 2001, the Florida Legislature passed a bill to create new structures for two of the regional campuses, the University of South Florida St. Petersburg (USFSP) and the University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM). This included a campus board of trustees, a campus executive officer, separate budget authority, and a mandate to achieve separate accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) (Florida Statute 1004.33; Florida Statute 1004.34). The USF System structure was created in 2005 as the umbrella structure for accreditation purposes (USFBOT, 2004; Austin, 2005). SACS, the regional accrediting body, suggested the USF System organizational structure house the four separately accredited institutions (K. Moore, personal communication, December 11, 2008). In 2008, the Florida Legislature passed a bill authorizing separate budgetary control and separate accreditation for the University of South Florida Polytechnic (USFP) located in Lakeland (Florida Statutes 1004.345).

Organizational Structure of the USF System at the Time of this Study

This study was conducted in September, 2010, at the beginning of the Fall

semester, when the USF System was becoming more organized, and each regional

campus was at a different point-in-time with the separate accreditation process. In

September, 2010, the time of this study, the USF System was five years old. Many of the

employees in the USF System were re-organizing their daily routines at their home

campuses, and participating in building the infrastructure for the USF System to provide

the umbrella for the four separately accredited institutions.

USFSP was the first campus to begin the separate accreditation process shortly

after the 2001 legislation. The employees of this institution had to pioneer through the

steps to create their separately accredited institution because separately accredited

regional campuses were a new structure in Florida and at the university. USFSP

achieved separate accreditation in 2006. At the time of this study, USFSP had been an

accredited institution for four years.

In 2006, when USFSP received separate accreditation by SACS, USFSM

administrators, faculty and staff followed very closely the accreditation process of

USFSP, hoping to learn from their pioneering experience. USFSM received their letter

of delegation of authority from USF System the President to pursue SACS accreditation

in 2009. At the time of this study, USFSM had submitted their final application to SACS

and was awaiting their site visit.

In 2008, legislation was passed with a mandate for the USFP campus to seek

separate accreditation for its campus. USFP was anticipating receiving its letter of

delegation of authority from the USF System President, and was beginning to prepare its application for separate accreditation when this study was conducted.

Data Collection and Analysis

Employee perceptions were measured using four survey instruments, each adapted so terminology referenced their own institution or the USF System as appropriate. Respondents from USFSM and USFP completed the survey based upon how they thought separate accreditation would change their institution and its relationship to the USF System. Respondents from USFSP completed the survey based upon how they thought separate accreditation had changed their institutional practices. USFT respondents completed the survey based upon how they thought separate accreditation would change the regional campuses.

Four dependent variables were used to organize the 25 Likert-type scale survey responses from participants. They were organizational structure (seven items), employee relations (seven items), inter-campus relationships (six items), and campus identity (five items). The four dependent variables were developed using Bolman and Deal's 2003 *four frame theory*. The theoretical concept has four components: (a) the way an institution is organized (the Structural Frame), (b) how employees are valued (the Human Resource frame), (c) how politics of power and negotiation are handled (the Political Frame), and (d) how the cultural dimensions of an institution are perceived (the Symbolic Frame).

The organizational structure dependent variable contains seven survey items. They addressed "accelerated decision making," "goal and objective achievement,"

"effective operations," "design of the USF System," "independent hiring decisions," and "independent decisions for student and business services."

The employee relations dependent variable contains seven survey items. They addressed "more meaningful and satisfying work experiences," "improved working conditions for employees by not having to report to the USFT departments," "alleviating feelings of isolation," and "increases in responsibilities and workloads with regards to separate accreditation" for regional campuses/institutions.

There were six survey items on the survey instrument that addressed inter-campus relationships. These items asked respondents about "allowing local communities to support regional campuses/institutions," "greater identification for marketing, fundraising, and local support," "equitable distribution of scarce resources," "ability to create academic programs," "leverage identity with the USF System," and "recognition from state and national politicians to facilitate goals" for the separately accredited institutions.

The campus identity dependent variable contained five survey items and addressed "enhancement of prestige and perceptions of education quality," "furtherance of the goal of USFT AAU status," "promoting a sense of community," "creation of separate identity," and "enhancing public understanding of the value of the regional campuses/institutions."

Quantitative analysis was conducted using MANOVA, ANOVA, and Tukey pairwise comparisons to determine if there were statistically significant differences for the main and interaction effects for campuses, employment category, years of employment, and gender for the four dependent variables.

The final section of the survey provided space for survey respondents to write in comments about the major strengths and major limitations of separate accreditation for the regional campuses. Survey respondents were asked to what degree the implications of separate accreditation had been communicated to them. Qualitative methods were used to code the data and identify themes for the self-report items for major strengths, major limitations, and communication about separate accreditation. The final two questions on the survey asked the respondents to respond "yes" or "no" if they were supportive of separate accreditation, and if separate accreditation for the regional campuses would benefit their personal situation. (See Appendices 23-26 for the survey instruments)

Research Questions and Findings

Research question one. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of USF System employees on each of the four campuses in the areas of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity with respect to the implications of separate accreditation of campuses with the USF System?

Findings for research question one. Statistically significant higher means were found from those survey respondents from USFSM and USFP, the campuses anticipating separate accreditation in the areas of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity. The higher means for USFSM and USFP indicate the two institutions seeking separate accreditation were anticipating greater improvements in each of the areas as a result of being separately accredited. See Appendix 27 for the survey items and means.

Research question two. Are there significant differences between the perceptions of employees in the areas of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity on selected demographic variables, including employee category (staff, faculty, and administration), years of employment, gender, and campus location?

Findings for research question two. Question two examined four main effects: campus location, employment category, years of employment, and gender. The question also examined three interaction effects for survey participants: campus and employee category, campus and years of employment, and campus and gender. To reiterate, the campus locations were USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP. The employment category is made up of administration, faculty, and staff employees. The administration employees are mid-level managers to higher-level executives. Faculty employees are those who teach and work as high-level administrators. Staff employees provide clerical, technical, and office support. Years of employment were divided into three categories: employees who had worked one to 10 years, employees who had worked more than 10 years through 21 years, and employees who had worked more than 21 years.

Main effects. Statistically significant differences were found for campus location and employment category main effects. There were no statistically significant differences from the survey respondents for the main effects of years of employment, and gender for the four dependent variables.

<u>Campus location.</u> The main effect results showed there were statistically significant differences in the average scores being higher for the campuses seeking separate accreditation (USFSM and USFP) than the averages for the separately accredited

institutions (USFT and USFSP). This was the case for the dependent variables

organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus

identity. Again, the higher means for USFSM and USFP indicated that when compared

to those institutions that were already accredited (USFT and USFP) the two institutions

seeking separate accreditation were anticipating greater improvements in each of the

areas as a result of being separately accredited.

Employment category. Main effects for employment category identified

statistically significant differences in the survey respondents' averages between

administration, staff and faculty. Significant differences were found for the following

three dependent variables: employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus

identity.

Faculty and staff survey participants for the employee relations dependent

variable had statistically significant higher averages than administrator survey

respondents. For the dependent variable inter-campus relationships, staff survey

respondents' means were higher than faculty and administrator means. Staff survey

participants' means were higher than faculty and administration survey respondents'

mean scores for the dependent variable campus identity. Although the higher means for

employee category participants indicate higher expectations for improvement on their

campuses due to separate accreditation, Cohen's f effect size for employee relations,

inter-campus relationships and campus identity dependent variables were small,

indicating a small practical significance in the mean difference between administration,

faculty, and staff employee categories**.**

Interaction effects. Three interaction effects were examined from the survey participant data for research question two. There were no statistically significant differences found in the survey participants' averages from USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP between campus and employee category, campus and years of employment, and campus and gender. This included the dependent variables organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity.

It may be assumed that there is no difference in the administrative, faculty and staff survey respondents' averages by campus location. The results imply there appears to be no difference in perceptions from the survey respondents for the years of employment at each campus or relationship between the variables of gender and campus location.

Findings for qualitative data. Participants from each campus were asked to provide additional comments on the major strengths and major limitations of separate accreditation for the regional campuses, and whether they felt information about separate accreditation for the regional campuses had been communicated to them.

Major strengths. A qualitative analysis of the USFT survey respondents (n = 203) identified seven themes related to the major strengths of separate accreditation of the USF System (see Appendix 31). The two themes identified as major strengths of separate accreditation for the regional campuses from USFT survey participants with the highest response rate were "greater individual identity and prestige" (24%) and "greater autonomy, independence, accountability, and responsibility" (23%).

USFSP survey respondents were asked to provide comments on the major strengths of separate accreditation for USFSP. Of those responding, (n = 36) 50%

117

identified "greater autonomy and independent decisions" and 36% identified "more independence for academic decisions" as major strengths of separate accreditation with the highest response rate for USFSP. Two other themes were identified, but were mentioned less frequently. (See Appendix 32)

Survey respondents from USFSM were asked to identify the major strengths of separate accreditation for USFSM. The sample size was n = 58. Of the five themes identified from the qualitative analysis, (see Appendix 33) 48% of the respondents identified "greater autonomy and independence" and 34% of the participants identified "greater independence to create academic programs" as the major strengths of separate accreditation for USFSM with the higher responses.

USFP survey respondents were asked to identify the major strengths of separate accreditation for USFP. The sample size was n = 41. Out of the four themes identified from the qualitative analysis, (see Appendix 34) 46% identified "greater ability to make independent decisions" and 32% identified "greater ability to make academic program decisions" as the major strengths of separate accreditation for USFP with the greater responses.

In summary, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP survey respondents replied that "greater independence and decisions relating to academics" as a major strengths of separate accreditation for their individual campuses. USFT survey respondent agreed that "greater independence" was a major strength in addition to "greater identity, prestige and responsibility" for separately accredited regional campuses.

Major limitations. USFT survey participants identified the major limitations of separate accreditation for the regional campuses. The sample size was n = 220. Nine

themes were identified from the qualitative data and the following two themes had the highest response rate. Of those responding, 25% of the respondents identified "lack of budget, resources, and increase in competition" and 19% of the respondents identified "lack of USF System infrastructure, collaboration, shared services, and communication" as major limitations of separate accreditation for the regional campuses. Appendix 31 displays the data.

Survey participants from USFSP were asked to provide comments on the major limitations of separate accreditation for USFSP. The sample size was n = 36. There were four themes identified in the qualitative analysis and they are listed in Appendix 32. Of those responding, 50% of the participants identified "lack of USF System infrastructure" and 28% of the participants identified "increases in workload" as the major limitations of separate accreditation for USFSP with the higher response rate.

USFSM survey respondents were asked to identify the major limitations of separate accreditation for USFSM. The sample size was n = 61. Out of the five themes identified from the qualitative analysis, 43% identified "lack of budget and resources" and 33% of the respondents identified "lack of USF System infrastructure" as the major limitations of separate accreditation for USFSM with the higher response rate. Appendix 33 provides the details.

Respondents from USFP were asked to identify the major limitations of separate accreditation for USFP. The sample size was n = 29. Four themes were identified by the qualitative analysis with 45% of the respondents identifying "lack of USF System infrastructure" and 21% of the participants identifying "loss of identity with USFT" as

the higher response rate for major limitations of separate accreditation for USFP. Appendix 34 provides the details.

In summary, survey respondents from all four campuses identified "lack of USF System infrastructure" as a major limitation of separate accreditation for the regional campuses. USFT and USFSM identified "lack of budget and resources" as a major limitation. USFSP identified "increase in workload" and USFP identified "loss of identity with USFT" as major limitations of separate accreditation.

Communication. Participants from each of the campuses were asked, "To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?" The survey data implies that there is less communication about separate accreditation at USFT among survey participants, and there is more communication about separate accreditation on the regional campuses. It may be assumed that the employees on the regional campuses are more involved in conversation about separate accreditation because it directly affects their work environment because of seeking separate accreditation. The USFT campus response, indicating a less perceived communication on the subject of separate accreditation, is likely due to the fact that there will be less change for most employees on this campus as a result of the reorganization.

Support for separate accreditation. Each campus was asked to respond "yes" or "no" to the following comment: "I support separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution." In summary, more than half of the survey respondents reported they were supportive of separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institutions from all four campuses with the highest percentage from USFP (98%), the second highest from USFSM (93%), the third highest from USFSP (78%), and the lowest from USFT (56%).

120

Benefits for personal situation. Each campus participant was asked to answer "yes" or "no" to the following item: "I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution." Of those responding, USFP reported the highest percentage (75%), USFSM the second highest (70%), USFSP the third highest (48%), and USFT the lowest percent (21%). More than half of the survey respondents from USFSP, the accredited regional institution, reported there would be no benefit to their personal situation. This may indicate the organizational change for their institution may have become more settled now that they have achieved separate accreditation. For USFT employees, the survey respondents' jobs may not be affected as much because of separate accreditation for the regional campuses as indicated by the higher percentage from survey respondents indicating their personal situation would not benefit.

Discussion of the Research Findings

So what does this research add to the literature about organizational change and leadership for a large university with regional branch campuses? Can the results provide real-life practical assistance or guidance to leaders and followers? Given the above summary of the research study findings, this study provides a snapshot of the employee respondents' perceptions about the anticipated organizational change of four campuses as they progress through separate accreditation to become a university system. The purpose of this study was to identify the perceptions of employees of the emerging USF System about the organizational change of separate accreditation of campuses moving from a large university with multiple campuses to a university system with regionally accredited institutions.

By achieving regional accreditation, the branch campuses within the USF System demonstrate their administrative and academic excellence, as has any other university accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). The consistent theme found in the research study was that those survey respondents from USFSM and USFP, the campuses anticipating separate accreditation, have greater hopes for improving the organization in the areas of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity, than USFT and USFSP, those institutions that already have separate accreditation. Discussion for leaders and followers within and outside of the university to consider about this organizational change is organized by the four dependent variables of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity, and includes examples from the qualitative data and open ended responses collected to support these findings.

122

Organizational structure. Research questions for this section of the survey

sought to identify employee responses about the newly forming organizational structure

of separately accredited regional campuses. Seven survey items addressed "accelerated

decision making," "goal and objective achievement," "effective operations," "design of

the USF System," "independent hiring decisions," and "independent decisions for student

and business services."

The organizational structure survey items were based on Bolman and Deal's

(2003) description of the *structural frame* which asks the question, "Is the organizational

structure in place to meet the mission, goals, and work processes for the organization?"

One of the assumptions of the structural frame is stated as follows: "structures must be

designed to fit an organization's circumstances" (p. 45). In 2000, USF's President made

a presentation to the Florida Board of Regents and articulated the desire to reorganize

USF to provide more support for the regional campuses. She stated, "Our goal is to

restructure our USF regional campuses' governance and management systems in a way

that is educationally and fiscally sound, and that provides a strong foundation for future

development of campuses."

Survey results 10 years later revealed the participants from USFSM (4.31) and

USFP (4.35), the campuses not currently separately accredited at the time of this study,

had higher averages for the organizational structure survey items. This seems to indicate

they were anticipating greater improvement of the organizational structure once they

were separately accredited. For USFT (3.57) and USFSP (3.41), the separately

accredited institutions, survey respondents' lower perceptions indicates that those

institutions with separate accreditation did not see as many benefits in the organizational

structure of their institutions or the USF System as a result of separate accreditation. To seek a better understanding, the individual survey items within the organizational structure dependent variable are reviewed.

Higher means from survey respondents on all four campuses may suggest perceived benefits of separate accreditation in the organizational structure of institutions in the following areas: "accelerated decision making," "achievement of individual goals and objectives," "effective operations," "design of the USF System," "hiring decisions," and "independent decisions regarding 'student' and 'business' services." The degree of benefit perceived varied by campus. The non-accredited campuses (USFSM and USFP) seemed to anticipate that separate accreditation would provide greater benefits in the organization of their colleges and the system. Major strengths identified from the four campuses on the benefits of separate accreditation of the regional campuses support the higher means in the above areas and are listed as follows:

"speedier attention to forms, student and staff needs. . .";

"will allow USFSP to grow with greater independence to achieve its unique mission and goals";

"to be supportive of the flagship campus and to enhance the work of the USF (S)ystem";

"ability to recruit and retain qualified faculty who have a mission to support a smaller institution";

"ability to develop, engage, and better serve its student body and campus community".

For USFT, survey respondents' results were lower for the "design of the USF System" (3.07). The qualitative data collected from USFT survey respondents on the major limitations of separate accreditation for the regional campuses may reveal some of the reasons for the lower mean addressing the "design of the USF System". Some of the data are as follows:

"I believe it creates a disjointed sense of university";

"no system level coordination for mission differentiation or degree programs";

"redundant services provided at multiple campuses".

In addition, one of the themes with the highest response rate identified as a major limitation for separate accreditation in the qualitative research from all four campuses was the "lack of USF System infrastructure." The lower means and comments from survey respondents may indicate there are practical realities in the organizational structure that may need to be addressed as the university moves to restructure its regional campuses and creation of the USF System.

Notably, USFSM (4.53) and USFP (4.60) survey respondents reported the highest means for "hiring decisions based on mission and goals," and this may reflect their anticipation of hiring employees with commitments to their individual campuses, without approval from the USFT. The following comments from the USFSM and USFP survey respondents about the major strengths of separate accreditation provide support for the "hiring decisions based on mission and goals":

"ability to develop programs, facilitate faculty promotion/tenure, and organize in ways that are meaningful to fulfilling the mission";

"greater autonomy in hiring and evaluating faculty and staff".

