Prof. Jonathan Hughes EDU 5655 – Data Analysis Urbana Teacher Survey Summary September 10, 2011 Carl Semmler Chris Kelly Robert Milani

The Urbana Education Association, in preparation for the upcoming contract negotiations with the Board of Education, has compiled the responses to the faculty survey. Herein is a summary statement which illustrates items which the faculty feel are important and unimportant.

The total number of surveys returned from our five elementary schools, one middle school and one high school was 118. The survey was broken down into six categories. The categories were: demographics, salary/fringe benefits, insurance, teacher protection, working conditions and priority ranking.

The surveys gauged the desire of the faculty to negotiate thirty-two items.

### Table 1

Most Important Priorities for Urbana Education Association

	Ν	Range	Sum	Mean	Variance
Q27: Lunch Period - Duty Free	117	3	134	1.15	.246
Q28: 30 Min. Lunch, Exclusive of Passing Time	115	3	137	1.19	.279
Q30: Establish Enforceable class size policy	117	2	152	1.30	.280
Q17: Current Level of BOE Contributions to Insurance	109	3	160	1.47	.473
Q11: Establish Sick Day Buy Back Program	117	3	174	1.49	.459
Q25: One Period Elem. Teachers for Prep	108	3	162	1.50	.794
Q29: Adequate Telephone Lines for Privacy Calls	116	3	182	1.57	.578
Q10: Personal Leave Days w/o Explanation	117	3	186	1.59	.744
Q34: Est. Stu w/ IEP's be Weighted for Class Size Determination	118	3	189	1.60	.532
Q22: Consistent Admin. of Policy - Parent Complaints	116	3	187	1.61	.518
Valid N (list wise)	99				

The chart above indicates the most important items to the teachers in Urbana Educational Association. The chart represents responses from all four of the major negotiation categories on the survey. The category "working conditions" is most represented with four items in the top ten desired negotiation items.

### Table 2

Least Important	Priorities for	Urbana Edi	<i>ication</i> Association

	Ν	Range	Sum	Mean	Variance
Q19: Provide Orthodontic Rider	118	3	321	2.72	1.143
Q39: Est. a Teacher-in-charge Position at Elem schools to Cover Principal Absence	110	3	276	2.51	.986
Q9: Increase Number of Personal Days	116	3	280	2.41	.766
Q15: Increase Amt. Life Insurance	116	3	276	2.38	.603
Q8: Increase Extra Curriculum Stipend - More Competitive	116	3	275	2.37	1.174
Q37: Provide \$\$ and/or app Expense for Teacher Achieving Board Cert.	116	3	275	2.37	.966
Q14: Tuition Reimbursement Program - Specific \$\$ Amt.	117	3	268	2.29	1.070
Q20: Est. Sick Leave Bank	117	3	252	2.15	.786
Q23: Insurance Coverage – On job damage or loss personal property	116	3	247	2.13	.653
Q32: Est. workload limit for Psych, Speech, Sp. Ed and Guidance personal	114	3	230	2.02	.920
Valid N (list wise)	105				

The chart above indicates the least important items to the teachers in Urbana Educational Association. The chart represents responses from all four of the major negotiation categories on the survey.

### Table 3 Salary/Fringe Benefits

	Ν	Range	Sum	Mean	Variance
Q11: Establish Sick Day Buy Back Program	117	3	174	1.49	.459
Q10: Personal Leave Days w/o Explanation	117	3	186	1.59	.744
Q12: Contribution by BOE to Retirees' Health Insurance	113	3	201	1.78	.638
Q13: 5 Sick Days - Family Illness Days	118	3	212	1.80	.710
Q7: Increase Longevity Payments	113	3	214	1.89	.792
Q14: Tuition Reimbursement Program - Specific \$\$ Amt.	117	3	268	2.29	1.070
Q8: Increase Xtra Curic Stipen - More Competitive	116	3	275	2.37	1.174
Q9: Increase Number of Personal Days	116	3	280	2.41	.766
Valid N (listwise)	104				

The chart above indicates the order of importance of items in the category of "salary/fringe benefits" to the teachers in Urbana Educational Association. Questions 10 and 11 are represented in the top ten overall items of importance to the teachers (see Table 1)

### Table 4 *Insurance*

	Ν	Range	Sum	Mean	Variance
Q17: Current level of BOE contributions to Insurance	109	3	160	1.47	.473
Q16: Rich Network Plan w/no Gatekeeper or PCP	114	3	184	1.61	.682
Q18: Improve dental plan \$1,000 to \$1,500	116	3	192	1.66	.680
Q20: Est. sick leave bank	117	3	252	2.15	.786
Q15: Increase Amt. Life Insurance	116	3	276	2.38	.603
Q19: Provide othodontic rider	118	3	321	2.72	1.143
Valid N (listwise)	104				

The chart above indicates the order of importance of items in the category of "insurance" to the teachers in Urbana Educational Association. Question 17 is represented in the top ten overall items of importance to the teachers (see Table 1)

## Table 5Teacher Protection

	Ν	Range	Sum	Mean	Variance
Q22: Consistent Admin of Policy - Parent Complaints	116	3	187	1.61	.518
Q21: Est. Student Discipline Plan	115	3	198	1.72	.606
Q24: Improve input for Staff Development	118	3	216	1.83	.569
Q23: Insur Coverage - On job damage or loss personal property	116	3	247	2.13	.653
Valid N (listwise)	115				

