

ANALYSIS OF THE RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONS
CONDUCTED IN THE 2021-2022 YEAR ON
SATISFACTION WITH THE EDUCATIONAL AND
WORKING ENVIRONMENT OF THE LECTURERS OF
GORIS STATE UNIVERSITY



Contents:

Section 1. General Profile of the Faculty Participating in the Study	3
General information about the composition of the Faculty Members	4
Section 2. The satisfactions of the staff with educational and working environment of GSU	5
Satisfaction with university resources and services	5
Satisfaction with the processes organized at GSU	6
Satisfaction with work of GSU departments.....	7
Satisfaction with GSU visibility and work with the public.....	8
Satisfaction with the available resources of GSU to engage in scientific activities.....	9
3. Strengths and weaknesses of GSU.....	10
4. Recommendations	11
Appendix 1. Questionnaire.....	12
Appendix 2. Charts	15

Section 1. General Profile of the Faculty Participating in the Study

Structural profile of the faculty members who participated in the survey

This report presents the analysis of surveys conducted among the faculty members of the Goris State University (GSU) in the 2021-22 academic year, which aims to

1. to find out the satisfaction of the staff with the educational and working environment,
2. to receive the recommendations of the Faculty Members in the direction of improving the functions of the university,
3. Based on the analysis of the results of the survey, develop measures aimed at improving the quality of various spheres of activity of the GSU

The survey was conducted by the "Education Quality Assurance and Student Career Support Department" of GSU using the Google Forms tool. The questionnaire included 7 questions and 55 sub-questions and consists of two sections: The 1st section, the purpose of which is to raise general information about the composition of the faculty members, includes questions about the gender, age, faculty distribution, scientific degree, title held at the university, and work experience of the faculty members' composition. The questions included in the 2nd section refer to the organization of processes at the GSU, the quality of the work of various departments, the opportunities to carry out active scientific activities, the available resources and services (See Appendix 1).

In order to show the progress of the results of the staff survey, parallels were made with the results of the previous (2019-2020) similar survey to highlight the changes and improvements implemented in the key areas of the university. In particular, the results of the questions whose content was comparable to the questions included in this questionnaire were subjected to a comparative analysis.

Out of 79 employees of the faculty members (55 main, 25 with external cooperation, with internal collaboration: 9) 30 lecturers (37.9%) participated in the survey. Accordingly, the representativeness of the data for the 2021-2022 school year is not ensured. It is noteworthy that 45 employees (56.9%) participated in the surveys conducted in 2019-2020. Thus, it can be concluded that compared to the previous year, there was a decrease in interest among professors in this survey. This can be due to several circumstances.

1. Although the survey was organized on the principle of anonymity to ensure the objectivity of the evaluation, the questionnaire contained many clarifying questions regarding the filler that practically makes a person identifiable. In particular, there are questions about the applicant's gender, date of birth, year of employment, faculty, title, scientific degree and work experience.

2. There is a perception among a part of the faculty regarding the feedback research process that the survey is self-serving and futile, and that their grievances and suggestions will never be processed. According to the teaching staff, no significant changes have been registered at GSU within 1 year after the surveys and their analysis among the teaching staff in the 2019-20 school year. Moreover, as a result of the analysis of surveys conducted in the 2021-22 school year, it becomes clear that the satisfaction of professors with the various processes and resources organized at the university has significantly decreased.

General information about the composition of the Faculty Members

The gender-age distribution of the lecturers who participated in the survey (30) is presented in Table 1 and Table 2.

By gender	Number	Percent
Female	20	66.7%
Male	10	33.3%
Overall	30	100%

Table 1. Gender distribution of lecturers

According to age groups	Number	Percent
Up to 35 years	4	13.3%
36-50 years old	17	56.7%
50 and over	8	26.7%
Unidentified	1	3.3%
Overall	30	100%

Table 2: Age distribution of lecturers

The following indicators were recorded regarding the sex-age composition. the majority of professors who participated in the survey are representatives of the 36-50 age group (56.7%) and female (66.7%).

Table 3 shows the distribution of the faculty members who participated in the survey by faculties.