Responses for "effective operations" and "independent decisions regarding business services" produced similar results. Survey respondents' means were higher from USFSM and USFP the campuses seeking separate accreditation indicating they are anticipating more "effective operations" and "independent decisions regarding business services" once they are separately accredited institutions. Respondents' means from USFT, the separately accredited institution, were lower than the responses from the two campuses seeking accreditation, with survey respondents means from USFSP being the lowest, possibly indicating the challenges of creating new structures for their institution within the USF System. Specifically, USFSP survey respondents were concerned about the "effective operations" (2.98) and "independent decisions regarding business services" (2.85). It is possible some survey respondents feel strongly that separate accreditation will not eliminate many problems that would create truly "effective operations" and "independent decisions regarding business services." For example, two of the more passionate comments from survey respondents about the major limitations of separate accreditation for the USFSP are as follows:

"same administrative fights! Campus cannot stand on its own";

"We still must get approval for administrative and business functions through

Tampa HR, Finance, Budgets, Purchasing etc."

It is important to consider the fact that USFSP began the process of becoming a separately accredited institution in 2001 before the conceptualization of the umbrella USF System. As discussed in the first chapter, the entire State University System of Florida was being restructured. In 2000, the governing structure for the Florida Board of Education was established to govern the K-20 system. In 2001, the Board of Regents, the

governing body for the State University System of Florida was being dissolved, and in 2002, the Board of Governors was created to govern the State University System of Florida. USFSP and USFSM were given mandates to seek separate accreditation. In addition, the universities' governing structure was changed and new boards of trustees were established and more authority was given to the universities that were previously governed by the Board of Regents, along with other changes (Venezia & Finney, 2006).

USFSP began the process of obtaining SACS accreditation for their campus during the time the state of Florida was reorganizing the structure for the State Universities. They pioneered the process of separate accreditation for the regional campuses at USF and because of their desire to become a separately accredited institution, the USF System was created for SACS accreditation purposes (Austin, 2005). It is possible that USFSP survey respondents were anticipating more independent decision making because there was no concept of an umbrella structure or USF System in the initial stages of USFSP becoming a separate accredited regional institution. By being the first campus to achieve separate accreditation, it is likely that USFSP survey respondents were involved in the initial challenges of creating new workflows and processes. Their perception may be reflected in their lower averages and may indicate they found there were still problems with the USF System which prevents effective operations.

One of the anticipated advantages of creating the USF System is the ability to share central services, such as the enterprise business systems which houses financial, employee, student, and catalog information for the university. It is possible that survey respondents from USFSP are experiencing work flow challenges when using the

electronic business systems because they were established for the university as one centralized institution. With the change to four individual institutions, separate academic programs and catalog requirements are being developed at each institution. This may require changes to the student business system to allow for individual reports and tracking of student and curriculum data in a decentralized organizational structure. USFSP survey respondents' lower perceptions for "independent decisions regarding business services" may reflect their desire to make changes in the enterprise business systems.

In summary, the higher means from survey respondents for organizational structure from all four campuses may reveal support for the organizational structure of the USF System with separately accredited regional campuses. Survey respondents from USFSM and USFP, the campuses seeking separate accreditation, produced statistically higher averages consistently for all seven items for the organizational structure dependent variable. USFT and USFSP, the separately accredited institutions survey respondents' means were statistically significantly lower for all seven survey items. USFSP survey respondents' lower means for "effective operations" and "independent decisions regarding business services," and the qualitative theme addressing "lack of USF System infrastructure" suggest attention be given to these areas by the management and leadership while fine tuning the organizational structure for the USF System with separately accredited regional campuses.

Employee relations. As the university moves to restructure into the USF System with separately accredited institutions, survey respondents' perceptions relating to employee relations were examined. There were seven employee relations survey items.

They addressed "more meaningful and satisfying work experiences," "improved working conditions for employees by not having to report/coordinate work through the USFT departments," "alleviating feelings of isolation," and "increases in responsibilities and workloads with regards to separate accreditation" for regional campuses.

The theoretical concept for the employee relations survey items was Bolman and Deal's (2003) *human resources frame*. One of the assumptions for this frame is that employers serve the needs of employees by supplying them a place to share their talents and produce products for employers. The frame also addresses those issues that create a supportive work environment that makes employees feel they are a significant part of the organization. Bennis (2003) explains that employees are an essential and the most important resource in an organization. The employee relations dependent variable seeks to determine how employees feel about their work during the organizational change process of developing separately accredited institutions within the USF System.

Survey results in the employee relations section revealed the consistent theme of this study, with USFSM and USFP survey respondents, the campuses seeking separate accreditation having statistically significant higher averages, respectively (4.07, 3.97) than USFT and USFSP survey respondents, the separately accredited institutions, respectively (3.31, 3.35).

At USFSM and USFP, the campuses seeking separate accreditation, survey participants' higher averages suggest greater anticipation for improved employee relations at their campuses once they are separately accredited. While USFT and USFSP, the accredited institutions, also agreed that employee relations would be improved, their lower means indicate they are less inclined to believe that the separate accreditation, by

129

itself, has a significant impact on employee relations issues. Previous research on perceptions of employees during organizational change suggests that higher means may reveal higher expectations from employees, while the lower means scores reveal that employees have settled into their routines and do not feel as positive about what organizational change (separate accreditation) can bring to an institution (Isabella, 1990; Jaffee, Scott, & Tobe, 1994).

The individual survey items for employee relations queried survey respondents' on how they felt about their jobs in relation to separate accreditation for the regional campuses. USFSM and USFP higher means for "a more meaningful and satisfying work experience" suggest survey respondents seem to be anticipating more satisfaction with their work experiences once separate accreditation is achieved, while USFT and USFSP survey respondents' lower means seem to indicate that they are not anticipating that regional accreditation will bring a "more meaningful and satisfying work" situation.

There was general agreement from USFT, USFSM, and USFP survey respondents that "faculty, staff and administrators employed at the regional campuses' working conditions would improve because of not having to report/coordinate through the USFT departments". USFSM and USFP, the campuses seeking separate accreditation produced higher means. This reflects a greater anticipation for more autonomy and ownership from USFSM and USFP in their daily tasks and responsibilities once they are separately accredited.

Faculty, staff and administrative survey respondents from USFSP, the separately accredited regional institution, reported the lowest mean of the four institutions for the item "more meaningful and satisfying work for employees at the separately accredited

130

campuses/institutions" (2.58) and for "improved working conditions for administration at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USFT academic departments" (2.92). It seems that the USFSP respondents have determined that "satisfaction in their work" and "improved working conditions" do not necessarily improve as a result of separate accreditation.

Separate accreditation by itself may not provide improved employee relations. Leadership and management styles and competence issues that existed before separate accreditation will likely continue after separate accreditation. There are many other influences that may have affected survey participant perceptions, such as leadership changes at USFSP, budget cuts within the USF System, and the economic crisis affecting Florida during the time of this survey.

Survey respondents from all four campuses were in agreement that "job responsibilities" and "workloads" would increase for employees at regional campuses. Notably, USFSP, the separately accredited regional institution, survey responses were the highest for these items. At the time of this survey, USFSP had been accredited for four years and the higher means reflect the realities of increases in workload and responsibilities once the campuses achieve separate accreditation. It is likely that separate accreditation and more autonomy requires more attention to admissions, tenure and promotion, budgeting and curriculum development as each separately accredited institution develops. Initially, it would seem that there would be a greater need for modification of the employment processes and greater collaboration between the four USF System campuses because of centralized reporting mechanism and the development of the USF System.

A USFT survey respondent noted one of the major limitations of separate accreditation for the regional campuses:

"A LOT of additional work administratively, especially in Tampa, to coordinate everything."

The assumption of more collaboration is supported from a survey respondent in the following major strength for separate accreditation:

"USFT Tampa has a history of making decisions and then letting us know after the fact. Now, at least to a certain extent, we can argue that we need to be included in the discussion."

Qualitative data collected from survey respondents in this study support the notion that workloads and responsibilities have increased for survey respondents because of separate accreditation for the regional campuses. The following are comments on the major limitations of separate accreditation for the regional campuses to support this assumption:

"More work, less recognition. Too many plates to balance at one time therefore, preventing any one job to be done really well";

"Staff suffer. Sick of hearing 'do more with less', more like 'do everything with nothing'";

"Workload and responsibility increase for all staff and administration."

Finally, "alleviating feelings of isolation at the regional campuses" revealed the lowest score for the employee relations dependent variable. The theme continues with USFSM and USFP, the campuses seeking separate accreditation, which had higher means from survey respondents than those from USFSP and USFT. The lower means for this

survey item seem to reflect that employees do not necessarily see that by becoming individually separate accredited institutions, there will be a difference in "alleviating the feeling of isolation" from USFT for the regional campus survey respondents. Survey respondents' major limitation qualitative comments for separately accredited campuses provide support for this observation:

"Many LIKED feeling more connected to USFT. . .many are feeling more disconnected from USFT";

"Isolation from faculty colleagues in our disciplines—our faculty just isn't big enough yet."

It is possible that in time, the separately accredited campuses will hire new employees with the goal of working for a separately accredited regional institution that will not have the past experience of being associated with the USFT. One survey respondent explained that separate accreditation will allow the regional campuses the "ability to recruit and retain quality faculty who have a mission to support a smaller institution" as a major strength for separate accreditation for regional campuses.

In addition to the employee relations survey items, the survey respondents were asked to respond to the question, "I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation." The survey respondents from the campuses seeking separate accreditation (USFSM and USFP) indicated they are anticipating benefits to their personal situations. More than half of the survey respondents from USFSP reported there would be no benefit to their personal situation because of separate accreditation. This may indicate the organizational change for their institution has become more settled now that they have achieved separate accreditation. For USFT employees, over 70% of

the survey respondents' indicated their personal situation as an employee would not be affected because of separate accreditation. Jobs may not be affected as much because of many of the additional duties being added is at the regional campuses because of separate accreditation and not at the USFT.

Management and leadership may consider the effect the organizational change has had on employee relations while developing separately accredited institutions and the USF System. Particular attention may need to be addressed for "workload and responsibilities," and specific issues relating to "isolation for employees on the regional campuses/institutions."

Inter-campus relationships. Research questions for this study addressed inter-campus relationships, based on the *political frame* of Bolman and Deal (2003). They state, "The political frame views organizations as living, screaming political arenas that host a complex web of individual and group interests" (p. 186). There were six survey items on the survey instrument that addressed inter-campus relationships. These items asked respondents about "allowing local communities to support regional campuses/institutions," "greater identification for marketing, fundraising, and local support," "equitable distribution of scarce resources," "ability to create academic programs," "leverage identity with the USF System," and "recognition from state and national politicians to facilitate goals" for the separately accredited institutions.

Consistently, survey respondents' higher scores from USFSM (3.96) and USFP (4.29), the campuses seeking separate accreditation, revealed their anticipation of better inter-campus relationships once they achieve separate accreditation. The survey respondents from USFT (3.33) and USFSP (3.26), the institutions with separate

134

accreditation, revealed lower responses, indicating they anticipate less change in inter-campus relationships because of separately accredited institutions.

For all four campuses, the survey respondents agreed that separate accreditation would "allow local communities to support regional campuses/institutions" and "allow regional campuses/institutions greater identification for marketing, fund raising, and community support" for their institutions. Consistently, the respondents' means for USFSM and USFP, the campuses seeking separate accreditation, were higher than USFT and USFSP survey respondents' means.

USFP faculty and staff produced the highest scores for "greater ability to create academic programs for local needs," while USFSM survey respondents produced the second highest score. USFT and USFSP, the separately accredited institutions survey respondents' means were lower, indicating that autonomy to create new academic programs was still a major bureaucratic problem, even with separate accreditation. For example, one of the major limitations of separate accreditation reported from a survey respondent supports this assumption: "all requests for new programs. . .must be approved by a Tampa based department." The ability to create academic programs to serve the needs of individual communities was one of the reasons to reorganize into the USF System with four separately accredited institutions (Greenberg, 2006). In the qualitative results, the issue of academic decisions was one of the themes reported as a major strength of separate accreditation for the regional campuses that produced a higher response from survey participants from USFSP, USFSM, and USFP. Major strengths of separate accreditation for the regional campuses from survey respondents support this interpretation:

135

"Greater autonomy in developing programs and courses";

"Can design programs around USFSP's Strategic Plan";

"Give(s) USFP the ability to craft unique programs for students which makes the entire USF System strong in the long-run."

Higher means were reported from each campus for "leveraging a unique identity within the USF System" and "recognition from politicians to facilitate goals" because of separate accreditation. Interestingly, USFP survey respondents produced the higher scores for these items, possibly reflecting the technology based mission that is implied with their unique name, USF Polytechnic. Survey respondents' higher averages for this item generally support USFP's anticipation of creating a unique marketing brand around a concentration of technology programs deemed important to the area. One of the major strengths of separate accreditation reported from a survey respondent states that separate accreditation will "allow USFP to fully pursue the Polytechnic model and create a truly unique public university offering."

Survey respondents from all four campuses rated "equitable distribution of scarce resources" the lowest out of all six survey items for inter-campus relationships. The lower averages indicate "equitable distribution of resources" may be difficult to accomplish. This may be a concern for each campus, particularly in the current state and federal budget scenarios. USFT and USFSM survey respondents reported budget and resources as a theme with a higher response rate in their qualitative responses. The following examples from the major limitation of separate accreditation for regional campuses from the qualitative data support this assumption:

136

"Separate accreditation creates more competition for funding";

"Money! Money! Money! Or the lack of. . .";

"Limited funds to achieve goals";

"Increased costs, workloads with limited staff resources."

Although the idea of "equitable distribution of scarce resources" was the lowest rated overall, USFP survey respondents rated this item the highest. This may be because they have support for their campus from politicians who are in key state legislative positions to assist with funding resources for their campus. Bolman and Deal's (2003) political frame addresses the importance of building coalitions and power when negotiating for scarce resources and the ability to bargain and negotiate for resources, and this may have had some influence on the more positive responses from USFP. In fact, at the time of this writing, the Florida Board of Governors discussed the separation of USFP from the USF System to become a separate and new university (SUS, 2011). Scarce resources not only include funding, but also may include employee time. For example, one survey respondent stated one of the major limitations for achieving separate accreditation for USFSM is that it "require[s] scarce resources, especially time."

USFT (2.55) and USFSP (2.17) lower scores for "equitably distribution of scarce resources" reflect the increase in resources needed for campuses to become separately accredited. They may be thinking they will have to give up some resources to the newly accredited institutions, a redistribution of resources. Data collected in the employee relations survey items reveal "increases in workloads and responsibilities" from survey respondents and this may be related to "scarce resources." It is also possible that

economic crisis in Florida, which has affected the university budget, may have had some influence on the survey respondents' perceptions at the time of this study.

In summary, the creation of four separately accredited institutions purports to provide more autonomy for individual groups on each campus within the organization of the university. It also may increase the complexity of "inter-campus relationships" and the need for increased coordination within the USF System. Particular attention to the perceptions of "equitable distribution of scarce resources" during the organizational change process may need to be addressed.

Campus identity. The survey instrument contained five survey items that addressed campus identity. This dependent variable was based on Bolman and Deal's (2003) *symbolic frame*, which describes the culture, beliefs, and values within an institution. The specific items addressed "enhancement of prestige and perceptions of education quality," "furtherance of the goal of USFT AAU status," "promoting a sense of community," "creation of separate identity," and "enhancing public understanding of the value of the regional campuses/institutions."

The overarching theme of the research study continues with the survey participants' averages for the five survey items from the campuses seeking separate accreditation, USFSM (3.85) and USFP (4.10), being higher than USFT (3.24) and USFSP (3.24), the institutions currently separately accredited. As in the previous three areas considered, those institutions seeking accreditation have an anticipation that separate accreditation will assist in creating individual cultures and allow for greater campus identity.

Following is a discussion of each of the survey items within the campus identity

dependent variable. USFP, USFSM, and USFSP survey respondents' revealed higher

mean responses for "prestige and perception of educational quality at the regional

campuses/institutions," with USFP mean being the highest, USFSM the second highest,

and USFSP the third highest. USFT administrators and faculty survey respondents

revealed the lowest average for this item. Historical research has implied there is the

perception that education quality on branch campuses can be inferior to educational

quality on main campuses (Sammartino, 1964; Schindler, 1952). Survey results from

USFT seem to imply that respondents believe that accreditation alone doesn't make the

difference. Survey data from some of the USFT survey respondents seem to support the

perception that separate accreditation for the regional campuses may not alone make a

difference in the perceptions of education quality. Major limitations of separate

accreditation for regional campuses from survey respondents support this assumption:

"Even those regional campuses with their own accreditation suffer from a public

perception of being less than the "real" university";

"Degree from the regional campus may not be as prestigious or recognizable as

the main campus."

USFT participants mean for "furthering the goal of achieving the AAU status for

USFT" was lower than the mean of three regional campuses (USFSP, USFSM, and

USFP). This implies that the survey respondents from USFT do not perceive achieving

separate accreditation for the regional campuses will affect the goal of achieving the

AAU status for USFT. USFT has been accredited for many years and is likely seen by

most in the USF System as the campus that will receive greater support and recognition,

particularly if AAU status is obtained. The separate accreditation will likely allow USFT

to provide a better institution profile to enhance AAU qualification.

