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I Executive Summary

About the Survey

University President Teresa A. Sullivan commissioned the Center for Survey Research to conduct a survey of all Academic Division staff. The purpose of the survey was to assist President Sullivan and the University administration in understanding the level of employee satisfaction among staff members and to identify areas for improvement. The survey questionnaire addressed a broad range of topics, including the adequacy of the work environment, the quality of work relationships, opportunities for advancement, and overall job satisfaction.

Survey Administration

The survey was hosted completely on the web. The survey was designed to ensure anonymity for the respondents. A letter from President Sullivan was sent by Messenger Mail to all Academic Division staff prior to the announcement emails to encourage participation in the survey. A series of reminder emails were sent to employees by CSR to promote participation in the survey.

There were 3,067 completed surveys. After adjusting for exclusions and a proportional adjustment to estimate the ineligible cases among those from whom we never heard, the survey response rate is 63%.

Questionnaire Design

Developing the questionnaire was a collaborative effort among the leadership of the Human Resources and Information Technology units at the University, an ad hoc Staff Survey Advisory Committee drawn from numerous departments within the Academic Division, and members of the CSR research team.

The questionnaire is divided into six principal parts covering fifteen “key-topic areas” thought to be related to employee satisfaction.

Demographic Overview

The survey questionnaire included demographic questions about respondents to allow for analysis of the data by personal and social characteristics. Nearly two-thirds (64.4%) of respondents are female and 35.6 percent of the respondents are male. Most of the respondents are full-time Academic Division staff with 2.5 percent part-time staff. Three-quarters (72.8%) of the respondents are non-supervisors. More than sixty percent (61%) are classified staff and 35.1% are University staff. The demographics of the survey respondents are fairly close to those for the full population of Academic Division staff.

Sampling Error

Based on an estimated eligible population of 4,866 employees and a response of 3,067 completed questionnaires, the sampling error for this survey is evaluated at ±1.1 percentage points. This means that in 95 out of 100 samples of the same size drawn from U.Va. Academic Division staff, the results obtained in the sample would fall in a range of ±1.1 percentage points of what would have been obtained had every employee been interviewed.

Results

Summary

Overall, U.Va. Academic Division Staff report high levels of satisfaction with U.Va. as a place to work. As is often the case in employee surveys, several intangible aspects of the job such as the employee’s commitment to U.Va. and the dignity the employee feels while performing the job have a strong statistical (derived) impact on overall satisfaction, while employees reported on the survey itself that extrinsic factors such as pay, performance evaluations and opportunities for promotion are most important for the University to work on and are also not performing well.

However, in the 2011 Academic Division Staff Survey, “the three P’s” of Pay, Performance Evaluations and Promotion Opportunities not only occupy their traditional high rankings based on employee mentions of areas that need attention, they are also statistically related to overall ratings of U.Va. as a place to work. They threaten to overtake the strengths that employees perceive in the intangible aspects of the job.

In general, females provided higher ratings than did males, with some notable exceptions being for personal safety in parking areas used for work, opportunities for promotion, and confidence that unethical behavior will be addressed.

As is often the case in employee surveys, the newest employees (in this survey, those with less than one year of service) and the most experienced employees (those with more than twenty-five
years of service) tended to give the highest ratings across the board, while those with six to fifteen years of experience are moderately more likely to give higher ratings. Employees with one to five years of experience and those with sixteen to twenty-five years tended to give the lowest ratings.

University staff were slightly more likely than were classified staff to give higher ratings in the survey, but classified staff reported higher levels of commitment to the University. Respondents who reported that they were in some other staffing category gave the lowest ratings, in general, compared to University or classified staff.

African-American respondents generally gave higher ratings than did respondents who reported themselves to be white or a member of some other racial or ethnic group. However, African-Americans gave lower ratings for diversity and equal employment opportunity.

Priority Matrices

Two “priority matrices” summarize the responses of employees in several areas of the questionnaire.

Figure I-1: Schematic of a Priority Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Measure of Importance (Employee Choices or Derived Statistically)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td><strong>Areas of Strength</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td><strong>First Priority</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Figure I-2 above, “Pay and benefits” is shown in quotation marks because respondents were presented with only that option when asked to choose the four most important areas for U.Va. to work on. We know from the performance ratings and open-ended comments that this low performance rating is specific to pay. Benefits are rated more highly and are discussed by staff in the open-ended comments much more favorably than is pay.

This priority matrix, based on employee choices of what is important to work on, clearly emphasizes pay, performance evaluations and promotion opportunities as areas for exploration and improvement. Areas of strength are work facilities, technology, and the employee’s immediate supervisor.
In Figure I-3 above, the level of importance is determined by a statistical analysis that regresses overall ratings for each of the key-topic areas onto the rating for U.Va. as a place to work. In this statistical analysis, pay and other benefits can be analyzed separately.

It is clear that the issue of pay is still an important area for attention. It is a strong statistical driver of overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work, and it is rated low in performance. The other two key-topic areas in “the three P’s” group are found in the area of third priority in the matrix – the cell representing low performance and medium importance.

The area of second priority contains three key-topic areas that are strongly related to overall ratings of U.Va. as a place to work, but are performing only moderately well. The two intangible key-topic areas here – dignity and worth you feel when doing your work, and the commitment of U.Va. to you as an employee – are often strengths in organizations. The three key-topic areas in the area of second priority should be explored to determine how to strengthen them.

Areas of strength in this matrix are numerous: the employee’s commitment to U.Va., the integrity of employees the respondent works with most, work facilities, leave benefits, education benefits, technology, and the employee’s immediate supervisor.

**Open-ended comments**

The open-ended comments provide an opportunity to explore the intensity and variety of opinion about various issues, and to learn about issues that may be faced by a minority of employees but that can have significant impacts on organizational performance. Many of the respondents also used
some of the open-ended responses to express their thanks for being surveyed.