Name of the faculty	Number	Percent
Faculty of Natural Sciences, Engineering and Economics	12	40%
Faculty of Humanities	18	60%
Overall	30	100%

Table 3. Distribution of lecturers by faculties

18 of the participants in the survey are from the Faculty of Humanities, and 12 are from the Faculty of Natural Sciences and Engineering.

The scientific degree of the staff is presented in Table 4.

Academic degree	Number	Percent
Candidate of Science	10	46.7%
Master's degree	14	33.3%
Unidentified	6	20%
Overall	30	100%

Table 4: Distribution of lecturers according to academic degrees

Section 2. The satisfaction of the staff with the educational and working environment of GSU

In the 2021-22 school year, as a result of the analysis of the surveys conducted among the faculty members, it becomes clear that the satisfaction of the professors in this direction has either not undergone a significant change, or has somewhat decreased. It also becomes obvious that

Faculty of Humanities staff rate the university's resources and services significantly higher than employees of the Faculty of "Natural Science and Engineering Professions". 2019-20 and 2021-22 All charts generated from the surveys are included in Appendix 2.

Satisfaction with university resources and services

Among the resources and services of GSU, the conditions necessary to perform the work duties were rated higher (3.63). However, it is noticeable that the average score has decreased compared to the survey conducted in 2019-20. Salary (2.06) was rated the lowest among the resources of the university. This trend is preserved in the research done in the previous year as well. The composition of the staff also rates the service of the aid station relatively highly (3.56), although the average rating has again significantly decreased compared to the 2019-20 year (4.06) (see table XX).

The table below shows the ranking of characteristics related to university resources and support services, according to the average ratings of satisfaction of the staff of the University.

	Average grade (2021-22)	Average grade (2019-2020)	Average grade (Faculty of Humanities), 2021-22)	Average grade (Faculty of Natural Sciences, Engineering and Economics, 2021-22)
Necessary conditions To perform work duties	3.63	3.97	3.88	3.10
Medical center service	3.56	4.06	3.77	3.25
Sanitary condition	3.46	3.48	3.72	3.08
Technical saturation of workplace	3.43	3.62	3.66	3.08
Reading room	3.40	3.82	3.27	3.58
Interpersonal relations	3.30	3.33	3.22	3.41
Furnishing of classrooms	3.26	3.20	3.55	2.83
Heating	3.26	3.86	3.72	2.58
Professional literature	3.13	3.35	3.16	3.08
Saturation of classroom equipment	3.06	3.06	3.27	2.75
Salary	2.06	2.82	2.27	1.75

Table 5. Ranking of characteristics related to university resources and support services according to the average scores of satisfaction of the staff.

To the question of what will contribute to increasing the efficiency of the staff's work, 5 lecturers answered salary review, 3 - technical equipment of the classrooms, 2 - improvement of building conditions, 1 - improvement of the academic environment, 1 - correct assessment of intellectual resources. 1: creation and encouragement of conditions for scientific research activities. 2 of the lecturers stated that the improvement of all the above-mentioned resources will contribute to the increase of the efficiency of their work, and 2 lecturers stated that everything is available in GSU to work effectively.

Satisfaction with the processes organized at the GSU

Among the processes organized at GSU, the process of document circulation and information dissemination received the highest rating (3.65), which was rated "satisfactory" by 80% of lecturers, and "unsatisfactory" by 20%. The process of organizing scientific and cultural life was rated the lowest (3.34). In the previous year, this process was also rated the lowest, but compared to the average rating of 2019-20, a slight increase was recorded.

The table below shows the ranking of the characteristics of the processes organized in the university, according to the average ratings of satisfaction of the staff of the University.