"Promoting the campus sense of community" and "creation of a separate identity"

revealed higher scores for all four campuses for these items, with USFSM and USFP, the

campuses seeking separate accreditation, revealing the higher means. Quotes from

survey respondents from the major strengths of separate accreditation for regional

campuses support the higher means for "promoting the campus sense of community":

> "The quality we have and always have had gives us a sense of pride second to
>
> none. We ARE USFSP!!!";
>
> "We will come into our own—defining ourself [sic], . . .our reputation for quality,
>
> responsiveness."

In addition, the major strengths of separate accreditation for regional campuses

from all four campuses survey respondents repeatedly produced data to support the

higher means for "creation of a separate identity":

> "Individual goals/objectives more easily met; allows for individual identity";
>
> "Develop a unique identity";
>
> "Ability to create separate identity";
>
> "Transition entirely to a polytechnic vision."

Interestingly, USFSP survey respondents' means were the lowest for the items

addressing the "campus sense of community" and "creation of a separate identity."

USFSP is the oldest of the three regional campuses and the closest in physical distance

from USFT. Identity and culture for the separately accredited regional institutions may

take time to develop. Some survey participants may be experiencing a sense of

withdrawal from USFT, as USFSP continues to develop its own identity and culture. Major limitations of separate accreditation from USFSP survey respondents' suggests employees are experiencing the differences now that they are separately accredited:

"A Masters III institution does not have the same impact in grants, nor does it allow the focus on research";

"No national recognition to a major research institution."

The campus identity section addressed "enhancing public understanding of the values of the regional campuses/institutions." Again, the USFSM and USFP, the campuses seeking separate accreditation, had higher means for this item indicating they seem to perceive the public will have a better understanding of the value of their campuses once they achieve separate accreditation. USFT administrators and faculty respondents had the lowest averages for this item. USFSP administrators and faculty survey respondents also reported lower averages for this item. It is possible that separate accreditation doesn't really do much to help the public understand the values of separate institutions. The public generally doesn't understand accreditation to begin with, and the two campuses that have separate accreditation may have a better understanding that by itself, separate accreditation does not mean a lot to the public. One of the major limitations for separately accredited campuses from a survey respondent supports this assumption:

"No one outside academia has any idea what 'separate accreditation' means and why a regional campus might want it or would benefit from it."

More emphasis may need to be placed on educating employees and the public on the value of education quality from separately accredited institutions.

In summary, more than half of the survey respondents from each of the four campuses reported they were supportive of separate accreditation for the regional campuses (USFT 56% USFSP 78% USFSM 93% USFP 98%). Survey participants agreed that separate accreditation for the four campuses would enhance campus identity for the regional campuses. Two areas may need to be addressed among managers and leaders while managing the organizational change process. They are the "prestige and perception of education quality at the regional campuses/institutions," and the "public understanding of the value of separately accredited regional institutions."

Implications

What is implied by this research study? What are the practical implications found for post-secondary leaders and followers to understand from this research study?

First, the research implies that employees are generally positive about the organizational structure of changing the university with branch campuses into the USF System with four separately accredited institutions. The study suggests that the business systems and work flow between the institutions may require more attention throughout the USF System organizational structure. One of the consistent themes revealed as a major limitation of separate accreditation for the regional campuses from survey respondents from all four campuses was the "lack of the USF System infrastructure". Bolman and Deal's (2003) *four frame theory* suggests that if procedures and processes are organized well and communicated to employees, this can provide for a smooth transition while making changes in an organization's structure. The campuses that are in the process of becoming separately accredited have higher means and this may indicate excitement about the possibilities of changing the organizational structure of their

142

campuses to operate more effectively. Continuing to enhance the organizational structure of the USF System and develop processes and structure to allow the separately accredited institutions to accomplish their goals, without the obstacles of increased bureaucracy, may enhance the perceptions of employees during this organizational change process.

The second implication revealed from this study is the perceptions of survey respondents were supportive of employee relations during this organizational change process. Many of the survey respondents indicated there may be benefits for their personal situation as an employee because of the separate accreditation of the regional campuses. The research reveals that separate accreditation alone may not create a work environment that is meaningful and satisfying, alleviate feelings of isolation, or improve working condition for some employees. Also, the research study implies that workload and responsibilities will increase for employees at the regional campuses. As the USF System develops, more training and sharing of information may assist all employees in better understanding their role in the organizational change process.

Individual leaders at the four campuses may want to reinforce communication by telling stories, celebrating victories, visiting employees in their work environments, listening to their suggestions, and collecting ideas to renew employee commitment to the change process (Kouzes & Posner, 2003). Communicating throughout the university about the new organizational structure of four separately accredited institutions as the USF System and continuing to instill the vision for the USF System may enhance employee relations.

Third, overall the study implies support for the inter-campus relationships for the USF System and separately accredited institutions. USFSM and USFP survey results

imply enthusiasm for the power to make decisions and participate in inter-campus relationships as separately accredited institutions. The study reveals there is some concern for equitability of scarce resources within the USF System. With the new structure of separately accredited institutions, the legislation provided for each campus to have separate budget authority. Bolman and Deal's (2003) *four frame theory* discuss the challenges of power and influence, and bargaining and negotiation surrounding resources. As each institution becomes separately accredited more collaboration between the institutions may be necessary at higher levels to coordinate resources to support the separate accredited institutions.

The research revealed excitement from many respondents about the ability to create new academic programs on each of the four institutions. Structure and clear procedures and processes can alleviate issues that may arise as each institution moves forward to create academic programs. The university is still considered "one institution" within the State University System of Florida, and documents submitted to the Board of Governors and Statewide Course Numbering System still require the coordination of the USF System offices. Kotter (1996) suggests the need to have key players in positions of power so that progress is not inhibited. The right expertise among workers so that the tasks can be accomplished, credibility, and the reputation of key players along with the right leadership to "drive the process" are essential (p. 57). Finally, the study found that survey respondents were supportive of separate accreditation for the regional campuses and their campus identity, especially the USFSM and USFP, the campuses anticipating separate accreditation, but they were concerned about the public understanding of what it means to be regional accredited.

Previous research reveals that culture and tradition is a large part of higher education, with relationships built within departments and disciplines (Austin, 1990). For the USF System, a new culture is being developed, in addition to the new cultures being developed within each of the regional campuses. Faculty governance (Birnbaum, 1988), sensemaking (Weick & Wheeton, 1995), and the theatre with employees acting out the drama of organization change in meetings and events (Mangham & Overington, 1987) are all part of the process of developing the cultures at universities. Campus identity for the USF System and each of the four separately accredited institutions may take time to develop.

One advantage for the USF System is consistent leadership, since this organizational change began in 2001. The President began her leadership role with USF in 2000. Her message has been consistent throughout the change process, as she has worked through several leadership changes at the regional campuses. Kotter (1996, 2003) discussed the importance and challenge of communicating during the organizational change process. He states that often the need to communicate the urgency of the change, having the right people in charge of the change process, and providing consistent messages over an extended period of time are hindered because of the "sheer magnitude of the task" (p. 87). This study revealed that USFT employees appeared to have the least communication about separate accreditation for the regional campuses. Theorists continually reveal the need to continue to communicate the vision and message about the organizational change process. Communication is important within each of the campuses, and between USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP, and may assist the practitioner to enhance the organizational change process.

As the USF System continues to evolve, organizational change theorists would suggest that leaders are challenged with instilling trust and security among employees during the organizational change process to ward off cynicism and resistance from employees (Bedeian, 2007; Kouzes & Posner, 2003; Reichers, Wanous, & Austin 1997; Schweiger & DeNisi, 1991). Kotter (1996) suggests leaders should lead by example, listen to others, and continually address problems that arise during the organizational change process. His research addresses the need to keep the communication simple, use metaphors, analogies, and examples when communicating the change vision. Repetition and using multiple venues is important in getting the message across to everyone. Bolman and Deal (2003) state, "Vision turns an organizations' core ideology, or sense of purpose, into an image of what the future might become" (p. 252). They discuss the need for consistency and commitment to communicating and articulating the vision, in addition to lateral communication and the importance of task forces, meetings, networks and other avenues of communication.

In summary, the research reveals that the respondents of the survey are in support of separate accreditation for the regional campuses, although the benefits appear to be perceived greater for those anticipating separate accreditation. Critical and constructive analysis of the practical implications of the research study results relating to organization structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity based on the survey respondents' perceptions of organizational change from a large university with regional campuses to a university system with four separately accredited institutions were provided.

This research study adds to the research literature on organizational change for higher education institutions with a snapshot of employee respondents' perceptions at different points of time within an organizational change process for a large university. The data collected provided perceptions from employees from four different sub-groups within the USF System. Each sub-group was at a different point in time in the separate accreditation process. It took five years after the initial legislation (2001) authorizing separate accreditation for USFSP to become a separately accredited institution in 2006. It took another five years for USFSM to be close to achieving separate accreditation. USFP, the youngest of the regional campuses, is working toward accreditation and the Board of Governors is considering changing them to a new university in the State. Limitations for the study and suggestions for further research are addressed in the next sections.

Limitations of the Study

The following are additional limitations for the study which were stated in chapter one.

1. The small sample size for each of the campuses is an issue and the reader should take this into consideration when reviewing the study.

2. Distribution of the survey instrument was sent out electronically with the support of each campus administrator during the Fall semester and this may have hindered the willingness of participation because of the workload required with the start-up of a new semester in an academic environment.

3. The findings of the survey are limited to the responses by faculty, staff and administrative employees who participated in the survey. It is possible that

employees with strong opinions about the subject or those that do not have much information about the subject participated in the results.

4. The survey items began with "will" and "supports" and this may have influenced the participants' responses.

Recommendations for Further Research

This study was designed to gather perceptions of employees within a large public university reorganizing from a university with multiple branch campuses to a university system with separately accredited institutions. The study was timely because the data were captured while in the midst of the organizational change and adds to the study of perceptions of employees in a university environment while experiencing the change process. Suggestions for further research in this area are as follows:

1. Design a qualitative study that would involve interviewing campus and university constituencies to gain greater understanding of how a major organizational change like this one could be improved. What was done right and what was problematic for different constituencies?

2. Design a study to gather perceptions from students and alumni about the organization change process of moving from a university with regional campuses to a university system with separately accredited institutions.

3. Duplicate the methodology of this study to research organizational change in other universities and colleges.

4. Complete a follow-up study in five years after all campuses have achieved separate accreditation to examine perceptions of the effects of separate

accreditation on organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus

relationships, and campus identity.

5. Create a longitudinal study about the organizational change process as the USF

System develops.

Conclusion

The measurement of organizational change is of great interest to researchers.

This study is one attempt to measure the perceptions of employees about a major

institutional change as it was taking place, and with the participants in different stages of

the change process. The organizational change of creating a university system with

separately accredited institutions is complex and fraught with challenge. The theme

throughout the findings of this research study on the perceptions of employees about

separate accreditation for the regional campuses in the USF System was consistent.

Survey respondents from the campuses seeking separate accreditation (USFSM and

USFP) anticipated greater benefits from separate accreditation than the survey

respondents from the accredited institutions (USFT and USFSP).

Respondents from all four campuses indicated support for the organizational

structure of the USF System with four separately accredited institutions, with some

respondents revealing that more attention may be needed to continually refine the

specifics of the organizational structure of the USF System infrastructure and business

systems to ensure effective operations for the four separate institutions. Survey

respondents were supportive with regard to improvement in employee relations, but did

anticipate that job responsibilities and workloads would increase, and did not feel that the

alleviation of "feelings of isolation" would change as a result of separate accreditation.

There was support for the belief that separate accreditation for the regional campuses would enhance inter-campus relationships for their campuses, but the respondents did have concerns about the distribution of scarce resources within the USF System. Enhancing campus identity for the individual campuses was strongly supported. More than 50% of the survey respondents stated they supported separate accreditation for the regional campuses, but the support for separate accreditation was strongest at the USFSM and USFP campuses.

To conclude, the data was collected for this study in September, 2010, and the dissertation study was completed in September, 2011. The USF System infrastructure has become more fully developed with the Governance Policy for the USF System updated in 2011 to clarify roles and responsibilities for the USF System to include USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP (USF System, n.d.) USFSP continues to grow and is planning for its SACS reaffirmation in 2011, five years after becoming a separately accredited institution. USFSM was granted initial separate accreditation from the University of South Florida by SACS in June, 2011, and now is the third institution within the USF System (SACCOC 2011). USFP has received their letter of delegation from the USF President and has submitted their initial application for separate accreditation to SACS. In addition USFP has received support from their community to become a separate university. Recently discussions about the vision for USFP occurred at the September 15, 2011 Board of Governors meeting (SUS, 2011). A respected State Senate representative from Florida attended the meeting in support of moving USFP from a regional campus to a university in the state with a polytechnic vision. Bolman and Deal (2003) discuss the importance of power and influence and bargaining and negotiation

within their political frame. They define power as the "…the capacity to get things done" (p. 188). The presentation to the Board of Governors and appearance from the State Senator supporting these changes is an example of the political frame. The final outcome of the Board of Governors meeting with regards to USFP according to the Tampa Tribune are "[t]he board voted unanimously to explore the details of breaking Polytechnic away from USF, tapping USF to do much of the work and return with a report in November" (Peterson, 2011).

As discussed earlier, change has been continuous for employees at the University of South Florida System as the University tries to position itself to best serve the region and the State of Florida. USFSP and USFSM have created academic and administrative structures to achieve regional accreditation from SACS. The USFP campus continues to pursue SACs accreditation in addition to exploring becoming a separate university. This study and future research studies within post-secondary educational institutions will enhance our understanding of how to facilitate major organizational chance more effectively.

Researcher's Perspective

As an employee at USFSM for the past 16 years, I recall when the 2001 legislation was passed mandating separate accreditation for USFSM and USFSP. There were many meetings and discussions among faculty, staff and administrators about what this legislation would mean for USFSM. For the first five years, it appeared that no action was taken to achieve separate accreditation. In 2008, when the deadline set by the Legislature grew closer, the majority of the faculty members at USFSM were opposed to separate accreditation and expressed their resistance in a Faculty Governance Association

survey with 69% of the survey respondents indicating their support for USFSM keeping an affiliation with USFT (Survey, USFSM). The USFSM faculty members were hired by USF as part of the flagship research intensive campus, USFT. Staff and administrative employees were concerned about workloads and skill level to work independently.

In Fall 2006, the USFSM leadership changed, USFSP had become separately accredited, and the USFSM faculty, staff and administrators began to again explore the possibilities of becoming a separately accredited institution. New administrators, deans and faculty members were hired who embraced the idea of separate accreditation for USFSM. Everyone began to buy into the idea of being separately accredited and took ownership for the organizational change. In Fall 2010, when this study was conducted, there seemed to be considerable anticipation about the advantages of separate accreditation on the part of USFSM survey respondents. The survey respondents displayed their commitment and a generally positive attitude toward working through the process and challenges of becoming their own institution. USFSM achieved separate accreditation in 2011. Since that process began, much progress has been made in establishing individual campus policies and procedures, and in developing the USF System infrastructure. My hope for the study was that it would be helpful to the leaders at USF's system institutions in understanding the perceptions of employees while going through this major organizational change process.

References

Armenakis, A., & Bedein, A. G. (1999). Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management, 25*(3), 293-315. doi:10.1016/50149-2063(99)00004-5

Austin, A. E. (1990). Faculty cultures, faculty values. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 68*, 61-74. doi:10.1002/ir.37019906807

Austin, D. (2005, March 24). Memorandum from Florida Board of Governors to President Judy Genshaft, University of South Florida, USF System.

Bedeian, A. G. (2007). Even if the tower is "ivory," it isn't "white": Understanding the consequences of faculty cynicism. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 6*(1), 9-22. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2007.24401700

Bennis, W. (2003). *On becoming a leader*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work the cybernetics of academic organization and leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education an introduction to theory and method* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Reframing organizations artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations artistry, choice and leadership* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

153

Brown, M., & Cregan, C. (2008). Organizational change cynicism: The role of employee involvement. *Human Resource Management, 47*(4), 667-686. doi:10.1002/hrm.20239

Clarke, B. R. (1983). The contradictions of change in academic systems. *Higher Education, 12*(1), 101-116. doi:10.1007/BF00140275

Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin, 112*(1), 155-159. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.112.1.155

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap. . .and others don't.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Collins, D. (2003). Pretesting survey instruments: An overview of cognitive methods. *Quality of Life Research*, *12*(3), 229-238. doi:10.1023/A:1023254226592

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika, 16(3)*, 297-334. doi:10.1007/BF02310555

Dean, J. W., Brandes, P., & Dharwadkar, R. (1998). Organizational cynicism. *The Academy of Management Review, 23*(2), 341-353. doi:10.5465/AMR.1998.533230

Dwyer, E. E. (1993). *Attitude scale construction: A review of the literature.* Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED359201)

Eaton, J. S. (2009). An overview of U.S. accreditation. *Council for Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://www.chea.org/pdf/2009.06_Overview_of_US _Accreditation.pdf#search=%22an%20overview%20of%20u.s%20accreditation %22

Florida Department of State. (2011). *State archives of Florida online catalog.* Retrieved

   from http://dlis.dos.state.fl.us/barm/rediscovery/default.asp?IDCFile=/

   fsa/DETAILSG.IDC,SPECIFIC=1062,DATABASE=GROUP

Florida Statute. Title XLVIII, Chapter 1004.33, K-20 Education Code: The University of

   South Florida St. Petersburg (2008).