It is well worth the time to review these responses. Some of the responses made available for public review were edited by CSR and UVA HR for language and to avoid identification of individuals. The unedited responses were delivered to President Sullivan to fulfill the promise made to employees that their input was wanted and that they should be honest and forthcoming.

**Going forward**

The survey results should be viewed as a conversation-starter, not a conversation-ender. They describe much to celebrate in areas of strength and pride. They also indicate areas for improvement. It will be important to sustain a process for making fuller meaning from the data, within the contexts of various departments and work units of a large and diverse organization.
Introduction

About the Survey

University President Teresa A. Sullivan commissioned the Center for Survey Research to conduct a survey of all Academic Division staff. The purpose of the survey was to assist President Sullivan and the University administration in understanding the level of employee satisfaction among staff members and to identify areas for improvement. The survey questionnaire addressed a broad range of topics, including the adequacy of the work environment, the quality of work relationships, opportunities for advancement, and overall job satisfaction.

Survey Administration

The survey was hosted completely on the web. A letter from President Sullivan was sent by Messenger Mail to all Academic Division staff prior to the announcement emails to encourage participation in the survey.

A series of reminder emails, were sent to employees by CSR to promote participation in the survey. See Table II-1 for the sequence of survey-related communications that were sent to employees during the survey period.

Table II-1: Sequence of Survey Related Communications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sent to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advance email</td>
<td>2/11</td>
<td>Pilot sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement email</td>
<td>2/14</td>
<td>Pilot sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you email</td>
<td>2/18</td>
<td>Pilot sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance letter (paper)</td>
<td>2/23</td>
<td>Production sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up email</td>
<td>2/24</td>
<td>Production sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcement email</td>
<td>3/2</td>
<td>Production sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors email</td>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>Supervisors of Academic Division staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you email</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>Production sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resume pilot email</td>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>Pilot sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reminder Email</td>
<td>3/17</td>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-out email</td>
<td>3/23</td>
<td>Non-respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey was designed to ensure anonymity for the respondents. The questionnaire asked for no personal identifying information other than the usual demographics. Respondents completing the online survey were asked to send an email separate from submission of the survey indicating completion or requesting removal from the reminder emails.

CSR received 3,067 completed surveys. At the time of the survey, University Human Resources reported a population of 5,085 Academic Division staff. After the survey was launched, the staff at the Darden School were removed from the study because they recently conducted a similar employee survey. This left a population of 4,977. Surveys where respondents failed to answer more than 25% of the questions, not including the demographics, were not considered as completed or partial surveys and hence were not included in the analysis. Respondents who indicated they are faculty or employees at Darden were also not included in the analysis. There were 54 employees without e-mail addresses, 21 who said they were ineligible for the survey and 14 whose e-mails were undeliverable. After these adjustments and a proportional adjustment to estimate the ineligible cases among those from whom we never heard, the survey response rate is 63% from an estimated 4,866 eligible employees.

Questionnaire Design

Developing the questionnaire was a collaborative effort among the leadership of the Human Resources and Information Technology units at the University, an ad hoc Staff Survey Advisory Committee drawn from numerous departments within the Academic Division, and members of the CSR research team. The Staff Survey Advisory Committee met with CSR and conducted a workshop to help develop a draft questionnaire. Once the draft questionnaire was developed, two focus groups were conducted by CSR with randomly selected employees. Input from the focus groups was instrumental in modifying the questionnaire before fielding the survey.

A pilot survey was conducted with a random sample of 300 employees. The pilot survey yielded some additional changes that were small enough to allow us to include the pilot respondents in the full dataset. One important change made after the pilot survey was to reduce the number of open-ended questions in order to shorten the survey. The time
spent on the open-ended questions would be at the discretion of the respondent.

**Major Sections**
The questionnaire is divided into six principal parts. Part I asks about the respondents’ work environment. Part II asks about opportunities for training, development and promotion. Part III asks about opportunities for training, and promotion. Part III also provides an opportunity for employees to think about their working relationships within the University. Part IV explores diversity, employee relations and equal employment opportunities. Part V explores overall satisfaction of respondents with the University as a place to work and gives respondents an opportunity to discuss the best things about working at the University of Virginia and the things they would like to see changed. Finally, Part VI asks a series of demographic questions used when conducting sub-group analysis.

**Key-topic Areas**
The core of the questionnaire contains fifteen key-topic sections that are listed in Table II-2.

**Table II-2: Key-Topics and Number of questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key-topic Section</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working facilities and technology</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How you feel when performing your work</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluation</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment within the University</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate supervisor</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University leadership</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and equal employment</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee relations</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and benefits</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic Overview**
The survey questionnaire included demographic questions about respondents to allow for analysis of the data by personal and social characteristics. Nearly two-thirds (64.4%) of respondents are female and 35.6 percent of the respondents are male. Most of the respondents are full-time Academic Division staff with 2.5 percent part-time staff. Three-quarters (72.8%) of the respondents are non-supervisors. More than sixty percent (61%) are classified staff and 35.1% are University staff.

Over forty percent (43.9%) of the respondents indicate that their supervisor is faculty, one-third (36.8%) have Classified staff as a supervisor, nearly twenty percent (18.5%) have University staff as their supervisor, and less than one percent are supervised by Research staff.

Staff were also asked how long they had worked for the University of Virginia: 15.8% said more than 25 years, 8.7% said 21-25 years, 8.7% said 16-20 years, 15.1% said 11-15 years, 19.8% said 6-10 years, 21.1% said 3-5 years, 5.8% said 1-2 years, and 5% said less than one year.

With regard to education, more than half of the respondents (56.3%) have some college education or a four-year college degree. More than one-fourth (27.8%) have completed some graduate work or have obtained an advanced degree. Only 15.9 percent of the respondents have a high school education or less.

