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Overview of the Presentation

- Survey purposes
- Survey protocol
- Questionnaire structure
- Survey results
  - Overall satisfaction
  - High and low ratings of key topics
- What’s important?
- Setting priorities from the survey
- Highlights in review
SURVEY PURPOSES
Survey Purposes

• Assist President Sullivan and the University administration to understand the level of employee satisfaction among staff members

• Identify areas for improvement

• Examine several topics: physical work environment, the quality of work relationships, opportunities for advancement, and overall job satisfaction

• Analyze by demographic groups

A resource and catalyst for discussion about self-improvement going forward
Who was surveyed?

• Academic Division staff members
  – Includes School of Medicine staff
  – Includes College at Wise
• Full time and part time

• Not surveyed:
  – Members of the faculty
  – Employees of the Darden School
  – Employees of the U.Va. Medical Center
Questionnaire Development

- Collaboration between CSR and Staff Survey Advisory Committee
- Used previous organizational surveys conducted by CSR, consulted surveys done at other universities
- Advisory Committee conducted a workshop to review questions and made recommendations for additions and modifications
- CSR conducted two focus groups to pretest the survey instrument
- A pilot of 300 employees was conducted to test the instrument (pilot data were included in the analysis)
Survey Administration

- Hosted completely on the web
- Fully voluntary and anonymous
  - Email confirmation from respondents
  - Upon notification respondents were removed from reminders
- Launched the survey with a letter on paper from President Sullivan
- To encourage responses
  - Series of email reminders to non-responders
  - Outreach efforts focused on those without convenient access to computers
Survey Communications

- Advance letter from President Sullivan
- Email announcement to all staff
- Email to supervisors of staff
- Thank you/reminder email to all staff
- Email reminders to non-respondents
- Close-out email to non-respondents
- Web survey launched: March 2, 2011
  - Closed: March 25, 2011
Accuracy of the Survey

- 63% of all employees completed survey
  - 3,076 out of 4,857 estimated to be eligible
  - Includes data from the pilot
- Margin of error (sampling error)
  - ± 1.1 percentage points at the 95% level of confidence
- No post-survey ‘weighting’ of the data was needed

Note: Surveys are subject to sources of error other than sampling error
## Profile of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEMOGRAPHIC</th>
<th>ALL STAFF</th>
<th>SURVEY</th>
<th>DEMOGRAPHIC</th>
<th>ALL STAFF</th>
<th>SURVEY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>18-24 years old</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25-34 years old</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed 0-5 yrs</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35-44 years old</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed 6-10 yrs</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45-54 years old</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed 11-20 yrs</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>55 and up</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed 21+ yrs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONNAIRE STRUCTURE
Questionnaire Structure

- Organized into 6 principal parts covering 15 key-topic areas
- Each key-topic followed by overall rating(s)
- Open-ended items at the end of each principal part to allow for additional comments
- Overall satisfaction questions for analysis
- Importance ratings
- Demographics
# Questionnaire Structure

## PART 1: WORK ENVIRONMENT

The following questions are about the work facilities and technology you use in your position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know/Does not apply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1. My work space is adequate to do my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. My work space is maintained well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. I have access to the <strong>technology</strong> necessary to do my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. I have access to the technology support necessary to do my job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. My usual work environment is safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6. I feel safe from possible violence in my workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7. I feel safe in the parking areas I use for work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8. Overall, how satisfied are you with the function and safety of work facilities you use in your position?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the technology you use in your position?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10. Please use the space below to write any additional comments you have about the work facilities and technology you use in your position.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questionnaire Content

Part I – Work Environment (36 four-point items)
- 1. Work facilities and technology
- 2. Empowerment
- 3. Dignity and worth you feel when performing your work
- 4. Process for performance evaluation
- 5. Mutual commitment between you and the University

Part II – Opportunities for Training, Development, and Promotion (15 four-point items)
- 6. Training and development efforts
- 7. Opportunities for promotion
Questionnaire Content