Florida Statute. Title XLVIII, Chapter 1004.34, K-20 Education Code: The University of

   South Florida Sarasota/Manatee (2008).

Florida Statute. Title XLVIII, Chapter 1004.345, K-20 Education Code: The University

   of South Florida Polytechnic (2008).

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th

   ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational research competencies for*

   analysis and applications (9th ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Genshaft, J. (2000, November). *President Genshaft's presentation to the board of*

   regents. Retrieved from http://www.usf.edu/AboutUSF/Administration/president

   /pdfs/archive/bor2000.pdf

Gioia, D. A., & Thomas, J. B. (1996). Identity, image, and issue interpretation:

   Sensemaking during strategic change in academia. *Administrative Science*

   Quarterly, 41(3), 370-403.

Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1996). *Statistical methods in education and psychology*

   (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Guskin, A. E. (1996). Facing the future. *Change, 28*(4), 4, 5, 12-18.

Greenberg, M. (2006). *University of South Florida: The first fifty years*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida.

Hill, R. A. (1985). Multi-campus university organizational structure and branch campus administrative problems. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section A. Humanities and Social Sciences, 46*(04), 858.

Isabella, L. A. (1990). Evolving interpretations as a change unfolds: How managers construe key organizational events. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(1), 7-41. doi:10.2307/256350

Jaffee, D. T., Scott, C. D., & Tobe, G. R. (1994). *Rekindling commitment: How to revitalize yourself*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Keller, G. (2001). Governance: The remarkable ambiguity. In P. G. Altbach, P. J. Gumport, & D. B. Johnstone, (Eds.), *In defense of American higher education* (pp. 304-322). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Kezar, A. J. (Ed.). (2001). Understanding and facilitating organizational change in the 21st century: Recent research and conceptualizations. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 28, 1-162*. doi:10.1002/aehe.2804

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Leadership: The challenge* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lueddeke, G. R. (1999). Toward a constructivist framework for guiding change and innovation in higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(3), 235-260.

Mangham I. L., & Overington, M. A. (1987). *Organizations as theater: A social psychology of dramatic appearances*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Nardi, P. M. (2003). *Doing survey research: A guide to quantitative methods.* Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Nitko, A. J., & Brookhart, S. M. (2007). *Educational assessment of students* (5th ed.). Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill.

O'Rourke, N., Hatcher, L., & Stepanski, E. J. (2005). *A step-by-step approach to using SAS ® for univariate and multivariate statistics.* Cary, NC: SAS Publishing.

Peterson, L. (2011, September 15), State will study separating Lakeland from USF. *The Tampa Tribune*. Retrieved from http://duke1.tbo.com/content/2011/sep/15/151611/usfs-future-in-lakeland-on-states-agenda-today/news-breaking/

Rajecki, D. W. (1982). *Attitudes themes and advances*. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates.

Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. A. (2005). *Designing and conducting survey research* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Reichers, A. E., Wanous, J. P., & Austin, J. T. (1997). Understanding and managing cynicism about organizational change. *Academy of Management Executive, 11*(1), 48-59.

Rowley, D. J., Lujan, H. D., & Dolence, M. G. (1997). *Strategic change in colleges and universities: Planning to survive and prosper.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Sammartino, P. (1964). Multiple-campus colleges. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *35*(9), 503-506.

Schabracq, M. J., & Cooper, C. L., (1998). Toward a phenomenological framework for the study of work and organizational stress. *Human Relations, 51*(5)*,* 625-648. doi:10.1023/A:1016958318510

Schindler, C. M. (1952). Stepchild of the college campus. *The Journal of Higher Education, 23*(4), 191-197, 227-228.

Schweiger, D. M., & DeNisi, A. S. (1991). Communication with employees following a merger: A longitudinal field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 34*(1), 110-135. doi:10.2307/256304

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization.* New York, NY: Doubleday/Currency.

Southern Association of College and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). (2001). *Principles of accreditation: Foundations for quality enhancement.* Retrieved from http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/PrinciplesOfAccreditation.PDF

Southern Association of College and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). (2002). *Separate accreditation for units of a member institution policy statement.* Retrieved from http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/separate%20accred%20for %20units.pdf

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). (2011). *Actions taken by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees June 23, 2011.* Retrieved from http://sacscoc.org/2011%20June%20Actions%20and %20Disclosure%20Statements/11cract%20june.pdf

Spector, P. E., & Michaels, C. E. (1983). A note on item order as an artifact in organizational surveys. *Journal of Occupational Psychology. 56*(1) 35-36.

State University System (SUS) of Florida. (2005). *Board of governors: Quick facts,* Retrieved from http://www.flbog.org/resources/quickfacts/

State University System (SUS) of Florida. (2005). *Board of governors: Strategic plan 2005-2013.* Retrieved from http://www.flbog.org/about/strategicplan/

State University System (SUS) of Florida. (2011). *Board of governors: Agenda and meeting materials*, *September 14-15, 2011.* Retrieved from http://www.flbog.org/documents_meetings/0150_0537_4313_999%20Complete %20Packet.pdf

Stevens, J. P. (1999). *Intermediate statistics: A modern approach* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Thurstone, L. L. (1928). Attitudes can be measured. *The American Journal of Sociology*, *33*(4), 529-554.

Trombley, W. (n.d.). *Florida Gulf Coast University: Amid alligators and hurricanes, a new campus is taking shape.* Retrieved from http://www.capolicycenter.org /ct_1096/ctn3_1096.html

U.S. Census Bureau. (1995). *Florida population of counties by decennial census: 1900 to 1990.* Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/population/cencounts/fl190090.txt

U. S. Census Bureau. (2008). *Population estimates: State - characteristics selected age groups by states and Puerto Rico: 2008* (SC-EST2008-01). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/popest/states/asrh/SC-EST2008-01.html

University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM). (2011). USFSM strategic plan (2006-2011). Retrieved from http://www.sarasota.usf.edu/ir/Strategic_Plan /StratPlanFINAL.pdf

University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM). (2008). USFSM Results of

    Faculty Governance Association Survey, January 2008. Received from the

    USFSM Faculty Senate.

University of South Florida St. Petersburg (USFSP). (2006). *Commission recommends*

    USFSP for separate accreditation. Retrieved from http://www.usfsp.edu/COE

    /SACS.pdf

University of South Florida System. (n.d.). *Governance policy for the USF System.*

    Retrieved from http://generalcounsel.usf.edu/policies-and-procedures/pdfs/BOT-

    policy-07-001-governance.pdf

University of South Florida Tampa (USFT). (2005). *Compliance certification report*

    2004-2005. Retrieved from the University of South Florida Office of Academic

    Programs and USF E-Campus on electronic CD.

University of South Florida Tampa (USFT). (2011). *Fifth year interim report for the*

    Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools

    (SACS): Part IV. Retrieved from

    http://usfweb2.usf.edu/assessment/SACS%202010/index.html

University of South Florida Tampa (USFT). (2011). *USF 1995-1996 undergraduate*

    catalog. Retrieved from http://www.ugs.usf.edu/catalogs/9596/cattoc.htm

University of South Florida Tampa (USFT). (2011). *USF System Facts 2009-2010*.

    Retrieved from http://system.usf.edu/index.asp

University of South Florida, University Board of Trustees (USFUBOT). (2004). *USF*

    Board of Trustee meeting minutes February 26, 2004, and October 24, 2004.

    Received from the Office of the President, University of South Florida by email.

Venezia, A., & Finney, J. (2006). *The governance divide: The case study for Florida.* (National Center Report #05-4). Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED508098)

Wahlstedt, G. I., & Edling, C. (1997). Organizational changes at a postal sorting terminal—Their effects upon work satisfaction, psychosomatic complaints and sick leave. *Work & Stress, 11*(3), 279-291. doi:10.1080/02678379708256841

Weick, K. E., & Wheeton. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Appendices

Appendix 1

Analyzed Data for Comprehension Question One
What does the term "separate accreditation" mean to you?

Interview	Answers
1	no longer be under the SACS accreditation, along with Tampa
2	separation of the academic link between the regional campus and the departments
3	the campuses each have to meet the criteria necessary to be accredited rather than relying on Tampa
4	validation of the academic programs…based on a certain set of criteria by the accrediting agency
5	function independently; provide the programs…make hiring decisions independently…award diplomas
6	more decision -making powers; met certain standard to be recognized…
7	each campus will have its own …SACS accreditation
8	SACS evaluation of our institution as a stand-alone academic institution; additional responsibility
9	recognized by the SACS COC as a separately…meet core requirements…certain amount of independence and decision making
10	meet a set of standards as prescribed by …SACS

Appendix 2

Analyzed Data for Comprehension Question Two
What do you think the survey items are asking you about?
Follow up questions for terms within the organizational structure items

Interview	Accelerate	Effectively	Independent Decisions	University System
1	Speed up	Smoothly, getting things done	On our own	the whole - just a series of more campuses
2	move faster; pick up momentum; move forward	respond in a real-time basis…being able to when something occurs	make them more independent	each campus; part of that system
3	Will allow decisions to be made in a more timely manner	With efficacy	Without control	four campuses
4	advance quicken	efficiency and clarity of purpose	Autonomy	hard concept; I can't tell you what that means.
5	make the decisions independently and quicker	wait on those decision from Tampa that hold us up	the right or autonomy to make decision regarding academics here.	That means USF as a whole, including St. Pete, Lakeland, Sarasota-Manatee and Tampa.
6	To go forth in a positive direction	Being done.. Achieving the goal or you know what's set out to be done.	Without having to … with a larger authority	the whole -- all campuses within the university
7	Make faster	More efficient	Being able to make our own decisions	all four campuses
8	Increase	absolute increased outcomes...efficiency of operation	we get to make for ourselves	just USFT and USF St. Pete.
9	Increased	outcomes of our decisions resulted in quality improvements and met needs	Being able to make the decision on this campus. Not requiring any further approval	the four campuses
10	Fast speed ahead	being good at	that we are allowed to make decisions ourselves. We do not have to ask permission	it's the regional campuses with the main campus.

Appendix 3

Analyzed Data for the Comprehension Question Two
What do you think the survey items are asking you about?
Follow up questions for terms within the employee relations items

Interview	Meaningful & Satisfying Work	Improve Working Conditions	Increased Responsibilities
1	make employees feel better; responsible; happy	things work better; system works; satisfaction out of being at work	more work to do
2	employees are trusted; they're empowered; actually contributing to something; they're moving along together collectively; see the point	simplify processes or streamline; eliminate forms; more efficient	making those jobs bigger; increased levels of duties
3	people don't have to work through another distant layer	time is saved; without having to go through the complex administrative grid	make the decisions
4	a sense of accomplishment	streamline processes	stuff to do, more tasks
5	Satisfying	for faculty…it will not improve	already been, it will increase; increase responsibilities
6	don't know	not sure	More workload
7	work we're doing is important; providing something to people; feel good about it	simplifying, less complication; making it simpler	take on more
8	Focus, understanding, appreciation for the conclusion, and the opportunity to actually make change happen	have a say; to see it happen	increase for this institution
9	people who benefit from the work express change and development; satisfying probably is that it's meaningful; making a difference; contributing to something bigger	morale; idea of compensation	making the decisions
10	contributions are appreciated; input is asked for/appreciated	Missed	overseeing both departments; increased responsibilities

Appendix 4

Analyzed Data for the Comprehension Question Two
What do you think the survey items are asking you about?
Follow up questions for terms within for the
Inter-campus Relationships Items

Interview	Increase Competition	Scarce Resources
1	recognition on different levels; trying to get more students; funding	state money, fundraising
2	internally, externally, same students	funding, students, donors
3	students, online courses	independent financial support, they wouldn't be competitive, each school goes to Legislature
4	not getting enough love from the parent	people, money
5	SCF, within USF System	not really sure how resources allocated
6	don't know, similar choices	Funding
7	same students, monies, funding	monies, funding, looking for same thing
8	credit hour generation, money, market share	differentiate between scarce resources; economic times
9	arguments, conflicts, resources	resources limited
10	parent, achieve, it's a top performer	lack of money; funding

Appendix 5

Analyzed Data for the Comprehension Question Two
What do you think the survey items are asking you about?
Follow up Questions for the Campus Identity Items

Interview	Prestige and Perception	Isolation	Separate Identity	Enhance public understanding
1	Prestige - how you are seen in the light of other universities and… communities	on your own	no longer connected; recognized for own work	working with community
2	viewed equally, entire system, better reputation, unique identity, marketing and branding	administration side of isolation; academic isolation; not participating actively; missing out on some of that day-to-day	separate academic identity; flagship programs	I don't think the public understands how important and exactly what accreditation is.
3	job placement success, known nationally	refers to resources; might be degree of isolation among faculty members	identity in perception; positive identity, own identities	local politicians, citizens, congressman
4	about visibility and creating, big brand	don't understand that	A unique mission purpose. Kind of a branding.	branding, people see USF as one entity
5	Thinking of it from a marketing perception, I don't' think it will impact us whatsoever.	some isolation separating departments; some shared resources	unity in USF; separate identity, diplomas	explain this clearly to the public
6	positive outlook, certain standards and expectations	Alone	Being recognized just for what we are and not being connected with something else.	more clear; promoting; understanding
7	being more noticed, better understanding	Being out of contact	define ourselves in our own terms as to who we are	community has better understanding
8	professional accreditation	not sure felt isolated; disagree	each one own personality	big problem, newspapers, media, continually educate
9	campus being a good school	you're detached from the greater whole	recognized for ourselves	accreditation has the potential for; allowing us to focus ..communicate
10	somebody perceives you; the way you look to the outside world	isolation is not a good thing	unique programs	good communicators

Appendix 6

Analyzed Data for the Retrieval Question

Can you provide examples of work issues or descriptive words that come to mind when
answering the items?

Interview	Data
1	committees, responsibilities, meetings
2	what accreditation means, speculative, blazing a new trail, academic decisions, administrative side
3	decision making, course offerings, freedom, hiring of adjuncts, greater flexibility
4	system structure, tying it to either an issue that's come up here
5	we can make independent decisions, have own programs, hire own faculty, on-line resources, technology, P-card, level of work load, changing codes, new systems and processes, taking on new responsibilities
6	workloads, scarce resources, increased responsibility, faculty and students
7	answered based on propaganda, trying to believe
8	twenty examples for each one
9	my history, actually participating in drawing up some [documents], central services, drives to Tampa
10	None

Appendix 7

Analyzed Data for the Decision/Judgment Questions One, Two and Three

Interview	Do the survey items apply to you as an employee?	On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the most confident, how confident did you feel when you assigned a score to the item?	What was your strategy when answering the items? How did you arrive at that answer? Did you think of a specific event?
1	Yes	4	think about whether or not I would agree with them…make sure I understood the question
2	I don't think that they apply…in my current role, but I have the awareness from being on one of the campuses.	4 and 5	Reflecting back to the working environment
3	as an adjunct professor at a regional campus	1.5 to 2	No. I look at every question for a logical paradigm…fit into a large deductive system
4	Yes, most of them do	3 to 4	Yes, Is it a process that I'm engaged in…knowledge
5	Yes	5	Thinking about conversations that I've had…some decision-making
6	most of them, yes	4 to 4.5	specific event or experience
7	Many of them do -- not all	3	No answer
8	Yes	5, but that's because I chose not to reply to the ones that I was not	I read the question, I decide what it applied to, then I think through a set of examples.
9	Yes, I've experienced almost all of it.	4	Yes
10	Not a lot	4.8	I analyzed it and made decisions based on knowledge

Appendix 8

Analyzed Data for the Response Questions One and Two

Interview	How did you feel about answering the items? Any anxiety/offensive?	Was there a clear choice, or did you need to evaluate your response to the item?
1	Positive, no	Usually clear choice
2	Very comfortable, no	Two questions where I did not feel like I had a clear choice
3	Worrisome to answer questions when you don't have significant knowledge, no.	No comment
4	Yeah	A couple of them I hesitated…landed on neutral
5	One of my concerns is I strongly agreed with a lot of them; It was positive; no	I think my neutrals were the ones that I'm not sure of
6	No	Neutral would be not knowing
7	They were all clear; straightforward; no	neutral because I just wasn't sure I could really have an honest opinion
8	I think the language was offensive to some of us who are no longer a campus; questions are simple for very complex issues.	frequently weren't clear choices; simple question and complex underneath
9	There were just a little bit; Hesitation was always did not have enough experience in that area.	No comment
10	Yes comfortable; straightforward	No comment

Appendix 9

Analyzed Data Comments When Completing the Survey Instrument

Interview	Comments
1	AAU status, don't know, stay neutral
2	don't know; feelings of isolation ; don't know st. Pete's atonomy level; don't know; interpret neutral - no effect
3	no comments
4	wouldn't know; the question "…system organization structure" don't think most people know much about
5	no comments
6	don't understand the questions; neutral; not 100% familiar with SACS; putting neutral; not understanding
7	"…system organization structure" not sure I now what it means; tough questions
8	don't know what that means; don't know; don't use word campus; don't know hr1; don't know; has accelerated the decision making process -- not sure I know what …means"
9	select other USF campuses; adjunct; "accelerate decision making process" want to mark D and A; don't know; don't know; not applicable; don't know
10	don't know; no knowledge of that; not applicable; don't know

Appendix 10

Letters from Institutional Review Board Approval for Surveys

USF

UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTH FLORIDA

DIVISION OF RESEARCH INTEGRITY AND COMPLIANCE
Institutional Review Boards, FWA No. 00001669
12901 Bruce B. Downs Blvd., MDC035 • Tampa, FL 33612-4799
(813) 974-5638 • FAX (813) 974-5618

August 2, 2010

Rhonda Moraca
Adult, Career and Higher Education

██████████████████

RE: **Exempt Certification** for IRB#: Pro00001322
Title: In the Midst of Organizational Change: A Survey of Employee Perceptions Toward
Separate Accreditation for Regional Campuses/Institution of a Southeast Public University .