The largest percentage of employees are ages 45-54 with nearly one-third (34.5%) of the respondents in this category. One-fourth (24.9%) of the respondents are 55-64, one-fifth (19.7%) are 35-44, and 15.3% are 25-34. Less than 6% of the respondents are 18-24 or over 65.

To report race, respondents were asked about which one classification used by University Human Resources applied to them: (American Indian or Alaska Native, Asian, Black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, White, or Two or more races). Nearly eighty-five percent (84.9%) of the respondents identified themselves as White, 9.6% were African-American, 2.8% Asian, 1.3% said two or more races, and 1.4% were other categories.
The demographics of the survey respondents are fairly close to those for the full population of Academic Division staff.

Sampling Error

Based on an estimated eligible population of 4,866 employees and a response of 3,067 completed questionnaires, the sampling error for this survey is evaluated at ±1.1 percentage points. This means that in 95 out of 100 samples of the same size drawn from U.Va. Academic Division staff, the results obtained in the sample would fall in a range of ±1.1 percentage points of what would have been obtained had every employee been interviewed.

About the Report

Overview

The report begins with an analysis of the overall satisfaction questions, in particular, how satisfied staff are with the University as a place to work. In addition, how do staff rate the University as a place to work now compared to the way it was two years ago and how likely is it that respondents will be working for the University three years from now.

The next four sections of the report will examine the fifteen key-topic areas. This will include an analysis of the overall ratings for each key-topic area, a review of the ratings of each item within the key-topic area, and a demographic analysis of each key-topic area.

The final section presents the priority matrix analysis and a summary of the findings. The priority matrix combines the importance and performance measures in order to examine where each key-topic area falls on these two dimensions.

Questionnaire Scales

Two sets of scales were used throughout the questionnaire. For the items within each key-topic area, employees were asked to rate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the key-topic items using a four point scale where 4 means “Strongly Agree” and 1 means “Strongly Disagree.”

Different scales were used for the overall questions in each key-topic area and the final questions asking about overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work and a comparison between the University as it is now and the way it was two years ago. The overall questions in each key-topic area and the satisfaction question (P1) used a seven-point scale with anchors of “Extremely Satisfied” to “ Extremely Dissatisfied.” The comparison question (P2) used a five-point scale where 1 means “Much better” and 5 “Much worse.”

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis, a statistical method for analyzing the underlying structure of a large number of variables, analyzes the interrelationships or correlations among a set of variables and identifies common underlying dimensions. Factor analysis was used to examine each of the key-topic areas to determine whether the key-topic area should be divided into significant underlying issues and analyzed separately. For each key-topic area, the factor score, which is a composite index of all the key-topic items, is saved to be used later in the regression analysis.

Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis is a statistical method used to analyze relationships between a set of variables known as independent variables and a single variable known as the dependent variable. The objective is to use the independent variables to predict variation in the dependent variable. More specifically, a regression routine weights the independent variables through regression analysis to insure maximal prediction of the dependent variable from the set of independent variables. The overall key-topic rating questions are used to predict the overall satisfaction questions. The regression analysis produced standardized regression coefficients or weights known as betas (β) that can have a value of -1 to +1. The standardized betas can be interpreted as the relative importance of the independent variables in predicting the dependent variable. The significance level of the beta coefficient is tested and reported along with the beta coefficients. The significance level can take on values from .000 to 1. For this report, any value that is .05 or less is considered statistically significant. That is, there is a 95% chance that the beta is not zero.

Each key-topic area was analyzed using multiple regression analysis to establish its influence on overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work. In this case, the dependent variable was “Overall satisfaction” (P1) and the items in each key-topic area constituted the independent
variables. Using the analysis, survey items were ranked in order of importance for each key-topic area. The importance weights are shown in the beta column and the level of significance is in the significance column. For statistical significance, the level of significance must be .05 or less. Results for these regressions are shown in Appendix D.

**Cross-tabulation Analysis**

In this study, a cross-tabulation analysis relates demographic variables to ratings of the items in the key-topic areas and to the overall satisfaction rating as well. Independent T-tests were used to assess statistical significance between the ratings and the demographic variables. Demographic questions were included at the end of the questionnaire to obtain information about the respondents who completed the survey. The demographic information was used to evaluate differences in ratings given by sub-groups, such as males versus females, or those with different numbers of years worked at the University, or full-time versus part-time. The results of the demographic cross-tabulation analysis are presented in Appendix E.

The analysis includes SPSS Complex Samples, an add-on module for SPSS for Windows®. This module provides more statistical precision with respect to inferences for a population by incorporating the sample design into survey analysis. It also allows the possibility to take into account the finite population correction factor, a characteristic of surveys taken with a limited study population, when conducting the statistical tests. Consequently, small differences in means ratings could be found statistically significant that would not be so identified without the module.
III Overall Satisfaction

Rating the University as a Place to Work

Overall, employees are very satisfied with the University as a place to work. On a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 means “very dissatisfied” and 7 “very satisfied,” respondents were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with U.Va. as a place to work.

Overall, how satisfied are you with the University as a place to work?

Performance Analysis

Figure III-1 illustrates how participants rated their overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work. Eight out of ten said they are “extremely satisfied,” “very satisfied,” or “somewhat satisfied” with the University as a place to work. More than half (54.6%) are “extremely satisfied” or “very satisfied.” On a scale from 1 to 7, the mean rating for “Overall Satisfaction” is a favorable 5.41.

Figure III-1: Overall Satisfaction with UVa as a place to Work

Demographic Analysis

Length of employment is a significant factor when measuring overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work. Employees who have worked for the University less than one year or have worked for the University for 26 or more years gave statistically higher ratings for overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work.

Education, age, and gender show statistically significant differences. Employees with a high school or less education, the youngest and oldest age categories, and females gave the highest ratings of the University as a place to work. Supervisors also gave higher ratings than employees who are not supervisors.