Part III – Working Relationships (30 four-point items)
  • 8. Teamwork
  • 9. Rating immediate supervisor
  • 10. Rating University leadership
  • 11. Communication
  • 12. Integrity of University employees

Part IV – Diversity, Employee Relations and Equal Employment Opportunity (14 four-point items)
  • 13. Diversity and equal employment opportunities
  • 14. Employee relations
  • 15. Compensation and benefits
Questionnaire Content

Part V – Overall satisfaction (5 items and 3 open-ends)

- Overall satisfaction with U.Va. as a place to work
- Rate U.Va. compared to two years ago
- Likelihood of working at U.Va. three years from now
  - (If unlikely) Primary reason this is unlikely
- Top four areas for U.Va. management to address
- What would you want Pres. Sullivan to know that did not get covered in this survey?
- What are the best things about working at the University?
- If you could change things about working at U.Va., what would they be?
Questionnaire Content

Part VI – Demographics (10 items)
- Are you a supervisor?
- Full-time or part-time?
- Length of service
- Gender
- Age
- Education
- Staff type
- Your supervisor’s position type
- University department or area
- Race/ethnicity

CSR keeps all this information confidential
SURVEY RESULTS

Overall Satisfaction
Overall Satisfaction

• *How satisfied are you overall with the University as a place to work?*
  – *Extremely satisfied to Extremely dissatisfied* (7 pts.)

• How would you rate the University as a place to work now compared to the way it was two years ago?
  – Much better to Much worse (5 pts.)

• How likely is it that you will be working for the University three years from now?
  – Extremely likely to Extremely unlikely (7 pts.)
Overall Employee Satisfaction

How satisfied are you overall with the University as a place to work?

- Extremely satisfied: 14.2%
- Very satisfied: 40.4%
- Somewhat satisfied: 31.0%
- Neutral: 5.6%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 5.2%
- Very dissatisfied: 2.2%
- Extremely dissatisfied: 1.4%

85.6% satisfied
Comparative Satisfaction

How would you rate the University as a place to work now as compared to the way it was two years ago?

- Much better: 5.9%
- Somewhat better: 16.3%
- About the same: 49.6%
- Somewhat worse: 20.6%
- Much worse: 7.7%

22.2% Better
28.3% Worse
Future Plans

How likely is it that you will be working for the University three years from now?

80.5% Likely to Stay
SURVEY RESULTS

Highest Mean Ratings
## Top-rated key-topic areas

### Ratings for overall items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leave benefits</td>
<td>O10</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work facilities</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>A9</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity of employees</td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the University</td>
<td>E8</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and equal employment</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate supervisor</td>
<td>I9</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education benefits</td>
<td>O13</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 = Extremely satisfied/committed → 1 = Extremely dissatisfied/uncommitted
Work Facilities

• “My usual work environment is safe” (mean of 3.57)
Integrity of Employees

- “The people I work with most behave ethically in the workplace” (mean of 3.31)
Commitment to the University

- "I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career at the University" (mean of 3.21)
Diversity and Equal Employment

- “The University treats all employees with fairness and respect” (mean of 3.50)

![Bar Chart]

- Strongly agree: 60.2%
- Somewhat agree: 32.5%
- Somewhat disagree: 4.9%
- Strongly disagree: 2.4%

4=Strongly agree
3=Somewhat agree
2=Somewhat disagree
1=Strongly disagree
Immediate Supervisor

• “My supervisor is generally available when I need assistance” (mean of 3.24)
SURVEY RESULTS

Lowest Mean Ratings
### Lowest-rated topic areas

#### Ratings for overall items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process for performance evaluation</td>
<td>D10</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>O6</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion at the University</td>
<td>G7</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7=Extremely satisfied/committed → 1=Extremely dissatisfied/uncommitted
Performance Evaluations

• “Time spent on performance evaluation is time well spent” (mean of 2.15)