Dear Ms. Moraca,

On 7/31/2010 , the Institutional Review Board (IRB) determined that your research meets USF
requirements and Federal Exemption criteria as outlined in the federal regulations at
45CFR46.101(b):

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement),
survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
(i) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified,
directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and (ii) any disclosure of the human
subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or
civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

As the principal investigator for this study, it is your responsibility to ensure that this research is
conducted as outlined in your application and consistent with the ethical principles outlined in
the Belmont Report and with USF IRB policies and procedures. Please note that changes to this
protocol may disqualify it from exempt status. Please note that you are responsible for notifying
the IRB prior to implementing any changes to the currently approved protocol.

The Institutional Review Board will maintain your exemption application for a period of five
years from the date of this letter or for three years after a Final Progress Report is received,
whichever is longer. If you wish to continue this protocol beyond five years, you will need to
submit a continuing review application at least 60 days prior to the exemption expiration date.
Should you complete this study prior to the end of the five-year period, you must submit a
request to close the study.

We appreciate your dedication to the ethical conduct of human subject research at the University
of South Florida and your continued commitment to human research protections. If you have
any questions regarding this matter, please call 813-974-9343.

Sincerely,

██████████████████

Krista Kutash, PhD, Chairperson
USF Institutional Review Board

Cc: Anna Davis, USF IRB Professional Staff

eIRB: Amendment Approved

eirb@research.usf.edu [eirb@research.usf.edu]

Sent: Friday, October 08, 2010 3:08 PM

To: Moraca, Rhonda

IRB Amendment Approved

To: Rhonda Moraca

RE: Amendment 1 for IRB Study #Pro00001322
Survey of Perceptions

PI: Rhonda Moraca

Link: Ame1_Pro00001322

You are receiving this notification because the above listed amendment has received Approval by the IRB. To begin your review, navigate to the project workspace by clicking the Link above.

WARNING: DO NOT REPLY. To ensure a timely response, please do not reply to this email. Direct all correspondence to the IRB Office either through your project's workspace or the contact information below.

University of South Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research and Innovation
3702 Spectrum Blvd Suite 155
Tampa, FL 33612

Template:_000 - IRB Amendment: Approved

https://email.usf.edu/OWA/?ae=Item&t=IPM.Note&id=RgAAAABFNJgutIG2R5bJKcQ...   10/12/2010

USF
UNIVERSITY OF
SOUTH FLORIDA

DIVISION OF RESEARCH INTEGRITY AND COMPLIANCE
Institutional Review Boards, FWA No. 00001669
12901 Bruce B. Downs Blvd., MDC035 • Tampa, FL 33612-4799
(813) 974-5638 • FAX (813) 974-5618

October 8, 2010

Rhonda Moraca
Adult, Career and Higher Education
████████████████

RE: **Approved** <u>Amendment Request</u>
      IRB#: MS1_Pro00001322
      Title: In the Midst of Organizational Change: A Survey of Employee Perceptions Toward
Separate Accreditation for Regional Campuses/Institution of a Southeast Public University

Dear Ms. Moraca,

On 10/6/2010 the Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviewed and approved your Amendment by
expedited review procedures.

The submitted request has been approved **from date:** 10/6/2010 **to date:** 7/31/2015 for the
following:

(1) Revised online survey instruments to reflect findings from pilot survey. Specifically, (1) The
demographic variable was changed to an open ended question to collect the number of years
employed, and (2) The items relating to the intercampus relations or political frame were
adjusted because of a low inter-rater reliability score.
(2) Follow-up email to be sent to the provost and regional chancellors of each campus advising
them that the attached survey, which will be sent to the employees on their campus/institution,
has been revised based on the pilot survey findings.

We appreciate your dedication to the ethical conduct of human subject research at the University
of South Florida and your continued commitment to human research protections. If you have any
questions regarding this matter, please call 813-974-9343.

Sincerely,

████████████████

Krista Kutash, Ph.D., Chairperson
USF Institutional Review Board

Appendix 11

Letter to Campus Administrator Requesting Permission to Administer Pilot Survey

Moraca, Rhonda

From:	Moraca, Rhonda
Sent:	Friday, August 06, 2010 10:28 AM
To:	Guilford, Arthur (USF Sarasota-Manatee)
Cc:	Jones, Bonnie
Subject:	Pilot Survey for Dissertation Request
Attachments:	USFSM_OPS_Pilot_Survey.pdf

Dr. Guilford,

First, I would like to thank you again for your valuable input in developing the survey instrument on perceptions of employees on the issue of separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution at USF as part of my dissertation research. I successfully defended my proposal on May 18, 2010, and received my IRB approval on August 2, 2010.

This letter is to officially request your permission to administer the pilot survey instrument to all OPS employees at USF Sarasota-Manatee. Once I have your approval, I will proceed with requesting the list of employees and email addresses from the USFSM Human Resource Department and proceed with sending out the survey. I would like to send the survey out to the OPS employees sometime next week if possible. Prior to sending the survey to employees at USF Sarasota-Manatee, I will be sending you an email and request that you send out an announcement for the survey by email to the OPS employees to encourage them to participate in the survey. As we discussed, once I have the results analyzed I will send you an executive summary of the findings in the research. The following is the draft email. Please let me know if you would like me to edit it in any way. I have attached a copy of the USFSM OPS pilot survey instrument.

Draft Email announcing the Survey from Dr. Guilford:

I would like to encourage you to participate in a survey you will be receiving shortly by email. The survey is on perceptions of employees about the issues of separate accreditation for USF's regional campuses. Please take a few moments to complete the survey. The survey is part of the dissertation research for Rhonda S. Moraca, a higher education doctoral candidate in the department of Adult Career and Higher Education at USF. The survey results will be helpful to Rhonda in completing her dissertation research and provide research on perceptions of employees for the campus during our reorganization into separately accredited institutions as part of the USF system.

Again, the purpose of this study is to identify the perceptions of employees at USF about the most pressing changes that occur with the separate accreditation of campuses, particularly as part of an organizational change that involves moving from a large university with multiple campuses to a university system with regionally accredited campuses.

The research questions are as follows:

1. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of USF employees on each of the four campuses in the areas of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity with respect to the implications of the separate accreditation of campuses with the USF system?

2. Are there any significant differences between the perceptions of employees in the areas organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity on selected demographic variables, including employee category (staff, faculty, administration), years of employment at USF, gender and campus location?

Thank you again for your support. I look forward to your response.

Rhonda

Rhonda S. Moraca

Appendix 12

Cover Memorandum Pilot Study Survey Instrument

USF Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM) Employee Survey of Perceptions towards
Separate Accreditation for USFSM

In the Midst of Organizational Change:
A Survey of Employee Perceptions Toward Separate Accreditation for Regional
Campuses/Institution of a Southeast Public University
IRB # Pro00001322

USF Sarasota-Manatee OPS Employee Survey of Perceptions towards Separate
Accreditation for USF Sarasota-Manatee.

You are invited to participate in a perception survey for USF Sarasota-Manatee
employees about separate accreditation for USFSM. This is a research project and the data will
be analyzed as part of my dissertation research in the higher education program at USFT.

Participation in this survey, or a decision not to participate, will not affect your
employment status. Your survey responses will be kept strictly confidential and data from this
research will be reported only in the aggregate.   An executive summary, along with a report of
the aggregate data will be provided to each campus/institution administrator.

It will take approximately 10 minutes to complete the survey. Your participation in this
study is completely voluntary. There are no foreseeable risks associated with this project.
However, if you feel uncomfortable answering any questions, you can withdraw from the survey
at any point.

Please answer each item as follows: Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N),
Agree (A), Strongly Agree (A), and Don't Know (DK).

If you have questions at any time about the survey or the procedures, please contact
Rhonda Moraca by email at moraca@sar.usf.edu Thank you very much for your time and
support. Please start the survey now by clicking on the link below.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/USFSMOPSPerceptionSurvey

Appendix 13

Pilot Study Survey Instrument
USF Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM) Employee Survey of Perceptions towards
Separate Accreditation for USFSM

1. Demographic Information

1. Employment classification

○ OPS Clerical

○ OPS Adjunct Faculty

○ None of the Above

2. Gender

○ Female

○ Male

3. Number of years you have been employed at USFSM

○ Less than 3 years

○ 3-9 years

○ 10-15 years

○ Greater than 16 years

4. Employment at other USF campuses/institutions

○ USF Tampa

○ USF St. Petersburg

○ USF Polytechnic

○ None of the above

2. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSM

Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree(A), Strongly Agree (SA), and Don't Know (DK).

1. will accelerate the decision making process for USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will enable USFSM to achieve its individual goals and objectives

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will allow USFSM to operate more effectively

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. supports the design of the four campuses/institutions as a university system

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

5. will allow USFSM to make hiring decisions based on its campus mission and goals

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSM

1. will enable USFSM to make independent decisions regarding student services

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will enable USFSM to make independent decisions regarding business services

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will create a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will improve the working conditions for faculty at USFSM by not having to report to the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

5. will improve the working conditions for staff at USFSM by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSM

1. will improve the working conditions for administration at USFSM by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will alleviate feelings of isolation at USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will increase job responsibilities for employees at USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will increase workloads (tasks) for employees at USFSM

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

5. will allow local communities to support USFSM

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

5. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSM

1. will increase competition between the four campuses/institutions

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

2. will decrease potential conflict between USF Tampa and USFSM with regard to promotion and tenure and other departmental issues

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

3. will increase competition for scarce resources between the four campuses/institutions

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

4. will allow scarce resources to be allocated more effectively for the four campuses/institutions

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

5. will enable USFSM to make independent decisions regarding academics

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

6. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSM

1. will enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality at USFSM

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

2. will further the goal of achieving the AAU status for USF Tampa

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

3. will promote the campus sense of community at USFSM

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

4. will allow USFSM to create a separate identity

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

5. will enhance public understanding of the value of USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

7. Please provide additional comments for the following:

1. Major strengths of separate accreditation for USFSM.

```
                              5
                              6
```

2. Major limitations of separate accreditation for USFSM.

```
                              5
                              6
```

3. To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?

```
                              5
                              6
```

4. I support separate accreditation.

○ Yes

○ No

5. I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation for USFSM?

○ Yes

○ No

Appendix 14

Cover Memorandum for USFSM Pilot Survey 12 Items
Inter-campus Relationship Survey

I need your assistance once again on 12 items for my dissertation survey. Please note the information below.

Thank you for your assistance with the survey. Rhonda

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/USFSM_OPSPerceptionSurvey_12items

In the Midst of Organizational Change:
A Survey of Employee Perceptions Toward Separate Accreditation for Regional
Campuses/Institution of a Southeast Public University
IRB # Pro00001322

USF Sarasota-Manatee OPS Employee Survey of Perceptions towards Separate Accreditation for USF Sarasota-Manatee.

You are invited to participate in a perception survey for USF Sarasota-Manatee employees about separate accreditation for USFSM. This is a research project and the data will be analyzed as part of my dissertation research in the higher education program at USF.

Participation in this survey, or a decision not to participate, will not affect your employment status. Your survey responses will be <u>kept strictly confidential</u> and data from this research will be reported only in the aggregate. An executive summary, along with a report of the aggregate data will be provided to each campus/institution administrator.

It will take approximately 5 minutes to complete the survey. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There are no foreseeable risks associated with this project. However, if you feel uncomfortable answering any questions, you can withdraw from the survey at any point.

Please answer each item as follows: Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree (A), Strongly Agree (A), and Don't Know (DK).

If you have questions at any time about the survey or the procedures, please contact Rhonda Moraca by email at moraca@sar.usf.edu Thank you very much for your time and support. Please start the survey now by clicking on the link below.

http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/USFSM_OPSPerceptionSurvey_12items

Appendix 15

Second Pilot Study USFSM 12-Item Inter-campus Relationships Survey

1. Demographic Information

1. Employment classification

◯ OPS Clerical

◯ OPS Adjunct Faculty

◯ None of the Above

2. Gender

◯ Female

◯ Male

3. Number of years you have been employed at USFSM

◯ Less than 3 years

◯ 3-9 years

◯ 10-15 years

◯ Greater than 16 years

4. Employment at other USF campuses/institutions

◯ USF Tampa

◯ USF St. Petersburg

◯ USF Polytechnic

◯ None of the above

2. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSM

1. will allow local communities to support USFSM

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

2. will allow USFSM to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

3. will increase competition between the four campuses/institutions

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

4. will allow USFSM to prioritize campus interests and values with USF System strategic plan

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

5. will decrease potential conflict between USF Tampa and USFSM with regard to promotion and tenure and other departmental issues

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

6. will allow USFSM to bargain and negotiate within the USF System to realize its academic mission

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

7. will increase competition for scarce resources between the four campuses/institutions

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

8. will allow greater autonomy for USFSM to utilize its resources

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

9. will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

10. will enable USFSM greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

11. will position USFSM to leverage a unique identity within the USF System

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

12. will allow USFSM recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

Appendix 16

Descriptive Statistics for Pilot Survey

Variable	*N*	*%*	*M*	*DK*	*N*	*%*	*α*
Total	46	35	-	-	131	100	-
Section 1 – Employment Classification							
Clerical	4	9	-	-	10	8	-
Adjunct Faculty	39	85	-	-	119	91	-
None of the Above	3	6	-	-	2	1	-
Gender							
Male	17	37	-	-	50	38	-
Female	29	63	-	-	81	62	-
# of Years Employed at USFSM							
<3	17	37	-	-	-	-	-
3-9	22	48	-	-	-	-	-
10-15	3	6	-	-	-	-	-
>16	4	9	-	-	-	-	-
Employment at Other USF campuses/institutions							
USFT	11	24	-	-	-	-	-
USFSP	1	2	-	-	-	-	-
USFP	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
None of the Above	34	74	-	-	-	-	-
Section 2, 3, 4, 5, 6							
Organizational Structure	22	48	4.23	24	-	-	.90
Employee Relations	26	56	3.81	20	-	-	.90
Inter-campus Relationships	26	56	3.64	20	-	-	.51
Campus Identity	23	50	3.87	23	-	-	.89
Section 7 – Open Ended Items							
Major Strengths	23	50	-	-	-	-	-
Major Limitations	28	61	-	-	-	-	-
Communication	30	65	-	-	-	-	-
Support Separate Accreditation							
Yes	36	78	-	-	-	-	-
No	7	15	-	-	-	-	-
Personal Situation Benefited							
Yes	26	56	-	-	-	-	-
No	15	33	-	-	-	-	-

Note. n= sample size, M = mean, DK = number of items answered as "don't know" and are not included in the sample means, N = total population, and α = Cronbach's alpha.

Descriptive Statistics for Inter-campus Relationships Category –Second Pilot Survey

Variable	*N*	*%*	*M*	*DK*	*N*	*%*	*α*
Total	39	30	-	-	131	100	-
Section 1 – Employment Classification							
Clerical	4	10	-	-	10	8	-
Adjunct Faculty	34	87	-	-	119	91	-
None of the Above	1	3	-	-	2	1	-
Gender							
Male	18	46	-	-	50	38	-
Female	21	34	-	-	81	62	-
# of Years Employed at USFSM							
<3	11	28	-	-	-	-	-
3-9	18	46	-	-	-	-	-
10-15	6	15	-	-	-	-	-
>16	4	10	-	-	-	-	-
Employment at Other USF campuses/institutions							
USFT	8	20	-	-	-	-	-
USFSP	1	3	-	-	-	-	-
USFP	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
None of the Above	30	77	-	-	-	-	-
Inter-campus Relationships Items							
1 – 12	28	72	3.99	11	-	-	.83
1, 2, 9, 10, 11, 12	28	72	3.99	11	-	-	.91

Note. n= sample size, M = mean, DK = number of items answered as "don't know" and are not included in the sample mean, N = total population, and α = Cronbach's alpha.

Appendix 18

Second Pilot Study Twelve Items Used for Inter-campus Relationships Category

Item	Original Pilot Survey	Second Pilot Survey Item	Final Survey Item
1. will allow local communities to support USFSM	X		X
2. will allow USFSM to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support		X	X
3. will increase competition between the four campuses/institutions	X		
4. will allow USFSM to prioritize campus interests and values with USF System strategic plan		X	
5. will decrease potential conflict between USF Tampa and USFSM with regard to promotion and tenure and other departmental issues	X		
6. will allow USFSM to bargain and negotiate within the USF System to realize its academic mission		X	
7. will increase competition for scarce resources between the four campuses/institutions	X		
8. will allow greater autonomy for USFSM to utilize its resources		X	
9. will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system	X		X
10. will enable USFSM greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs		X	X
11. will position USFSM to leverage a unique identity within the USF System		X	X
12. will allow USFSM recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals		X	X

Appendix 19

Letter to Campus Administrator Requesting Permission to Administer Survey

Dear Campus Administrator

  First, I would like to thank you again for your valuable input in developing the survey instrument on perceptions of employees on the issue of separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution at USF. I successfully defended my proposal on May 18, 2010 and this letter is to officially request your permission to administer the survey at _____.