Comparative Satisfaction Rating

In addition to the overall satisfaction rating, employees were asked to rate the University as a place to work now compared to the way it was two years ago. Using a five-point scale where 5 means “Much better” and 1 means “Much worse,” nearly half of the respondents indicated that, compared to two years ago, the University is about the same.

Almost one-quarter (22.2%) said the University is “somewhat better” or “much better” than it was two years ago. Less than one-third (28.3%) said the University is “somewhat worse” or “much worse” than it was two years ago. The mean rating for the University compared to two years ago is 2.92. Figure III-2 shows illustrates how participated rated this item.

Figure III-2: Satisfaction with UVa Compared to Two Years Ago
Demographic Analysis

Employees in the 18-24 age category were more likely to rate the University higher as a place to work compared to two years ago. Those with a high school or less education also gave higher ratings than those with higher levels of education. Females gave statistically higher ratings of the University compared to two years ago than males. Blacks gave significantly higher ratings than whites.

Working for the University Three Years from Now

Staff were also asked how likely it is that they will be working for the University three years from now. On a scale of 1 to 7 with “1” being “Extremely likely or definitely intend to say” and “7” being “Extremely unlikely or definitely intend to leave,” eight out of ten indicated they are likely to be working for the University three years from now.

Nearly two-thirds (65%) said they are “extremely likely” or “very likely” to be working for the University three years from now. Of the 12.8% who said they were unlikely to be working for the University three years from now, one-fifth (20.3%) will retire, one-fifth (22.7%) indicated they might be looking somewhere else, and one-quarter (25.7%) said they were not likely to be working for the University three years from now because they are dissatisfied with the University.

Demographic Analysis

Employees who have worked for the University for 21-25 years were more likely to say they would be working for the University three years from now. Employees with 11-15 and 16-20 years were also more likely to say they would be working for the University three years from now.

Respondents who are 45-54 years old were the most likely to say they would be working for the University three years from now. Supervisors and Classified Staff were also more likely to be working for the University three years from now.
IV Work Environment

The first section of the UVa Academic Division Staff survey addresses key-topic areas that examine how staff rate their current work environment at the University of Virginia. For each key-topic, respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the items presented using a four-point scale where 4 means “Strongly Agree” and 1 means “Strongly Disagree.”

Work facilities and technology

The first key-topic area assessed is “Work facilities and technology.” In order to evaluate this key-topic, seven questions were asked of employees including two questions that address overall satisfaction with the function and safety of work facilities and the technology employees use in their position. Overall, 89 percent of employees are satisfied with the function and safety of work facilities (see Figure IV-1).

Figure IV-1: Overall Satisfaction with the Function and Safety of Work Facilities

The mean rating for this item is 5.67 on a seven-point scale, which indicates a very favorable evaluation of the function and safety of work facilities.

The second overall question asks, “Overall, how satisfied are you with the technology you use in your position?” As with the function and safety of work facilities, employees gave high ratings on their satisfaction with the technology they use in their position with nearly ninety (88.9%) percent being satisfied and nearly two-thirds (64.6%) being “extremely satisfied” or “very satisfied” (see Figure IV-2). The mean rating for satisfaction with technology is 5.66.

Figure IV-2: Overall Satisfaction with Technology

The statement with the highest mean rating of 3.57 was “My usual work environment is safe (A5).” The second highest with a 3.50 mean rating was, “I feel safe from possible violence in my workplace (A6).” Nearly two-thirds, (64% and 60.4% respectively), of staff “strongly agreed” with both of these statements.

The lowest rated item in this key-topic area was (A7), “I feel safe in the parking areas I use for work” with a mean rating of 3.22 followed by (A2), “My work space is maintained well” with a mean rating of 3.27.
Importance Analysis

All the items in this key-topic area have a positive and significant effect on overall satisfaction with work facilities and technology. The item, “My work space is adequate to do my job” (A1) has the greatest impact on overall satisfaction with the function and safety of work facilities. (see Table C-1 of Appendix C). This item also has a positive and significant impact on overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work.

Having access to technology and having access to technology support were both positive and significant factors in determining overall satisfaction with technology. These were also significant factors in overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work.

Demographic Analysis

Classified staff gave higher ratings than University staff of work facilities and technology. A well-maintained work space, access to the technology necessary to do their job, and access to technology support were items with statistically higher ratings.

Overall, newer staff gave higher ratings of work facilities and technology. Employees with 26 or more years of employment also gave higher ratings. Younger employees rated access to technology and safety in the workplace higher than other staff. Males were more likely to rate safety higher. Blacks gave significantly higher ratings for all items in this key-topic area than whites.

Empowerment

The next key-topic area is “empowerment in the workplace.” Six items were used to measure employees’ satisfaction with the empowerment they feel in the workplace. Nearly three-quarters (74.6%) are satisfied with empowerment in the workplace (see Figure IV-3). The mean rating for this key-topic area is 5.11.

Performance Analysis

Nearly one-half (42.7% and 42.1% respectively) said they “strongly agree” that they are encouraged to take initiative and have the authority to do the things that they are responsible to do. These two items received the highest mean rating of 3.19. Staff were not as favorable in rating the statement, “I am involved in decision making that affects my job.” Only 28 percent said they “strongly agree” with this statement, and the mean rating was 2.82, the lowest rated item in this key-topic area.

Important Analysis

All six of the items in this key-topic area have a positive and significant impact on overall satisfaction with the empowerment staff have in the workplace. As with performance, “I am involved in decision making that affects my job” (B5) has the greatest impact. Except for the item, “I can make the decisions I need to make to do my job well” (B3), all the items in this key-topic area have a positive and significant effect on overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work (see Table D-3 of Appendix D).
Demographic Analysis

Empowerment is felt more by employees who have been working for the University less than a year or more than 25 years. Overall satisfaction was rated with a mean of 5.81 and 5.43 respectively for these years of employment. Staff 18-24 years old feel more empowered than older staff. Females and supervisors also feel more empowered. Blacks were more likely than whites to say they have plenty of opportunities to learn new skills and have an opportunity to do what they do best every day.