	Average grade (2021-22)	Average grade (2019-2020)	Average grade (Faculty of Humanities), 2021-22)	Average grade (Faculty of Natural Sciences, Engineering and Economics, 2021-22)
Document circulation and dissemination of information	3.65	¹	3.72	3.54
Educational process	3.57	3.86	3.56	3.58
Opportunity for self- development	3.50	3.64	3.50	3.50
Discipline	3.46	3.84	3.55	3.33
Events contributing to professional activity	3.37	3.33	3.47	3.25
Scientific and cultural life	3.34	3.20	3.52	3.08

Table 6. Ranking of the characteristics related to the processes organized in the university according to the average ratings of satisfaction of the staff

¹ In the 2019-20 year, this question was missing from the questionnaire

Almost no recommendations were made by the faculty members on how to improve the above-mentioned processes. 1 lecturer stated that more professional training opportunities should be created, and 1 lecturer stated that discipline should be tightened.

Satisfaction with the work of GSU departments

It is interesting that the highest average score among the departments of GSU received the "Education Quality Assurance and Student Career Support Department" (3.79), which conducted the survey, and here we see a deviation from the pattern: compared to the analysis of the survey conducted among the 2019-20 staff, a positive trend is observed. the grade given to the department has increased slightly.

The rectorate (3.75), chairs (3.72) and accounting (3.72) received a relatively high score, although the scores decreased compared to the 2019-20 year.

The university library received the lowest average score among the departments of GSU. Although it was rated as satisfactory (3.24), we regularly receive complaints about its saturation in various surveys (students, graduates, etc.). 66.7% of lecturers evaluated this survey "sufficient", and 33.3% - "unsatisfactory". However, the survey does not find out what literature is missing in the library. However, comparing the evaluations given by the professors of the two faculties, it can be concluded that the employees of the Faculty of Science and Technology have a greater need for professional literature.

The table below shows the classification of the characteristics of the work of the departments in the university, according to the average ratings of satisfaction of the staff.

	Average grade (2021-22)	Average grade (2019-2020)	Average grade (Faculty of Humanities), 2021-22)	Average grade (Faculty of Natural Sciences, Engineering and Economics, 2021-22)
Department of Continuing Learning and Career Development	3.79	3.66	4.05	3.41
Rectorate	3.75	4.00	3.82	3.66
Chairs	3.72	4.37	3.76	3.66
Accounting	3.72	3.95	3.76	3.66
Department of external relations and cooperation	3.64	3.51	3.76	3.45
Scientific center	3.64	-	3.82	3.36
Educational department	3.62	3.82	3.76	3.41
Faculties	3.55	4.35	3.52	3.58
Staff Management Department	3.48	3.84	3.58	3.33
Economic Affairs Department	3.48	3.80	3.52	3.41
Student Scientific Society	3.39	3.20	3.47	3.27
Students Council	3.25	3.20	3.23	3.27
Library	3.24	3.97	3.00	3.58

Table 7. Ranking of the characteristics related to the work of departments in the university according to the average ratings of satisfaction of the staff.

To the question of how to improve the work of the above-mentioned departments, one of the lecturers stated that it is necessary to involve the Students Council more in the intra-university life, one lecturer stated that the student-library connection should be strengthened.

Satisfaction with GSU visibility and work with the public

The composition of the GSU faculty members was mostly satisfied with the quality and availability of publications on the official GSU Facebook page (3.67). Contrary to the above, 30% of respondents are concerned about the structure of the gorsu.am website (3.10). The low frequency of using the website also proves the inconvenience and inefficiency of the website. On this occasion, one of the lecturers noted that he noticed a lack of professional expertise in this field and a strict selectivity in the publication and coverage of materials. In his opinion, it is not professional when the information appears on the Facebook page of the university rather than on the official website.

When asked how to improve the visibility of GSU in social networks and work with the public, some of the professors said that the website should become more modern and user-friendly. It is recommended to entrust the website to more competitive specialists or create a new website

The table below shows the ranking of university visibility and characteristics of work with the public, according to the average ratings of satisfaction of the staff.