  The purpose of this study is to identify the perceptions of employees in the USF System about the most pressing changes that occur with the separate accreditation of campuses, particularly as part of an organizational change that involves moving from a large university with multiple campuses to a university system with regionally accredited institutions.
  The research questions are as follows:

1. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of USF System employees on each of the four campuses in the areas of organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity with respect to the implications of the separate accreditation of campuses with the USF System?

2. Are there any significant differences between the perceptions of employees in the areas organizational structure, employee relations, inter-campus relationships, and campus identity on selected demographic variables, including employee category (staff, faculty, administration), years of employment at USF, gender and campus location?

  Prior to sending the survey to employees at _____, I will send you an email requesting that you send out an announcement for the survey by email to your employees to encourage them to participate in the survey. I have attached a draft of the email for your review and comments. In addition, I have attached the final survey instrument for _____, a copy of my approved proposal defense, and a copy of the approved IRB.

  Thank you again for your support.   I look forward to your response. As we discussed, once I have the resulted analyzed I will send you an executive summary of the findings in the research.

Sincerely,

Rhonda S. Moraca

Appendix 20

Email from Campus Administrator Announcing the Survey

Campus Administrators

I would like to encourage you to participate in a survey you will be receiving shortly by

email. The survey is on perceptions of employees about the issues of separate

accreditation for USF's regional campuses. Please take a few moments to complete the

survey. The survey is part of the dissertation research for Rhonda S. Moraca, a higher

education doctoral candidate in the department of Adult Career and Higher Education at

USF. The survey results will be helpful to Rhonda in completing her dissertation

research and provide research on perceptions of employees for the campus during our

reorganization into separately accredited institutions as part of the USF System.

Appendix 21

Invitation Cover Memorandum for Each Campus Requesting Survey
Participation

You are invited to participate in a perception survey for [campus/institution] employees regarding separate accreditation for USF's regional campuses/institution. The data collected in this research project will be analyzed by Rhonda Moraca, a University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee employee and student in the higher education program, as part of her dissertation research. The title of the project is: In the Midst of Organizational Change: A Survey of Employee Perceptions Toward Separate Accreditation for Regional Campuses/Institution of a Southeast Public University. Her research has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB # Pro 00001322. It has been approved for distribution to the [campus/institution] community because of its potential use in the continuing development of the USF System.

Participation in this survey, or a decision not to participate, will not affect your employment status and is strictly voluntary. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential and data from this research will be reported only in the aggregate. Computer IP addresses will not be collected as part of this survey. An executive summary, along with a report of the aggregate data, will be provided to each campus/institution administrator.

The survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete. There are no foreseeable risks associated with this project. However, if you feel uncomfortable answering any questions, you can withdraw from the survey at any point.

If you have questions at any time about the survey or the procedures, please contact Rhonda Moraca by email at moraca@sar.usf.edu. Thank you very much for your time and support. Please start the survey now by clicking on the link below.

Appendix 22

Survey Instrument Sections and Items

Category	Survey Items
Demographics	Section 1
Organizational Structure	Section 2, Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; Section 3, Items 1, 2
Employee Relations	Section 3, Items 3, 4, 5; Section 4, Items 1, 2, 3, 4
Inter-campus Relationships	Section 4, Items 5; Section 5, Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Campus Identity	Section 6, Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
Additional Comments	Section 7

Appendix 23

USF Tampa (USFT) Employee Survey of Perceptions Towards Separate Accreditation
for USFs Regional Campuses/Institutions

USFT Survey Perception Employees

1. Demographic Information USFT

1. Employment classification

- ( ) Faculty (includes faculty administrators)
- ( ) Staff (Formerly USPS)
- ( ) Administration (Formerly A&P)
- ( ) None of the Above

2. Gender

- ( ) Female
- ( ) Male

3. Number of years you have been employed at USFT

[   ]

4. Employment at other USF campuses/institutions where you have been employed including adjunct or part time employment.

- ( ) USF St. Petersburg
- ( ) USF Sarasota-Manatee
- ( ) USF Polytechnic
- ( ) None of the above

2. Please answer following items regarding Separate Accreditation of regional ...

Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree(A), Strongly Agree (SA), and Don't Know (DK).

1. will accelerate the decision making process for each regional campus/institution

( ) SD   ( ) D   ( ) N   ( ) A   ( ) SA   ( ) DK

2. will enable the regional campuses/institutions to achieve their individual goals and objectives

( ) SD   ( ) D   ( ) N   ( ) A   ( ) SA   ( ) DK

3. will allow the regional campuses/institutions to operate more effectively

( ) SD   ( ) D   ( ) N   ( ) A   ( ) SA   ( ) DK

4. supports the design of the four campuses/institutions as a university system

( ) SD   ( ) D   ( ) N   ( ) A   ( ) SA   ( ) DK

191

USFT Survey Perception Employees

5. will allow the regional campuses/institutions to make hiring decisions based on their campus' mission and goals

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. Please answer following items regarding Separate Accreditation of the regio...

1. will enable the regional campuses/institutions to make independent decisions regarding student services

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will enable the regional campuses/institutions to make independent decisions regarding business services

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will create a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at the regional campuses/institution

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will improve the working conditions for faculty at the regional campuses/institution by not having to report to the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

5. will improve the working conditions for staff at the regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. Please answer following items regarding Separate Accreditation of the regio...

1. will improve the working conditions for administration at the regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will alleviate feelings of isolation at the regional campuses/institution

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

USFT Survey Perception Employees

3. will increase job responsibilities for employees at the regional campuses/institution

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

4. will increase workloads (tasks) for employees at the regional campuses/institution

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

5. will allow local communities to support the regional campuses/institution

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

5. Please answer following items regarding Separate Accreditation of the regio...

1. will allow regional campuses/institution to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

2. will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

3. will enable the regional campuses/institution greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

4. will position regional campuses/institution to leverage a unique identity within the USF System

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

5. will allow the regional campuses/institution recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

6. Please answer following items regarding Separate Accreditation of the regio...

1. will enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality on the regional campuses/institution

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

USFT Survey Perception Employees

2. will further the goal of achieving the AAU status for USF Tampa

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will promote each regional campuses/institution sense of community

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will allow each regional campus/institution to create a separate identity

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

5. will enhance public understanding of the value of the regional campuses/institution

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

7. Please provide additional comments for the following:

1. Major strengths of separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution.

2. Major limitations of separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution.

3. To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?

4. I support separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution.

○ Yes

○ No

5. I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation for the regional campuses/institution.

○ Yes

○ No

Appendix 24

USF St. Petersburg (USFSP) Employee Survey of Perceptions Towards Separate
Accreditation for USFSP

USFSP Survey Perception Employees

1. Demographic Information USFSP

1. Employment classification

- ○ Faculty (includes faculty administrators)
- ○ Staff (Formerly USPS)
- ○ Administration (Formerly A&P)
- ○ None of the Above

2. Gender

- ○ Female
- ○ Male

3. Number of years you have been employed at USFSP

[   ]

4. Employment at other USF campuses/institutions where you have been employed including adjunct or part time employment.

- ○ USF Tampa
- ○ USF Sarasota-Manatee
- ○ USF Polytechnic
- ○ None of the above

2. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSP

Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree(A), Strongly Agree (SA), and Don't Know (DK).

1. has accelerated the decision making process for USFSP

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. has enabled USFSP to achieve its individual goals and objectives

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. has allowed USFSP to operate more effectively

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. supports the design of the four campuses/institutions as a university system

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

USFSP Survey Perception Employees

5. has allowed USFSP to make hiring decisions based on its campus mission and goals

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

3. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSP

1. has enabled USFSP to make independent decisions regarding student services

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

2. has enabled USFSP to make independent decisions regarding business services

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

3. has created a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at USFSP

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

4. has improved the working conditions for faculty at USFSP by not having to report to the USF Tampa academic departments

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

5. has improved the working conditions for staff at USFSP by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

4. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSP

1. has improved the working conditions for administration at USFSP by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

2. has alleviate feelings of isolation at USFSP

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

3. has increased job responsibilities for employees at USFSP

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

4. has increased workloads (tasks) for employees at USFSP

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

USFSP Survey Perception Employees

5. has allowed local communities to support USFSP

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

5. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSP

1. has allowed USFSP to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

2. has allowed scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

3. has enabled USFSP greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

4. has positioned USFSP to leverage a unique identity within the USF System

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

5. has allowed USFSP recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

6. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSP

1. has enhanced the prestige and perception of educational quality at USFSP

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

2. has furthered the goal of achieving the AAU status for USF Tampa

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

3. has promoted the campus sense of community at USFSP

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

4. has allowed USFSP to create a separate identity

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

USFSP Survey Perception Employees

5. has enhanced public understanding of the value of USFSP

◯ SD   ◯ D   ◯ N   ◯ A   ◯ SA   ◯ DK

7. Please provide additional comments for the following:

1. Major strengths of separate accreditation for USFSP.

2. Major limitations of separate accreditation for USFSP.

3. To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?

4. I support separate accreditation for USFSP

◯ Yes

◯ No

5. I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation for USFSP?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Appendix 25

USF Sarasota-Manatee (USFSM) Employee Survey of Perceptions Towards Separate
Accreditation for USFSM

USFSM Survey Perception Employees

1. Demographic Information USFSM

1. Employment classification

○ Faculty (includes faculty administrators)

○ Staff (formerly USPS)

○ Administration (Formerly A&P)

○ None of the Above

2. Gender

○ Female

○ Male

3. Number of years you have been employed at USFSM

[   ]

4. Employment at other USF campuses/institutions where you have been employed including adjunct or part time employment.

○ USF Tampa

○ USF St. Petersburg

○ USF Polytechnic

○ None of the above

2. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSM

Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree(A), Strongly Agree (SA), and Don't Know (DK).

1. will accelerate the decision making process for USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will enable USFSM to achieve its individual goals and objectives

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will allow USFSM to operate more effectively

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. supports the design of the four campuses/institutions as a university system

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

USFSM Survey Perception Employees

5. will allow USFSM to make hiring decisions based on its campus mission and goals

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSM

1. will enable USFSM to make independent decisions regarding student services

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will enable USFSM to make independent decisions regarding business services

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will create a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will improve the working conditions for faculty at USFSM by not having to report to the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

5. will improve the working conditions for staff at USFSM by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSM

1. will improve the working conditions for administration at USFSM by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will alleviate feelings of isolation at USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will increase job responsibilities for employees at USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will increase workloads (tasks) for employees at USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

USFSM Survey Perception Employees

5. will allow local communities to support USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

---

5. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSM

1. will allow USFSM to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will enable USFSM greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will position USFSM to leverage a unique identity within the USF System

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

5. will allow USFSM recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

---

6. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFSM

1. will enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality at USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will further the goal of achieving the AAU status for USF Tampa

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will promote the campus sense of community at USFSM

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will allow USFSM to create a separate identity

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

USFSM Survey Perception Employees

5. **will enhance public understanding of the value of USFSM**

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

7. Please provide additional comments for the following:

1. **Major strengths of separate accreditation for USFSM.**

2. **Major limitations of separate accreditation for USFSM.**

3. **To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?**

4. **I support separate accreditation for USFSM.**

○ Yes

○ No

5. **I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation for USFSM?**

○ Yes

○ No

Appendix 26
USF Polytechnic (USFP) Employee Survey of Perceptions Towards Separate Accreditation for USFP

USFP Survey Perception Employees

1. Demographic Information - USFP

1. Employment classification

- ( ) Faculty (Includes faculty administrators)
- ( ) Staff (Formerly USPS)
- ( ) Administration (Formerly A&P)
- ( ) None of the Above

2. Gender

- ( ) Female
- ( ) Male

3. Number of years you have been employed at USFP

[   ]

4. Employment at other USF campuses/institutions where you have been employed including adjunct or part time employment.

- ( ) USF Tampa
- ( ) USF St. Petersburg
- ( ) USF Sarasota-Manatee
- ( ) None of the above

2. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFP

Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Neutral (N), Agree(A), Strongly Agree (SA), and Don't Know (DK).

1. will accelerate the decision making process for USFP

( ) SD   ( ) D   ( ) N   ( ) A   ( ) SA   ( ) DK

2. will enable USFP to achieve its individual goals and objectives

( ) SD   ( ) D   ( ) N   ( ) A   ( ) SA   ( ) DK

3. will allow USFP to operate more effectively

( ) SD   ( ) D   ( ) N   ( ) A   ( ) SA   ( ) DK

4. supports the design of the four campuses/institutions as a university system

( ) SD   ( ) D   ( ) N   ( ) A   ( ) SA   ( ) DK

USFP Survey Perception Employees

5. will allow USFP to make hiring decisions based on its campus mission and goals

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFP

1. will enable USFP to make independent decisions regarding student services

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will enable USFP to make independent decisions regarding business services

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will create a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at USFP

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will improve the working conditions for faculty at USFP by not having to report to the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

5. will improve the working conditions for staff at USFP by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFP

1. will improve the working conditions for administration at USFP by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will alleviate feelings of isolation at USFP

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will increase job responsibilities for employees at USFP

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will increase workloads (tasks) for employees at USFP

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

5. will allow local communities to support USFP

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

USFP Survey Perception Employees

5. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFP

1. will allow USFP to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will enable USFP greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will position USFP to leverage a unique identity with the USF System

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

5. will allow USFP recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

6. Please answer the following items regarding Separate Accreditation of USFP

1. will enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality at USFP

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

2. will further the goal of achieving the AAU status for USF Tampa

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

3. will promote the campus sense of community at USFP

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

4. will allow USFP to create a separate identity

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

5. will enhance public understanding of the value of USFP

○ SD   ○ D   ○ N   ○ A   ○ SA   ○ DK

7. Please provide additional comments for the following:

USFP Survey Perception Employees

1. Major strengths of separate accreditation for USFP.

2. Major limitations of separate accreditation for USFP.

3. To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?

4. I support separate accreditation for USFP.

◯ Yes

◯ No

5. I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation for USFP?

◯ Yes

◯ No

Appendix 27

Survey Items Averages for Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP

Survey Item	USFT n=422(7%) M(SD)	USFSP n=69(22%) M(SD)	USFSM n=89(57%) M(SD)	USFP n=53(43%) M(SD)
Organizational Structure	3.57(.90)	3.41(.95)	4.31(.63)	4.35(.58)
1. will accelerate the decision making process for regional campuses/institution	3.55(1.14)	3.66(1.26)	4.51(.75)	4.38(.83)
2. will enable regional campuses/institution to achieve its individual goals and objectives	3.72(1.09)	3.42(1.28)	4.36(.81)	4.51(.62)
3. will allow regional campuses/institution to operate more effectively	3.25(1.20)	2.98(1.40)	4.28(.92)	4.28(.90)
4. supports the design of the four campuses/institution as a university system	3.07(1.37)	3.67(1.24)	4.03(.97)	4.40(.69)
5. will allow regional campuses/institution to make hiring decisions based on its campus mission and goals	3.89(1.01)	3.70(1.12)	4.53(.78)	4.60(.61)
6. will enable regional campuses/institution to make independent decisions regarding student services	3.79(1.00)	3.61(1.03)	4.32(.78)	4.42(.71)
7. will enable regional campuses/institution to make independent decisions regarding business services	3.61(1.12)	2.85(1.28)	4.07(.98)	4.04(1.03)
Employee Relations	3.35(.86)	3.31(.78)	4.07(.74)	3.97(.59)
1. will create a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.18(1.15)	2.58(1.30)	3.86(1.14)	3.83(1.05)
2. will improve the working conditions for faculty at regional campuses/institution by not having to report to the USF Tampa academic departments	3.17(1.22)	3.06(1.28)	4.3(3.86)	4.27(.86)
3. will improve the working conditions for staff at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	3.23(1.21)	3.05(1.34)	4.15(1.03)	4.07(1.00)
4. will improve the working conditions for administration at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	3.29(1.22)	2.92(1.16)	4.26(.96)	4.30(.70)
5. will alleviate feelings of isolation at regional campuses/institution	2.82(1.22)	2.51(1.09)	3.33(1.28)	3.00(1.14)
6. will increase job responsibilities for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.80(1.07)	4.45(.89)	4.47(.68)	4.23(.96)
7. will increase workloads (tasks) for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.70(1.13)	4.50(.82)	4.42(.82)	4.25(.94)