How You Feel When Performing Your Work

How you feel when performing your work was measured with seven items that ask employees to rate their feelings of dignity and worth when performing work as employees at the University. More than three-quarters of staff are satisfied with the dignity and worth they feel when performing their work at the University (see Figure IV-4). The mean rating for this key-topic area is 5.30 on a seven-point scale.

Figure IV-4: Overall Satisfaction with the Dignity and Worth Felt When Performing Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely dissatisfied</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance evaluation

The highest-rated item in this key-topic area was, “I am proud to tell people that I work for the University of Virginia” (C1) with a mean rating of 3.47. Nine out of ten (92.4%) said they agree with this statement. The second highest-rated item was, “My work really matters” (C3) with a mean rating of 3.36 and 88.6 percent saying they agree with this statement.

The lowest-rated item in this key-topic area was, “I feel appreciated and valued at work” (C2) with a mean rating of 2.92.

Importance analysis

All seven items in this key-topic area are statistically significant with C2, “I feel appreciated and valued at work” having the greatest impact on the level of dignity and work staff feel when performing their work at the University (see Table C-4 in Appendix C).

For overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work, the strongest statistically significant factor in this key-topic area was “I am proud to tell people that I work for the University of Virginia” (C1). The second most significant factor was, “I feel appreciated and valued at work” (C2).

Three items in this area were not statistically significant in determining overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work: “My work really matters” (C3), “My job gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment” (C5), and “I see the connection between the work that I do and the success of the University” (C7).

Demographic Analysis

University staff are proud to tell people they work for the University and feel more appreciated and valued at work than Classified staff. On all items in this key-topic area, supervisors gave better ratings. Females are more likely to say they are proud to work for the University, feel appreciated and valued at work, and agree that work really matters.

Younger employees gave higher ratings for this key-topic area except for “My work really matters” (C3) and “I see the connection between the work that I do and the success of the University” (C7). Employees who have worked for the University for less than one year gave significantly higher ratings of overall satisfaction with the level of dignity and worth they feel when perform their work. Blacks were more likely than whites to say “My work really matters.”
Process for Your Performance Evaluation

Less than half (46.5%) of staff are satisfied with the process for their performance evaluation. More than one-third (37.2%) are dissatisfied with the process for performance evaluations. Results for this topic’s overall evaluation are presented in Figure IV-5. The mean rating is 4.08 on a scale of “1” to “7.”

Figure IV-5: Overall Satisfaction with the Process for Performance Evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely dissatisfied</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance Analysis

Of the nine items used to measure this key-topic area, only one item, “I have the opportunity to provide input into my goals and evaluation” (D7) had a mean rating higher than a mean of 3 (3.15). More than eight out of ten (84.6%) said they agree with this statement.

The statement, “Time spent on performance evaluation is time well spent” (D9) was the lowest-rated statement in this key-topic area with a mean of 2.15 and only one-third (37.7%) of employees agreeing with this statement. The second lowest-rated item was, “The career development section of the performance evaluation helps me plan and develop my career” (D5) with a mean rating of 2.32 and less than half of employees agreed with this statement.

Importance Analysis

Except for the item, “I have the opportunity to provide input into my goals and evaluation” (D7), all the items were statistically significant in determining overall satisfaction with the process for performance evaluations. The item with the strongest impact was, “Time spent on performance evaluation is time well spent” (D9).

Six of the nine items are statistically significant in determining overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work. The three statements that were not statistically significant were D2, D4 and D8 (see Table D-5 in Appendix D for complete results). The item in this key-topic area with the greatest impact on overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work was “The career development section of the performance evaluation helps me plan and develop my career” (D5).

Demographic Analysis

Supervisors are more satisfied with the process of performance evaluations. Compared to Classified Staff, University Staff gave higher ratings for being able to provide input into their goals, finding the performance evaluation system to be user-friendly, and feeling the time spent on performance evaluation is time well spent.

Females are more satisfied with the process of performance evaluations than males. Blacks were significantly more satisfied than whites with the process for performance evaluations. Overall satisfaction with the process for performance evaluations was significantly higher for employees with a high school education or less. As with many of the key-topic areas, newer employees and employees who have been with the University for many years are more satisfied with the process of performance evaluations.

Mutual Commitment Between You and the University

Seven items were included in this key-topic area to measure the commitment that staff feel toward the University and the level of commitment that staff feel the University has for them as their employer. Two separate overall items were used to evaluate these two distinct levels of commitment between staff and the University.
More than 8 out of 10 (82.4%) said they were committed to the University with a mean rating of 5.50 on a seven-point scale (see Figure IV-6).

Figure IV-6: Overall Commitment to the University

![Figure IV-6: Overall Commitment to the University]

When rating overall commitment of the University as an employer to the respondents, more than two-thirds (66.5%) said they felt the University was committed to them as an employer. The mean rating for commitment from University to employees was 4.76 (see Figure IV-7).

Performance Analysis

Of the seven items in this key-topic area, the statement, “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career at the University” (E1) received the highest rating with a mean of 3.21 and more than 8 out of 10 (82.4%) saying they agree with this statement.

The lowest-rated item was E6, “The University shows its commitment to me by offering small rewards and other job perks” with a mean rating of 2.24 and less than half (42.6%) saying they agree with this statement.

Importance Analysis

Four of the seven items were statistically significant factors in determining overall commitment to the University. The item with the greatest impact was, “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career at the University” (E1). The second factor was, “The University has a great deal of personal meaning for me” (E3).