The chart above indicates the order of importance of items in the category of "teacher protection" to the teachers in Urbana Educational Association. Question 22 is represented in the top ten overall items of importance to the teachers (see Table 1)

### Table 6 *Working Conditions*

	N	Range	Sum	Mean	Variance
Q27: Lunch Period - Duty Free	117	3	134	1.15	.246
Q28: 30 min lunch, exclusive of passing time	115	3	137	1.19	.279
Q30: Est. enforceable class size policy	117	2	152	1.30	.280
Q25: one period Elem Teachers for Prep	108	3	162	1.50	.794
Q29: adequate telephone lines for privacy calls	116	3	182	1.57	.578
Q34: Est. Stu w/ IEP's be weighted for class size determination	118	3	189	1.60	.532
Q33: Est. training for handicapped student placement	117	3	196	1.68	.601
Q26: Release time Teacher Attendance at PPT's	115	3	197	1.71	.663
Q35: Increase \$\$ for in- service edu, conf and travel	118	3	204	1.73	.524
Q36: Increase Teacher Autonomy for Building Decisions	116	3	210	1.81	.451
Q38: Provide \$\$ for teachers who request sub for an absent colleague during prep	117	3	229	1.96	.886
Q31: Est. Max # of classes per day for "Special" classes - PE, Art, etc.	116	3	228	1.97	1.025
Q32: Est. workload limit for Psych, Speech, SpEd and Guidance personal	114	3	230	2.02	.920
Q37: Provide \$\$ and/or app expense for teacher achieving Board Cert.	116	3	275	2.37	.966
Q39: Est. a Teacher-in-charge position at Elem schools to cover principal absence	110	3	276	2.51	.986
Valid N (listwise)	103				

The chart above indicates the order of importance of items in the category of "working conditions" to the teachers in Urbana Educational Association. Questions 25, 27, 28, 29 30 and 34 is represented in the top ten overall items of importance to the teachers (see Table 1)

The majority of the faculty is most concerned with items related to "working conditions." In particular, the two most important items in this category are related to the utilization of time. The faculty would like to have a duty free lunch and a full 30 minute block for lunch. The next item of importance in this area involves class size policy. The fourth most important item is the request for the Board of Education to contribute more to the insurance plan premium. Conversely and ironically the least important issue to the faculty also involves insurance. Very few teachers wished to have an orthodontic rider to the dental plan.

#### Table 7

			Q1	4: Tuition reimb	urse \$ per cre	dit	Total
		-	Top Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	Not Important	
Total Full-time Experience	0-4 yrs	Count	13	1	3	0	17
·		% within Total Full-time Experience	76.5%	5.9%	17.6%	.0%	100.0%
	5-10 yrs	Count	7	8	7	1	23
		% within Total Full-time Experience	30.4%	34.8%	30.4%	4.3%	100.0%
	11-19	Count	8	14	6	2	3
	yrs >20 yrs	% within Total Full-time Experience Count	26.7% 5	46.7% 11	20.0%	6.7% 14	100.0% 4
		% within Total Full-time Experience	10.6%	23.4%	36.2%	29.8%	100.0%
Total		Count	33	34	33	17	11
		% within Total Full-time Experience	28.2%	29.1%	28.2%	14.5%	100.0%

Cross-Tabulation Between Teaching Experience and Desire for Tuition Reimbursement

Upon further analysis of the relationship between question 14: *Establish a tuition reimbursement program with a specified dollar amount per credit* and the total full time employees, it is noted how the more experienced staff (>20 yrs) have little or no interest in tuition reimbursement program while those teachers with less experience (0-4 yrs) would like a tuition reimbursement plan. It should be noted how 77 of the 117 teachers surveyed have over 11 years of total experience in the district. This cross tabulation had a Chi-Square result of 41.772(a) with a very high level of significant.

			Q28: 1	30 min lunch v	v-o passing ti	me	Total
			Top Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority	Not Important	
Building Farmin Assignment	Farmingville	Count	6	0	0	0	6
-		% within Building Assignment	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	Ridgebury	Count	2	0	0	0	2
		% within Building Assignment	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Scotland Veterans Park East Ridge MS	Count	19	2	1	0	22	
	% within Building Assignment	86.4%	9.1%	4.5%	.0%	100.0%	
		Count	21	1	0	0	22
		% within Building Assignment	95.5%	4.5%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
		Count	6	0	1	0	7
		% within Building Assignment	85.7%	.0%	14.3%	.0%	100.0%
	Ridgefield High	Count	44	8	2	1	55
Other		% within Building Assignment	80.0%	14.5%	3.6%	1.8%	100.0%
	Other	Count	1	0	0	0	1
		% within Building Assignment	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
Total	Cou	int	99	11	4	1	115
		vithin Building ignment	86.1%	9.6%	3.5%	.9%	100.0%

# Table 8Cross-Tabulation between Teaching Experience and Desire for Tuition Reimbursement

Upon further analysis of the relationship between question 28: *Ensure that all teachers have at least thirty (30) minutes for lunch, exclusive of passing time* and the total full time employees, it is noted how most of the teachers agree they want this in the next contract. Regardless of which building they work in. This cross tabulation had a Chi-Square result of 8.801(a) with a very low level of significant.