Survey Items Averages for Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP

Survey Item	USFT n=422(7%) M(SD)	USFSP n=69(22%) M(SD)	USFSM n=89(57%) M(SD)	USFP n=53(43%) M(SD)
Inter-campus Relationships	3.33(.92)	3.26(.95)	3.96(.76)	4.29(.56)
1. will allow local communities to support regional campuses/institution	3.36(1.07)	3.36(1.18)	3.98(.85)	4.00(.98)
2. will allow regional campuses/institution to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support	3.61(1.13)	3.50(1.18)	4.09(.98)	4.42(.76)
3. will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system	2.55(1.18)	2.17(1.16)	3.00(1.32)	3.50(1.14)
4. will enable regional campuses/institution greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs	3.59(1.10)	3.55(1.05)	4.39(.72)	4.60(.61)
5. will position regional campuses/institution to leverage a unique identity within the USF System	3.47(1.11)	3.50(1.22)	4.09(.95)	4.69(.47)
6. will allow regional campuses/institution recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals	3.22(1.20)	3.29(1.23)	3.84(.95)	4.36(.71)
Campus Identity	3.24(.93)	3.24(1.05)	3.85(.85)	4.10(.59)
1. will enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality at regional campuses/institution	3.36(1.27)	3.20(1.26)	3.53(1.22)	4.13(.99)
2. will further the goal of achieving the AAU status for USF Tampa	3.61(1.31)	3.00(1.26)	3.81(1.10)	3.73(1.04)
3. will promote each regional campus/institution sense of community	2.55(1.02)	3.44(1.33)	4.13(.85)	4.19(.82)
4. will allow each regional campus/institution to create a separate identity	3.59(.98)	3.35(1.31)	4.09(.93)	4.44(.68)
5. will enhance public understanding of the value of regional campuses/institution	3.47(1.23)	3.02(1.28)	3.67(1.15)	3.93(.99)

Appendix 28

Survey Items Averages by Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, USFP – Employment Category

Survey Item	Administration				Faculty				Staff			
	USFT n = 165 (39%) M(SD)	USFSP n =25 (36%) M(SD)	USFSM n =24 (27%) M(SD)	USFP n = 18 (34%) M(SD)	USFT n = 165 (39%) M(SD)	USFSP n =25 (36%) M(SD)	USFSM n =24 (27%) M(SD)	USFP n = 24 (45%) M(SD)	USFT n = 165 (39%) M(SD)	USFSP n =25 (36%) M(SD)	USFSM n =24 (27%) M(SD)	USFP n = 11 (21%) M(SD)
Organizational Structure	3 50(.91)	3.37(.88)	4.14(.63)	4.20(.73)	3.56(.92)	3.48(.94)	4.37(.63)	4.40(.47)	3.72(.86)	3.29(1.17)	4.39(.61)	4.51(.48)
1. will accelerate the decision making process for regional campuses/institution	3.44(1.14)	3.13(1.32)	4.29(.91)	4.22(1.00)	3.66(1.21)	3.59(1.13)	4.63(.73)	4.45(.74)	3.54(1.02)	3.131.55)	4.50(.51)	4.50(.71)
2. will enable regional campuses/institution to achieve its individual goals and objectives	3.66(1.08)	3.45(1.30)	4.17(.65)	4.5(.62)	3.71(1.13)	3.48(1.28)	4.45(.85)	4.57(.60)	3.84(1.02)	3.11(1.36)	4.39(.89)	4.40(.70)
3. will allow regional campuses/institution to operate more effectively	3.15(1.19)	2.91(1.53)	4.26(.69)	4.06(1.20)	3.15(1.26)	3.09(1.28)	4.26(1.02)	4.29(.72)	3.57(1.09)	2.78(1.56)	4.35(.99)	4.67(.50)
4. supports the design of the four campuses/institution as a university system	3.13(1.33)	3.91(1.15)	3.96(1.13)	4.24(.75)	2.78(1.42)	3.53(1.29)	3.97(.93)	4.42(.69)	3.44(1.26)	3.60(1.26)	4.25(.85)	4.67(.50)
5. will allow regional campuses/institution to make hiring decisions based on its campus mission and goals	3.84(1.03)	3.78(1.00)	4.48(.95)	4.44(.78)	3.88(1.04)	3.74(1.15)	4.55(.78)	4.68(.48)	3.99(.91)	3.40(1.35)	4.54(.59)	4.70(.48)
6. will enable regional campuses/institution to make independent decisions regarding student services	3.70(1.01)	3.65(.93)	3.96(.81)	4.25(.97)	3.81(1.03)	3.79(.83)	4.39(.82)	4.48(.51)	3.93(.95)	3.00(1.58)	4.62(.50)	4.60(.52)
7. will enable regional campuses/institution to make independent decisions regarding business services	3.43(1.17)	2.55(1.19)	3.86(.85)	3.81(1.33)	3.69(1.09)	3.19(1.30)	4.13(1.04)	4.05(.89)	3.80(1.03)	2.43(1.27)	4.20(1.01)	4.40(.70)

Appendix 28 (Continued)

Survey Items Averages by Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, USFP – Employment Category

Survey Item	Administration				Faculty				Staff			
	USFT n = 165 (39%) M(SD)	USFSP n =25 (36%) M(SD)	USFSM n =24 (27%) M(SD)	USFP n = 18 (34%) M(SD)	USFT n = 165 (39%) M(SD)	USFSP n =25 (36%) M(SD)	USFSM n =24 (27%) M(SD)	USFP n = 24 (45%) M(SD)	USFT n = 165 (39%) M(SD)	USFSP n =25 (36%) M(SD)	USFSM n =24 (27%) M(SD)	USFP n = 11 (21%) M(SD)
Employee Relations	3.24(.86)	3.30(.76)	3.82(.66)	3.85(.57)	3.38(.86)	3.38(.76)	4.25(.66)	4.06(.62)	3.50(.82)	3.13(.93)	4.01(.88)	3.94(.59)
1. will create a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.06(1.14)	2.42(1.35)	3.67(.92)	3.76(1.20)	3.15(1.19)	2.74(1.21)	4.00(1.21)	3.86(.85)	3.43(1.11)	2.50(1.51)	3.81(1 25)	3.89(1 27)
2. will improve the working conditions for faculty at regional campuses/institution by not having to report to the USF Tampa academic departments	3.02(1.22)	3.33(1.23)	4.08(.86)	4.07(.80)	3.20(1.27)	3.00(1.31)	4.40(.93)	4.43(.81)	3.35(1.12)	2.86(1.35)	4.38(.72)	4.22(1.09)
3. will improve the working conditions for staff at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	3.00(1.23)	3.15(1.27)	3.81(.98)	4.00(.76)	3.33(1.23)	3.14(1.38)	4.39(.95)	4.18(1.05)	3.44(1.09)	2.60(1.43)	4.05(1 18)	3.89(1 27)
4. will improve the working conditions for administration at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	2.98(1.23)	2.91(1.23)	3.82(1.05)	3.94(.68)	3.48(1.23)	3.04(1.07)	4.45(.92)	4.53(.51)	3.48(1.11)	2.50(1.38)	4.44(.73)	4.44(.88)
5. will alleviate feelings of isolation at regional campuses/institution	2.68(1.17)	2.41(1.18)	2.86(1.01)	2.50(.82)	2.76(1.25)	2.58(1.03)	3.60(1.31)	3.17(1.23)	3.15(1.21)	2.50(1.18)	3.32(1 39)	3.50(1 20)
6. will increase job responsibilities for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.79(1.05)	4.39(1.03)	4.30(.76)	4.24(.97)	3.77(1.14)	4.59(.56)	4.50(.70)	4.50(.76)	3.87(.99)	4.11(1.36)	4.60(.50)	3.43(1 13)
7. will increase workloads (tasks) for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.69(1.10)	4.57(.73)	4.27(.94)	4.38(.89)	3.73(1.21)	4.57(.73)	4.40(.85)	4.40(.88)	3.67(1.06)	4.11(1 27)	4.63(.60)	3.63(1.06)

Survey Items Averages by Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, USFP – Employment Category

Survey Item	Administration				Faculty				Staff			
	USFT *n* = 165 (39%) *M(SD)*	USFSP *n* =25 (36%) *M(SD)*	USFSM *n* =24 (27%) *M(SD)*	USFP n = 18 (34%) *M(SD)*	USFT *n* = 165 (39%) *M(SD)*	USFSP *n* =25 (36%) *M(SD)*	USFSM *n* =24 (27%) *M(SD)*	USFP n = 24 (45%) *M(SD)*	USFT *n* = 165 (39%) *M(SD)*	USFSP *n* =25 (36%) *M(SD)*	USFSM *n* =24 (27%) *M(SD)*	USFP n = 11 (21%) *M(SD)*
Inter-campus Relationships	3.26(.91)	3.31(.84)	3.65(.73)	4.18(.57)	3.22(.94)	3.31(1.01)	4.06(.79)	4.27(.57)	3.62(.87)	3.04(1.07)	4.09(.69)	4.49(.52)
1. will allow local communities to support regional campuses/institution	3.33(1.09)	3.37(1.38)	3.67(.86)	3.82(1.13)	3.28(1.10)	3.46(.96)	4.21(.77)	3.88(.93)	3.55(.98)	3.00(1.41)	3.95(.89)	4.56(.53)
2. will allow regional campuses/institution to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support	3.39(1.23)	3.42(1.18)	3.60(.99)	4.28(1.02)	3.72(1.10)	3.65(1.08)	4.33(96)	4.48(.60)	3.81(.95)	3.22(1.56)	4.09(.90)	4.55(.52)
3. will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system	2.46(1.14)	2.00(1.07)	2.83(1.10)	3.15(1.21)	2.29(1.13)	2.50(1.17)	2.96(1.48)	3.71(1.07)	3.14(1.13)	1.50(1.07)	3.24(1 30)	3.80(1 10)
4. will enable regional campuses/institution greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs	3.62(1.06)	3.76(.89)	4.22(.80)	4.41(.80)	3.43(1.18)	3.48(1.12)	4.35(.77)	4.70(.47)	3.79(1.00)	3.30(1.16)	4.63(.49)	4.70(.48)
5. will position regional campuses/institution to leverage a unique identity within the USF System	3.37(1.14)	3.71(1.04)	3.55(96)	4.76(.44)	3.43(1.15)	3.45(1.34)	4.24(.95)	4.64(.49)	3.71(.96)	3.18(1.25)	4.35(.71)	4.70(.48)
6. will allow regional campuses/institution recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals	3.16(1.21)	3.43(1.04)	3.42(.90)	4.47(.62)	3.06(1.24)	3.10(1.32)	3.91(1.06)	4.16(.83)	3.60(1.01)	3.57(1.51)	4.10(.70)	4.56(.53)

Survey Items Averages by Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, USFP – Employment Category

	Administration				Faculty				Staff			
	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP	USFT	USFSP	USFSM	USFP
	n = 165	*n* =161	*n* =96	*n* =25	*n* =33	*n* =11	*n* =24	*n* =41	*n* =24	*n* =18	*n* =24	*n* =11
	(39%)	(36%)	(27%)	(34%)	(38%)	(48%)	(46%)	(45%)	(23%)	(16%)	(27%)	(21%)
Survey Item	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*	*M(SD)*
Campus Identity	3.20(.94)	3.31(1.00)	3.57(.78)	4.07(.65)	3.13(.96)	3.18(1.03)	3.91(.87)	4.03(.54)	3.53(.84)	3.27(1.32)	4.01(.84)	4.36(.58)
1. will enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality at regional campuses/institution	2.75(1.28)	3.52(1.16)	3.29(1.01)	4.19(.98)	2.40(1.25)	3.00(1 24)	3.43(1.36)	3.90(1.07)	3.27(1.11)	3.10(1.52)	3.95(1 10)	4.56(.73)
2. will further the goal of achieving the AAU status for USF Tampa	2.91(1.22)	3.17(1.53)	3.75(.97)	3.58(1.00)	2.79(1.50)	2.77(1.19)	3.79(1.29)	3.67(1.14)	3.17(1.03)	3.50(.84)	3.92(.64)	4.14(.90)
3. will promote each regional campus/institution sense of community	3.57(1.06)	3.32(1.46)	3.95(.67)	4.06(1.00)	3.58(1.02)	3.48(1.18)	4.25(.93)	4.29(.56)	3.71(.97)	3.64(1.57)	4.09(.87)	4.22(.97)
4. will allow each regional campus/institution to create a separate identity	3.60(1.06)	3.38(1.35)	3.82(.80)	4.59(.62)	3.79(.94)	3.39(1.27)	4.20(1.04)	4.36(.58)	3.84(.90)	3.18(1.47)	4.17(.82)	4.33(1.00)
5. will enhance public understanding of the value of regional campuses/institution	2.80(1.23)	3.13(1.04)	3.40(1.05)	3.94(1.03)	2.72(1.24)	2.97(1.30)	3.74(1.24)	3.79(.92)	3.37(1.12)	2.91(1.45)	3.80(1 11)	4.29(1 12)

Appendix 29

Survey Items Averages for Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP - Years of Employment

Survey Item	USFT n = 422			USFSP n = 69			USFSM n = 89			USFP n = 53		
	0 to 10 *n* = 231 (55%) *M(SD)*	>10 to 21 *n* =118 (28%) *M(SD)*	> 21 *n* =72 (17%) *M(SD)*	0 to 10 *n* =48 (69%) *M(SD)*	>10 to 21 *n* =17 (25%) *M(SD)*	> 21 *n* =4 (6%) *M(SD)*	0 to 10 *n* =74 (83%) *M(SD)*	>10 to 21 *n* =12 (14%) *M(SD)*	> 21 *n* =2 (2%) *M(SD)*	0 to 10 *n* =46 (87%) *M(SD)*	>10 to 21 *n* =6 (11%) *M(SD)*	> 21 *n*=0 (0%) *M(SD)*
Organizational Structure	3.65(.85)	3.44(.97)	3.56(.93)	3.40(.96)	3.42(.90)	3.53(1 20)	4.33(.59)	4.30(.61)	4.79(.10)	4.36(.52)	4.20(.99)	-
will accelerate the decision making process for regional campuses/institution	3.63(1.05)	3.40(1.22)	3.58(1 24)	3.29(1.23)	3.53(1.28)	3.51(.73)	4.54(.65)	4.50(.67)	5.0(0)	4.40(.76)	4.17(1.33)	-
will enable regional campuses/institution to achieve its individual goals and objectives	3.73(1.01)	3.66(1.15)	3.81(1.18)	3.35(1.36)	3.47(1.18)	4.0(.82)	4.35(.85)	4.42(.51)	5.0(0)	4.52(.55)	4.33(1.03)	-
will allow regional campuses/institution to operate more effectively	3.35(1.11)	3.11(1.27)	3.21(1.32)	2.95(1.38)	3.06(1.43)	3.01(.83)	4.28(.96)	4.18(.75)	5.0(0)	4.35(.77)	3.83(1.60)	-
supports the design of the four campuses/institution as a university system	3.18(1.35)	2.91(1.39)	2.99(1.40)	3.50(1.30)	4.00(1.03)	4.25(.96)	4.04(96)	4.18(.60)	4.5(.71)	4.36(.71)	4.60(.55)	-
will allow regional campuses/institution to make hiring decisions based on its campus mission and goals	3.93(.96)	3.76(1.10)	4.00(.96)	3.77(1.07)	3.50(1.10)	3.75(1.89)	4.54(.71)	4.67(.49)	5.0(0)	4.65(.48)	4.17(1.17)	-
will enable regional campuses/institution to make independent decisions regarding student services	3.85(.96)	3.68(1.05)	3.81(1.03)	3.55(1.10)	3.83(.83)	3.67(.58)	4.37(.73)	4.08(1.0)	5.0(0)	4.39(.74)	4.50(.55)	-
will enable regional campuses/institution to make independent decisions regarding business services	3.72(1.06)	3.44(1.14)	3.57(1.25)	2.97(1.24)	2.73(1.39)	2.251.26)	4.10(.95)	4.0(1.25)	4.0(0)	4.05(1.02)	3.83(1.17)	-

Appendix 29 (Continued)

Survey Items Averages for Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP - Years of Employment

Survey Item	USFT n = 422			USFSP n = 69			USFSM n = 89			USFP n = 53		
	0 to 10 n = 231 (55%) $M(SD)$	>10 to 21 n =118 (28%) $M(SD)$	> 21 n =72 (17%) $M(SD)$	0 to 10 n =48 (69%) $M(SD)$	>10 to 21 n =17 (25%) $M(SD)$	> 21 n =4 (6%) $M(SD)$	0 to 10 n =74 (83%) $M(SD)$	>10 to 21 n =12 (14%) $M(SD)$	> 21 n =2 (2%) $M(SD)$	0 to 10 n =46 (87%) $M(SD)$	>10 to 21 n =6 (11%) $M(SD)$	> 21 $n=0$ (0%) $M(SD)$
Employee Relations	3.38.82	3.31.90	3.35.91	3.27.83	3.41.74	3.41.35	4.11.72	3.83.82	4.71.40	3 90.57	4 31 58	
will create a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.24(1.14)	3.05(1.16)	3.23(1.17)	2.61(1.29)	2.35(1.41)	3.25(.96)	3.82(1.17)	4.00(1.05)	5.0(0)	3.80(1.04)	4.00(1 26)	-
will improve the working conditions for faculty at regional campuses/institution by not having to report to the USF Tampa academic departments	3.29(1.15)	2.99(1.25)	3.11(1.34)	3.09(1.38)	2.77(1.09)	4.00(0)	4.34(.87)	4.25(.87)	5.0(0)	4.21(.91)	4.50(55)	-
will improve the working conditions for staff at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	3.35(1.16)	3.02(1.21)	3.17(1.30)	2.93(1.40)	3.27(1.28)	3.50(1.00)	4.23(.99)	3.64(1 21)	5.0(0)	3.96(1.03)	4.60(.55)	-
will improve the working conditions for administration at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	3.36(1.20)	3.12(1.23)	3.33(1 24)	2.94(1.23)	3.00(1.10)	2.33(.58)	4.34(.90)	3.81(1.17)	5.0(0)	4.26(.72)	4.40(.55)	-
will alleviate feelings of isolation at regional campuses/institution	2.92(1.20)	2.73(1.26)	2.69(1 22)	2.60(1.05)	2.36(1.28)	2.0(.82)	3.31(1.28)	3.18(1.33)	5.0(0)	2.92(1.08)	3.20(1.48)	-
will increase job responsibilities for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.72(1.02)	3.95(1.07)	3.81(1.21)	4.30(1.01)	4.82(.39)	4.50(.58)	4.54(.61)	4.18(.87)	4.5(.71)	4.18(.93)	4.40(1.34)	-
will increase workloads (tasks) for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.52(1.10)	3.94(1.17)	3.88(1.08)	4.43(.86)	4.81(.40)	4.01(.41)	4.51(.74)	4.18(.87)	3.52(.12)	4.19(1.00)	4.50(.55)	-