All but one of the items in this key-topic area was statistically significant in the overall commitment that staff feel the University has to them as their employer. “The University has a great deal of personal meaning for me” (E3) was not statistically significant. This item was also not statistically significant when measuring overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work. The item with the greatest impact in measuring the...
overall commitment staff feel the University has to them as their employer was, “My contributions to the University are recognized appropriately” (E7). Overall satisfaction with the University is impacted the most by staff who would be happy to spend the rest of their career at the University.

**Demographic Analysis**

Classified Staff are more committed to the University than University Staff. Supervisors gave stronger ratings for overall commitment to the University and also feel a stronger commitment from the University as an employer.

The youngest staff felt the strongest commitment from the University as an employer and the oldest staff expressed the strongest commitment to the University. Gender was not a significant factor in this key-topic area. Race was a significant factor in overall commitment of the University to the respondents.
V Opportunities for Training, Development, and Promotions

This section of the UVa Academic Division Staff survey addresses key-topic areas that relate to the University’s training and development efforts and opportunities for promotion. For each key-topic, respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agree or disagree with the items presented using a four-point scale where 4 means “Strongly Agree” and 1 means “Strongly Disagree.”

University’s training and development efforts

A total of nine statements were used to give employees an opportunity to rate the University’s training and development efforts. Overall 70.8 percent of employees are satisfied with the training they receive (see Figure III-1).

Figure V-1: Overall Satisfaction with the Training you receive

Performance Analysis

The two items with the highest mean rating were, “I receive the training I need to do my job safely” (F4) with a mean rating of 3.34 and “I have used skills that I learned in training” (F6) with a mean rating of 3.33. More than 9 out of 10 (91.4% and 90.5% respectively) said they agree with these two statements.

The lowest-rated items in this key-topic area were “I have the time I need to take advantage of training opportunities” (F9) and “I feel I have adequate opportunities to develop my career” (F8) with mean ratings of 2.66 and 2.77 respectively.

Importance Analysis

Eight of the nine items were statistically significant in overall satisfaction with training. The item with the greatest impact was, “I feel I have adequate opportunities to develop my career” (F8). In addition to this statement, “The amount of training that I receive allows me to do my job well” (F1) and “I have the time I need to take advantage of training opportunities” (F9) were also significant items in determining overall satisfaction with training.

Only four of the nine items were statistically significant in determining overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work. The statement with the greatest impact was “I feel I have adequate opportunities to develop my career” (F8).

Demographic Analysis

Area, gender, age, and length of employment are significant factors in overall satisfaction with training. University Staff said that opportunities to receive training are distributed fairly in their department. Supervisors gave significantly higher ratings for overall satisfaction with the training they receive.

Employees with a high school education or less are overall more satisfied with training. Supervisors were more satisfied, except they were not as likely to feel they have the time they need to take advantage of training opportunities or find the quality of training to be useful for their jobs. In most categories in this key-topic area, blacks gave significantly higher ratings than whites.
Opportunities for promotion

The second key-topic area in this section examines how staff rated their opportunities for promotion. Overall, this key-topic area was rated lower than other areas. Only 37.3 percent were satisfied with opportunities for promotion at the University with a mean rating of 3.86 on a scale of “1” to “7.” More than 4 out of 10 were dissatisfied with opportunities for promotion (see Figure V-2).

Figure V-2: Overall Satisfaction with Promotions

Performance Analysis

All six of the statements used to measure employee ratings of promotion opportunities received a mean rating of less than 3.00. The highest-rated item, “I see myself in a long-term career path at the University” (G6) received a mean rating of 2.85. The second highest-rated item, “I have professional networking opportunities inside or outside of my department” (G4) received a 2.68 mean rating.

The lowest-rated item was “The best chance I see for a promotion is inside my department” (G5) with a mean rating of 1.85. Only one-quarter (26.1%) of the respondents said they agree with this statement. “In my department, opportunities for promotion are equally available” (G1) was rated with a mean of 2.04 with only one-third (33.7%) of the staff agreeing with this statement.

Importance Analysis

Every statement in this key-topic area was significant in measuring employee satisfaction with promotion opportunities. The strongest factor was “In my department, opportunities for promotion are equally available” (G1). The second most significant factor was “I see myself in a long-term career path at the University” (G6).

“I see myself in a long-term career path at the University” was also the most significant item to affect employee satisfaction with the University as a place to work. The regression analysis indicates that this one item has a strong impact much more than any other factor when measuring satisfaction with the University as a place to work.

“Opportunities for promotion are equally available” (G1) and “In my department, promotions happen mostly because of work achievements” (G2) were not statistically significant factors in the analysis of satisfaction with the University as a place to work.

Demographic Analysis

Males feel that opportunities for promotion are equally available and promotions happen mostly because of work achievements. They also agreed that the best chance for a promotion is inside their department.

Staff with higher levels of education were more likely to agree that promotions are equally available and that promotions happen mostly because of work achievements. Younger employees were more likely to say that professional networking opportunities are available inside and outside their department. Classified Staff were more likely to say they see themselves in a long-term career path at the University. Race was a significant factor only in the overall satisfaction item with blacks giving a higher rating than whites.
VI Working Relationships

The third major area of the UVa Academic Division Staff survey addresses key-topic areas that related to the working relationships that staff maintain in their positions within the University. Employees were asked to rate teamwork with the people they work with most, their immediate supervisor, University leadership, communication of official work-related information within the University, and the integrity of University employees in performing their work.

Teamwork

To measure teamwork, staff were given eight statements for rating their work relationships with the people they work with most. Overall, three-fourths (77.5%) of the respondents said they were satisfied with the teamwork they experience at the University. Only 13.7 percent said they were dissatisfied with the teamwork they experience (see Figure VI-1).

Figure VI-1: Overall Satisfaction with Teamwork
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Performance Analysis

“I receive the support I need from the people I work with most” (H2) was rated the highest item in this key-topic area with a mean rating of 3.26. The second highest-rated item was, “The people I work with most are good at solving problems together” (H3) with a mean rating of 3.22. H1 and H4 were rated nearly as high with mean ratings of 3.19.