	Average grade (2021-22)	Average grade (2019-2020)	Average grade (Faculty of Humanities), 2021-22)	Average grade (Faculty of Natural Sciences, Engineering and Economics, 2021-22)
The quality of publications on the official Facebook page of GSU availability	3.67	3.75	4.00	3.18
News coverage	3.53	3.62	3.88	3.00
The convenience of receiving information from the official Facebook page of GSU	3.42	3.84	3.64	3.09
Department of Public Relations and Information - Lecturer cooperation	3.35	3.51	3.47	3.18
GSU Public Relations and Media Department's activities transparency and availability	3.32	3.64	3.47	3.09

Feedback sharing mechanisms that contribute to the formation of relations with the public the activity	3.25	3.46	3.29	3.18
Convenience of receiving information	3.17	3.73	3.29	3.00
Information completeness	3.17	3.68	3.35	2.90
Frequency of using the website	3.21	3.73	3.23	3.18
Website structure	3.10	3.71	3.23	2.90

Table 8. Ranking of characteristics related to the university's visibility and work with the public according to the average satisfaction of the staff of grades

Satisfaction with the available resources of GSU to engage in scientific activities

According to the composition of the staff, the university sufficiently provides conditions for engaging in research activities (3.13), which is slightly lower compared to the results of the 2019-20 academic year. In addition, the professors of the Faculty of Science and Technology evaluate this component significantly lower (2.75) than the professors of the Faculty of Science and Technology (3.41).

To the question of what is needed for the staff to carry out more active scientific activities, 2 people answered the enrichment of the material and technical base and literature, one - salary revision, especially in courses with up to 10 students, in which case the payment is made according to the number of students, but the lecturer is the same during the class. knowledge provides. 1 person mentioned the publication of a scientific bulletin, 1 person mentioned the establishment of a base laboratory, 3 people emphasized the need for financial investment.

	Average grade (2021-22)	Average grade (2019-2020)	Average grade (Faculty of Humanities), 2021-22)	Average grade (Faculty of Natural Sciences, Engineering and Economics, 2021-22)
The university provides facilities with scientific research works to practice	3.13	3.28	3.41	2.75
Necessary scientific literature is available in the university research works to implement	3.03	3.20	3.23	2.75

The University provides the necessary logistical base of research works for implementation	3.03	3.24	3.29	2.66
--	------	------	------	------

Table 9. Ranking of the characteristics related to active scientific activity at the university according to the average satisfaction ratings of the staff

3. Strengths and weaknesses of GSU

The following tables summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the GSU according to the composition of the faculty members.

3.1 Strengths	
3.1.1 Geographical location, role in the region	3
3.1.2 Student-centered approach	2
3.1.3 Healthy interpersonal relationships	2
3.1.4 Participation in international programs	2
3.1.5 Human resources	2
3.1.6 Implementation of non-formal education	1
3.1.7 Involvement of leading specialists in relevant specialties	1
3.1.8 Horizontal dialog of leader-subordinate relationship system	1
3.1.9 Flexible management system	1
3.1.10 High quality of education	1
3.1.11 Document base	1
3.1.12 Being an accredited university	1

Table 10: Strengths of GSU

3.2 Weaknesses	
3.2.1 Decrease in the number of students year by year	6
3.2.2 A scarce material and technical base	5
3.2.3 Lack of law and order	2
3.2.4 Insufficient heating	2
3.2.5 interpersonal relationships,	2
3.2.6 Low pay	2
3.2.7 Imperfection of the teaching staff motivation promotion system	1
3.2.8 Weak university-employer connection	1
3.2.9 Weak connection with external stakeholders	1

3.2.10 Lack of international collaborations	1
3.2.11 Irregular student attendance	1
3.3.11 Lack of motivational components	1
3.3.12 Weak collaboration between university departments	1
3.3.13 Low university rating	1

Table 11: Weaknesses of GSU.

3. Recommendations

- Revise the questionnaire by removing the questions identifying the respondent from the "Personal Section".
- • Based on the results of this research, develop and present to the Board of Directors an action plan for the improvement of the university.
- • Develop a professional needs assessment questionnaire and conduct a needs assessment among the staff.
- According to the analysis of the professional needs assessment, as a result of the joint work of the management of GSU, the "Education Quality Assurance and Student Career Support Department" and the heads of departments, develop a document on the mechanisms, procedures and tools for the professional development and improvement of the teaching staff (Individual Development Plan), which is fixed there should be clear steps, including directions and stages of actions.
- • To involve the GSU staff in relevant professional courses, trainings, seminars, scientific conferences