4=Strongly agree
3=Somewhat agree
2=Somewhat disagree
1=Strongly disagree
Pay

• “My pay is about the same as or better than I would receive if I were doing the same type of work for another organization” (mean of 2.08)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4=Strongly agree
3=Somewhat agree
2=Somewhat disagree
1=Strongly disagree
Opportunities for Promotion

- “The best chance I see for a promotion is inside my department” (mean of 1.85)

47.7%
26.3%
19.9%
6.2%
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Strongly disagree
Somewhat disagree
Somewhat agree
Strongly agree

4=Strongly agree
3=Somewhat agree
2=Somewhat disagree
1=Strongly disagree
WHAT’S IMPORTANT?

Perceived importance and derived importance
Perceived Importance

- **Perceived importance (Employee Choice)**
  - What four key topic areas employees chose:
    “The following is a list of categories of questions you just answered on this questionnaire. We would like to know which ones you see as most important for management to address. Please choose up to four issues you would most like management to work on.

Q1. My most important concerns or issues are:
   *(Check up to four.)*
**Derived Importance**

- Derived importance (*Statistically Derived*)
  - Derived from statistical modeling of the data
  - Regression analysis (‘leverage analysis’) or zero-order correlations among overall key-topic ratings and overall satisfaction with working at the University
  - Identifies the statistical drivers of employee satisfaction
    - Items that can best predict employee satisfaction
## Ranking of Key-Topic Areas

### The Top 5 in Perceived Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% who chose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pay and benefits</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion opportunities</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluation process</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee empowerment</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Ranking of Key-Topic Areas

### The Top 5 in Derived Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Beta Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the University</td>
<td>.239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity and worth</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University leadership</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of the University</td>
<td>.116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standardized beta coefficients indicate the strength of relationship with ratings of overall satisfaction with U.Va. as a place to work.
SETTING PRIORITIES

Priority matrices
What is a Priority Matrix?

• Combines information from two sources:
  – Performance ratings for topics given by employees
  – Importance of topics (mentioned by employees, or derived)
• Topics divided into high, medium, low groups on performance
• Same topics divided into high, medium, low groups on importance
  – two measures of importance, two matrices
• Topics represented on the two dimensions
• Matrix can suggest areas for change strategies
# Schematic of a Priority Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Well Are We Doing? (Mean Performance Scores)</th>
<th>How Important Is It? (Employee Choices or Derived Statistically)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High, Strengths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Second priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>First priority, Third priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2011 Perceived Importance Priority Matrix

### How Important Is It? (Employee Choices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Work facilities, Technology, Immediate supervisor</td>
<td>Integrity of employees, Diversity and EEO, Commitment to the University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Dignity and worth, Empowerment, Employee relations Training and development, Communication</td>
<td>Teamwork, University leadership, Commitment of U.Va. to staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>“Pay and benefits”, Performance evaluations, Promotion opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2011 Derived Importance Priority Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Important Is It? (Derived Statistically)</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong> Commitment to U.Va.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity Work facilities Leave benefits Education benefits Technology Immediate supervisor</td>
<td>Diversity and equal employment opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong> Dignity and worth University leadership Commitment of U.Va. to staff</td>
<td>Empowerment Health, disability, wellness, life insurance, and retirement benefits Teamwork Communication</td>
<td>Employee relations Training and development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong> Pay</td>
<td>Promotion opportunities Performance evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary
The Survey Shows . . .

- High levels of satisfaction with U.Va. as a place to work
- Intangible aspects of the job have a strong statistical impact on overall satisfaction
- Areas of high priority for exploration and improvement:
  - Pay
  - Performance Evaluations
  - Promotional opportunities
What’s Next

- This survey is the first step in an ongoing process.
- Survey results indicate areas for strength and pride.
- Open-ended comments provide an opportunity to explore the intensity of opinion about various issues.
- It is important to sustain a process for creating understanding of the data, within the contexts of various departments and work units.