The lowest-rated items were “In my opinion, the people I work with most are reaching their full potential” (H8) with a mean of 2.68 and “There are enough employees in my department to meet our responsibilities well” (H7) with a mean of 2.69.

Important Analysis

All eight items in this key-topic area were significant factors in measuring overall satisfaction with the teamwork that staff experience with the people they work with most. The two most significant statements were, “People I work with most work well as a team” (H1) and “In my opinion, the people I work with most are reaching their full potential” (H8).

When measuring overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work, the statement that was the most significant was, “In my opinion, the people I work with most are reaching their full potential” (H8).

Demographic Analysis

Males show stronger agreement with trust in the people they work with most and rating these people as being made to handle conflict more appropriately. Overall satisfaction with teamwork is strongest among newer employees and younger employees.

Supervisors feel that the people they work with most work well as a team. They feel a part of the team and agree that the people they work with handle conflict appropriately. However, staff who are supervisors were less likely to say there are enough employees to meet their responsibilities. Blacks were more likely than whites to say “There are enough employees in my department to meet our responsibilities well” and “The people I work with most are reaching their full potential.”
Immediate supervisor

Immediate supervisors were rated highly by Academic Division staff. Overall, nearly 8 out of 10 (78%) said they were satisfied with their immediate supervisor with 6 out of 10 (59.4%) saying they were “extremely satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their immediate supervisor.

Figure VI-2: Overall Satisfaction with your Immediate Supervisor

Performance Analysis

More than three-fourths (83.2%) of the Academic Division staff who rated their immediate supervisor said their supervisor is generally available when they need assistance (I6) with a mean of 3.24 and their supervisor recognizes them for doing a good job (I8) with a mean of 3.19. Further staff said their supervisor communicates information about matters that affect employees (I1) with a mean of 3.07 and ask them for ideas and suggestions for improvements (I2) with a mean of 3.05.

The lowest-rated statement was, “I can provide feedback into the performance evaluation of my supervisor” (I7) with a mean of 2.78. Staff also said, “My supervisor promotes or shows an active interest in my career development” (I4) with a mean of 2.84.

Importance Analysis

All eight of the statements in this key-topic area are statistically significant items as measures of overall satisfaction with immediate supervisors and the one with the greatest impact was, “My supervisor recognizes me for doing a good job” (I8). This statement was also the most significant item from this key-topic area in measuring overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work.

Demographic Analysis

Higher education is a significant factor in overall satisfaction with immediate supervisors. Employees with more than 25 years of employment said they can provide feedback into the performance evaluation of their supervisors. Younger employees also felt that they are able to provide feedback into their immediate supervisors’ performance evaluation.

University Staff gave higher ratings of their immediate supervisors than Classified Staff. Overall satisfaction was rated with a mean of 5.57 compared to 5.38. Blacks were more likely than whites to say they can provide feedback into the performance evaluation of their supervisor.
University leadership

Overall, staff also gave favorable ratings of University leadership. Nearly two-thirds (64.7%) were “extremely satisfied,” “very satisfied,” or “somewhat satisfied.” Only 16.2 percent said they were dissatisfied with University leadership (see Figure VI-3).

Figure VI-3: Overall Satisfaction with University leadership

Performance Analysis

Five statements were rated to measure satisfaction with University leadership. All five were rated with a mean of less than 3.00. The statement with the highest mean rating was, “In my opinion, University leadership is effectively ensuring a successful future for the University” (J5) with a mean of 2.93 and more than three-quarters (76.8%) of respondents agreeing with the statement.

The lowest-rated item was, “University leadership makes it easier for me to get my job done” (J3) with a mean rating of 2.64, which is fair but leaves room for some improvement.

Importance Analysis

All five items were statistically significant and the regression analysis indicates that ratings in this key-topic area have a negative impact on overall satisfaction with University leadership. The statement with the greatest impact is, “In my opinion, University leadership is effectively ensuring a successful future for the University” (J5) and trusting the decisions made by University leadership had the second highest impact (J1).

Four of the five items in this key-topic area have a statistically significant relationship with overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work. “University leadership makes it easier for me to get my job done” (J3) and “In my opinion, University leadership is effectively ensuring a successful future for the University” (J5) had the greatest impact.

Demographic Analysis

Females are significantly more satisfied with University leadership than males. As with other key-topic areas, staff in the 18-24 year old category are more satisfied with all items in this key-topic area with a mean rating of 5.34 for overall satisfaction with University leadership.

Supervisors were more likely to say that the actions of University leadership are always ethical. They also gave the highest rating for overall satisfaction with University leadership. University Staff gave higher ratings of University leadership than Classified Staff. There was no significant difference by race in overall satisfaction with University leadership.
Communication

Ratings of communication were good with a mean rating of 4.77. More than two-thirds (64.7%) of Academic Division staff said they were satisfied with communication within the University. Only 9.4 percent said they were “extremely satisfied” but 24.1 percent said they were “very satisfied” and 31.2 percent said they were “somewhat satisfied” (see Figure VI-4).

Figure VI-4: Overall Satisfaction with Communication
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Performance Analysis

“Job expectations are communicated to me clearly” (K1) was rated the highest with a mean of 3.15 and more 8 out of 10 (82.2%) of staff said they agree with this statement. Staff also said, “My supervisor or management discusses changes that affect my job with me before they are put into effect” (K2) with a mean of 2.81.

“The existing communication with the University helps me do my job better” (K4) was the lowest-rated statement with a mean of 2.74 and only 18.7 percent who said they “strongly agree” with the statement.

Importance Analysis

All four statements in this key-topic area are statistically significant in measuring overall satisfaction with communication within the University. The strongest factor was, “The existing communication within the University helps me do my job better” (K4) with a very strong correlation to overall satisfaction with communication.