214

Appendix 29 (Continued)

Survey Items Averages for Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP - Years of Employment

Survey Item	USFT n = 422			USFSP n = 69			USFSM n = 89			USFP n = 53		
	0 to 10 *n* = 231 (55%) *M(SD)*	>10 to 21 *n* =118 (28%) *M(SD)*	> 21 *n* =72 (17%) *M(SD)*	0 to 10 *n* =48 (69%) *M(SD)*	>10 to 21 *n* =17 (25%) *M(SD)*	> 21 *n* =4 (6%) *M(SD)*	0 to 10 *n* =74 (83%) *M(SD)*	>10 to 21 *n* =12 (14%) *M(SD)*	> 21 *n* =2 (2%) *M(SD)*	0 to 10 *n* =46 (87%) *M(SD)*	>10 to 21 *n* =6 (11%) *M(SD)*	> 21 *n*=0 (0%) *M(SD)*
Inter-campus Relationships	3.37(.96)	3.26(.86)	3.31(.89)	3.22(1.01)	3.34(.87)	3.43(.65)	3.95(.77)	3.93(.71)	4.83.(24)	4.29(.54)	4.18(.73)	_
1. will allow local communities to support regional campuses/institution	3.39(1.02)	3.26(1.16)	3.46(1.06)	3.21(1.23)	3.71(.99)	3.50(1.29)	3.97(.85)	4.10(.88)	4.5.7(1)	4.08(.91)	3.33(1 21)	-
2. will allow regional campuses/institution to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support	3.61(1.16)	3.54(1.10)	3.76(1.10)	3.53(1.20)	3.47(1.12)	3.25(1.50)	4.10(97)	3.89(1.17)	5.0(0)	4.44(.70)	4.17(1.17)	-
3. will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system	2.75(1.19)	2.27(1.10)	2.38(1.18)	2.13(1.22)	2.38(1.09)	1.67(.58)	2.98(1.32)	2.89(1.36)	5.0(-)	3.56(1.12)	3.25(1 50)	-
4. will enable regional campuses/institution greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs	3.64(1.11)	3.57(1.09)	3.50(1.09)	3.53(1.10)	3.63(.96)	3.33(1.15)	4.39(.74)	4.42(.51)	5.0(0)	4.58(.64)	4.67(.52)	-
5. will position regional campuses/institution to leverage a unique identity within the USF System	3.51(1.14)	3.40(1.09)	3.47(1.07)	3.38(1.32)	3.65(.93)	4.25(.96)	4.09(.98)	4.09(.70)	5.0(-)	4.69(.47)	4.67(.52)	-
6. will allow regional campuses/institution recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals	3.24(1.20)	3.18(1.19)	3.24(1.19)	3.18(1.37)	3.38(.96)	4.00(0)	3.84(.94)	3.78(1.09)	5.0(-)	4.32(.74)	4.50(55)	-

Appendix 29 (Continued)

Survey Items Averages for Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP - Years of Employment

Survey Item	USFT n = 422			USFSP n = 69			USFSM n = 89			USFP n = 53		
	0 to 10	>10 to 21	> 21	0 to 10	>10 to 21	> 21	0 to 10	>10 to 21	> 21	0 to 10	>10 to 21	> 21
	n = 231 (55%) $M(SD)$	n =118 (28%) $M(SD)$	n =72 (17%) $M(SD)$	n =48 (69%) $M(SD)$	n =17 (25%) $M(SD)$	n =4 (6%) $M(SD)$	n =74 (83%) $M(SD)$	n =12 (14%) $M(SD)$	n =2 (2%) $M(SD)$	n =46 (87%) $M(SD)$	n =6 (11%) $M(SD)$	n=0 (0%) $M(SD)$
Campus Identity	3.35(.92)	3.09(.92)	3.17(.97)	3.21(1.10)	3.22(1.00)	3.65(.96)	3.83(.86)	3.95(.81)	4.53(.39)	4.12(.59)	4.01(.63)	-
1. will enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality at regional campuses/institution	2.94(1.27)	2.43(1.17)	2.65(1.33)	3.04(1.30)	3.54(1.13)	4.00(.82)	3.48(1.26)	3.70(1.06)	4.5(.71)	4.16(1.02)	4.00(.89)	-
2. will further the goal of achieving the AAU status for USF Tampa	3.18(1.22)	2.49(1.35)	2.83(1.34)	3.04(1.27)	3.08(1.39)	2.33(.58)	3.79(1.11)	4.00(1 20)	4.0(-)	3.81(1.08)	3.40(.89)	-
3. will promote each regional campus/institution sense of community	3.67(.97)	3.50(1.07)	3.62(1.04)	3.58(1 33)	3.06(1.34)	3.50(1.29)	4.14(.83)	4.00(1.00)	5.0(0)	4.20(.84)	4.17(.75)	-
4. will allow each regional campus/institution to create a separate identity	3.71(1.01)	3.75(.93)	3.74(.99)	3.30(1.33)	3.35(1.37)	4.00(.82)	4.09(.95)	4.09(.83)	4.5(.71)	4.44(.71)	4.33(.52)	-
5. will enhance public understanding of the value of regional campuses/institution	3.04(1.20)	2.64(1.21)	2.85(1.31)	2.82(1.30)	3.38(1.20)	3.75(.96)	3.61(1.21)	3.90(.88)	4.5(.71)	3.95(1.03)	3.80(.84)	-

Appendix 30

Survey Items Averages for Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP - Gender

Survey Item	USFT n = 422		USFSP n = 69		USFSM n = 89		USFP n = 53	
	Female (56%) M(SD)	Male (44%) M(SD)	Female (57%) M(SD)	Male (43%) M(SD)	Female (66%) M(SD)	Male (34%) M(SD)	Female (55%) M(SD)	Male (45%) M(SD)
Organizational Structure	3.68(.84)	3.43(.97)	3.54(.92)	3.24(.97)	4.32(.58)	4.31(.72)	4.39(.57)	4.31(.60)
1. will accelerate the decision making process for regional campuses/institution	3.65(1.04)	3.42(1 24)	3.53(1.24)	3.17(1.28)	4.54(.54)	4.43(1.04)	4.44(.85)	4.30(.82)
2. will enable regional campuses/institution to achieve its individual goals and objectives	3.85(.95)	3.56(1.21)	3.74(1.17)	3.03(1.32)	4.39(.75)	4.31(.92)	4.62(.57)	4.39(.66)
3. will allow regional campuses/institution to operate more effectively	3.45(1.10)	3.01(1.28)	3.11(1.41)	2.83(1.39)	4.28(.89)	4.28(1.00)	4.28(.84)	4.27(.98)
4. supports the design of the four campuses/institution as a university system	3.15(1.31)	2.97(1.44)	3.79(1.17)	3.53(1.31)	4.02(.94)	4.07(1.04)	4.44(.77)	4.35(.59)
5. will allow regional campuses/institution to make hiring decisions based on its campus mission and goals	3.99(.93)	3.77(1.09)	3.79(1.23)	3.60(1.00)	4.53(.73)	4.52(.87)	4.78(.42)	4.39(.72)
6. will enable regional campuses/institution to make independent decisions regarding student services	3.93(.89)	3.62(1 11)	3.59(1.05)	3.64(1.03)	4.30(.81)	4.37(.74)	4.41(.84)	4.43(.51)
7. will enable regional campuses/institution to make independent decisions regarding business services	3.72(1.06)	3.49(1.18)	2.82(1.19)	2.88(1 39)	4.12(1.01)	3.95(.90)	4.00(1.10)	4.10(.97)
Employee Relations	3.46(.82)	3.22(.89)	3.32(.68)	3.30(.90)	4.02(.66)	4.17(.88)	3.89(.64)	4.08(.51)
1. will create a more meaningful and satisfying work experience for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.32(1.12)	3.03(1.18)	2.61(1.23)	2.55(1.40)	3.72(1.14)	4.10(1.12)	3.56(1.05)	4.20(.95)
2. will improve the working conditions for faculty at regional campuses/institution by not having to report to the USF Tampa academic departments	3.32(1.13)	3.00(1.29)	2.91(1.06)	3.19(1.44)	4.30(.80)	4.38(.98)	4.16(.90)	4.40(.82)
3. will improve the working conditions for staff at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	3.38(1.12)	3.05(1.28)	3.10(1.22)	3.00(1.49)	4.04(1.00)	4.37(1.08)	4.00(.98)	4.15(1.04)
4. will improve the working conditions for administration at regional campuses/institution by not having to coordinate work through the USF Tampa academic departments	3.46(1.13)	3.08(1.29)	3.07(1.05)	2.74(1.29)	4.20(.90)	4.38(1.06)	4.35(.80)	4.22(.55)
5. will alleviate feelings of isolation at regional campuses/institution	3.01(1.25)	2.57(1.14)	2.41(1.05)	2.62(1.15)	3.11(1.28)	3.78(1 19)	2.92(1.13)	3.10(1 18)
6. will increase job responsibilities for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.88(.98)	3.71(1.16)	4.44(.89)	4.47(.90)	4.57(.60)	4.27(.78)	4.21(1.02)	4.25(.91)
7. will increase workloads (tasks) for employees at regional campuses/institution	3.74(1.06)	3.66(1 20)	4.52(.80)	4.48(.87)	4.54(.65)	4.19(1.06)	4.24(.97)	4.26(.93)

Survey Items Averages for Dependent Variables for USFT, USFSP, USFSM, and USFP - Gender

Survey Item	USFT n = 422 Female (56%) M(SD)	Male (44%) M(SD)	USFSP n = 69 Female (57%) M(SD)	Male (43%) M(SD)	USFSM n = 89 Female (66%) M(SD)	Male (34%) M(SD)	USFP n = 53 Female (55%) M(SD)	Male (45%) M(SD)
Inter-campus Relationships	3.50(.83)	3.11(.98)	3.41(.89)	3.08(1.01)	3.96(.74)	3.94(.83)	4.27(.51)	4.31(.63)
1. will allow local communities to support regional campuses/institution	3.51(.97)	3.18(1.16)	3.45(1.15)	3.24(1.23)	3.92(.84)	4.12(.88)	4.00(1.00)	4.00(.97)
2. will allow regional campuses/institution to have a greater regional identification for marketing, fund raising and local community support	3.73(1.03)	3.47(1.23)	3.66(1.10)	3.31(1.26)	4.09(.92)	4.07(1.12)	4.39(.74)	4.45(.80)
3. will allow scarce resources to be distributed more equitably within the system	2.73(1.19)	2.35(1.14)	2.14(1.16)	2.21(1.18)	2.93(1.27)	3.14(1.42)	3.39(1.09)	3.64(1.22)
4. will enable regional campuses/institution greater ability to create academic programs that respond to local/regional needs	3.76(1.01)	3.38(1.18)	3.64(.99)	3.45(1.12)	4.40(.78)	4.37(.61)	4.56(.70)	4.65(.49)
5. will position regional campuses/institution to leverage a unique identity within the USF System	3.65(.99)	3.25(1.22)	3.69(1.12)	3.27(1.31)	4.07(.94)	4.11(.97)	4.74(.45)	4.64(.49)
6. will allow regional campuses/institution recognition among the state and national politicians in the region to facilitate regional goals	3.41(1.10)	2.99(1.26)	3.47(1.10)	3.07(1.36)	3.92(.85)	3.69(1.12)	4.37(.63)	4.33(.84)
Campus Identity	3.39(.85)	3.07(1.00)	3.35(1.07)	3.10(1.04)	3.87(.79)	3.81(.97)	3.99(.61)	4.24(.54)
1. will enhance the prestige and perception of educational quality at regional campuses/institution	2.92(1.21)	2.56(1.31)	3.35(1.28)	3.03(1.25)	3.46(1.22)	3.65(1.23)	4.08(1.04)	4.20(.95)
2. will further the goal of achieving the AAU status for USF Tampa	3.01(1.15)	2.83(1.45)	3.10(1.45)	2.90(1.07)	4.00(.93)	3.50(1.30)	3.50(1.06)	4.07(.96)
3. will promote each regional campus/institution sense of community	3.73(.93)	3.46(1.11)	3.44(1.39)	3.47(1.28)	4.07(.87)	4.24(.83)	4.03(.94)	4.38(.59)
4. will allow each regional campus/institution to create a separate identity	3.87(.84)	3.55(1.11)	3.52(1.25)	3.13(1.38)	4.11(.88)	4.07(1.03)	4.44(.75)	4.43(.60)
5. will enhance public understanding of the value of regional campuses/institution	3.04(1.20)	2.74(1 25)	3.19(1.26)	2.79(1.29)	3.64(1.12)	3.70(1.23)	3.83(1.09)	4.05(.85)

Appendix 31

USFT Qualitative Data Themes and Nominal Items

Item	Emerging Themes	n	%
Major Strengths		203	3.5
	Greater individual identity and prestige	48	24
	Greater autonomy, independence, accountability, and responsibility	47	23
	More community and political support	24	12
	Increased ability to create individual academic programs	21	10
	Ability to operate more effectively with less bureaucracy	15	7
	Benefits the USF System organizational structure	15	7
	Ability to create tenure and promotion process	1	.4
Major Limitations		220	3.8
	Lack of budget, resources, and increase in competition	55	25
	Lack of USF System infrastructure, collaboration, shared services, and communication	43	19
	Loss of USF identity as a whole	33	15
	Duplication of services	28	13
	Increased workload, responsibility, less expertise	19	8
	Less perceived quality and prestige	14	6
	Lack of understanding for students, public, and employees	14	6
	Lack of branding	5	2
	Ability to develop tenure and promotion for faculty	3	1
To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?		210	3.7
	Communicated	53	25
	Not communicated	157	75
I support separate accreditation.		366	6
	Yes	206	56
	No	160	44
I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation?		368	6
	Yes	78	21
	No	290	79

Appendix 32

USFSP Qualitative Data Themes and Nominal Items

Item	Emerging Themes	n	%
Major Strength		36	11
	Greater autonomy and independent decisions	18	50
	More independence for academic decisions	13	36
	Greater ability to create identity, prestige and mission	3	8
	Ability to hire and evaluate faculty	2	5
Major Limitations		36	11
	Lack of USF System infrastructure	18	50
	Increase in workload	10	28
	Lack of budget and resource needs	7	19
	Less student involvement in USFT events	1	3
To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?		35	11
	Communicated	23	66
	Not communicated	12	34
I support separate accreditation.		65	20
	Yes	51	78
	No	14	22
I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation?		63	20
	Yes	30	48
	No	33	52

Appendix 33

USFSM Qualitative Data Themes and Nominal Items

Item	Emerging themes	n	%
Major Strength		58	37
	Greater autonomy and independence	28	48
	Greater independence to create academic programs	20	34
	Ability to react to community needs	5	8
	Ability to make independent hiring decisions	3	5
	Ability to create campus identity	2	3
Major Limitations		61	39
	Lack of budget and resources	26	43
	Lack of USF System infrastructure	20	33
	Lesser USFSM degree prestige	8	13
	Greater increases in workloads	4	6
	Lack of USFSM infrastructure	3	5
To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?		58	37
	Communicated	44	76
	Not Communicated	14	24
I support Separate Accreditation		86	55
	Yes	80	93
	No	6	7
I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation?		82	53
	Yes	57	70
	No	25	30

Appendix 34

USFP Qualitative Data Themes and Nominal Items

Item	Emerging Themes	n	%
Major Strengths		41	33
	Greater ability to make independent decisions	19	46
	Greater ability to make academic program decisions	13	32
	Greater autonomy	7	17
	Ability to create tenure and promotion process	2	5
Major Limitations		29	23
	Lack of USF System infrastructure	13	45
	Loss of identity with USFT	6	21
	Increases in workload	5	17
	Lack of USFP infrastructure	3	10
To what degree have the implications of separate accreditation been communicated to you as an employee?		32	26
	Communicated	23	72
	Not communicated	9	28
I support separate accreditation.		50	40
	Yes	49	98
	No	1	2
I feel my personal situation as an employee will be benefited by separate accreditation?		48	39
	Yes	36	75
	No	12	25

Appendix 35

Generalization for Campus Chi-Square Goodness-of-Fit

Source	χ^2	df_{num}	p
Employment Category			
USFT	16.71	2	.0002
USFSP	10.94	2	.0042
USFSM	18.86	2	.0001
USFP	18.85	2	.0001
Gender			
USFT	.1993	1	.6553
USFSP	2.511	1	.1130
USFSM	.2029	1	.6524
USFP	.1127	1	.7371

Note. χ^2 = Chi-Square; df_{num} = degrees of freedom between; $p > ChiSq$.