Only two of the statements were found to be statistically significant in measuring overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work. The statement with the strongest impact was also (K4), “The existing communication within the University helps me do my job better.”

Demographic Analysis

Age, gender, length of employment, and education are significant factors in the ratings of communication within the University. The youngest staff, females, new employees, and staff with less education gave the highest ratings for communication. Staff who have been employed at the University for less than five years agree that communication within the University helps them do their job better.

Supervisors were more satisfied than non-supervisors with when rating overall satisfaction with communication within the University. University Staff gave higher ratings than Classified Staff when rating overall satisfaction with communication within the University. Blacks gave significantly higher ratings than whites for overall satisfaction with communication.

Integrity of University employees

The final key-topic area in the section on working relationships is “Integrity.” Five items were used to measure and define integrity in terms of ethical and unethical behavior among employees. Overall satisfaction with the integrity of employees while performing their work was very favorable with a mean rating of 5.50 and more than half (58.2%) said they “extremely satisfied” or “very satisfied” with employee integrity (see Figure VI-5).
Performance Analysis

All five statements in this key-topic area were rated nearly 3.00 or better. The highest-rated statement was, “I am familiar with the University of Virginia’s Ethics Code and Standards of Conduct” (L5) with a mean of 3.40 and more than fifty percent (51.7%) said they “strongly agree” with this statement. The second highest statement with a mean of 3.31 was, “The people I work with most behave ethically in the workplace” (L2).

The lowest-rated statements were related to reporting unethical behavior (L4) and the type of action that the University takes when wrongdoing is discovered (L2). Both of these with a 2.99 mean rating.

Importance Analysis

All but one statement in this key-topic area are statistically significant in driving overall satisfaction with employee integrity. The one with the greatest impact was, “The people I work with most behave ethically in the workplace” (L1). Being familiar with the Code and Standards of Conduct (L5) was not statistically significant in driving overall satisfaction with employee integrity.

This pattern was exactly the same in determining how this key-topic area drives overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work. Four out of five of the statements were statistically significant, and L4, “The people I work with most can report any unethical behavior they see without fear of reprisal” was the statement with the greatest impact.

Demographic Analysis

While female staff are more familiar with the University of Virginia’s Ethics Code and Standards of Conduct, males were more likely to agree that the people they work with most can report unethical behavior they see without fear of reprisal. Staff with higher levels of education agreed that the people they work with most behave ethically and are confident that decisive action will be taken when wrongdoing is discovered.

University Staff gave higher ratings than Classified Staff in rating overall satisfaction with the integrity of the employees they work with most and were more likely to agree that the people they work with most can report any unethical behavior they see without fear of reprisal. Newer employees who have been with the University for less than a year gave a significantly higher rating of overall satisfaction with a mean of 6.14. Race was a significant factor in overall satisfaction with the integrity of the employees with whites giving significantly higher ratings.
VII  Diversity, Employee Relations and Equal Employment Opportunity

Academic Division staff were asked to rate diversity, employee relations, and equal employment opportunity within the University community. These three key-topic areas comprise the final major section of rated areas.

Diversity and equal employment opportunities

Overall, employees gave favorable ratings for satisfaction with diversity and equal employment opportunities by the University and their department with an overall mean rating of 5.47 on a seven-point scale with “1” being “extremely dissatisfied” and “7” being “extremely satisfied” (see Figure VII-1).

Performance Analysis

Five items were used to measure satisfaction with diversity and equal employment opportunities. All five items were above or nearly a 3.00 mean rating. The highest-rated item was agreement with the University’s official statement, “The University treats all employees with fairness and respect regardless of their race, color, religion, gender, age, national origin, disability, veteran status, sexual orientation, transgender, or gender identity” (M1). Nearly two-thirds of the staff said they “strongly agree” with this statement, and almost one-third said they “agree” leaving less than 10 percent who disagreed.

The lowest-rated item was M2, “The University seeks out multiple voices and perspectives when decisions are made about how we work” with a mean of 2.99. This rating is, however, still favorable.

Importance Analysis

When measuring how these items affect overall satisfaction with diversity and equal employment opportunity, the item with the greatest impact was, “If I were to experience harassment or discrimination, I would feel comfortable asking for help” (M5) and the second was the University’s statement regarding diversity and equal employment opportunity (M1). All five statements were statistically significant in this analysis.

With regard to overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work, the analysis indicates that M2, “The University seeks out multiple voices and perspectives when decisions are made about how we work” has the most impact on overall satisfaction. The item that mentions inappropriate jokes or comments was not found to be statistically significant (M3).

Demographic Analysis

Higher education equates to less tolerance of inappropriate behavior within the University and also higher ratings of respect for differences within the University. Females are more likely to agree that the University seeks out multiple voices and perspectives when decisions are made about how they work and gave higher ratings than males for overall satisfaction with diversity and equal employment opportunities.

Staff who have been employed by the University 16-20 years were the least satisfied with diversity and equal employment opportunities. Classified Staff were less satisfied than University Staff, and blacks gave significantly lower ratings than whites for overall satisfaction with diversity and equal employment opportunities.
Employee relations in your Department

The second key-topic area in this section deals with how well departments are rated in their ability to handle complaints that involve hiring policies and procedures or other issues within the department. The mean rating for overall satisfaction with the way a department handles employee relations issues was 5.00 with more than two-thirds who are satisfied with the way their department handles employee relations issues.

Figure VII-2: Overall Satisfaction with Employee Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely satisfied</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely dissatisfied</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The lowest-rated statement was, “If I disagree with my supervisor, I can get a fair hearing from his or her supervisor” (N2) with a mean rating of 2.89, however one-third (33.6%) of the staff “strongly agree” and one-third (35.3%) “agree” with the statement.

Importance Analysis

All four items are statistically significant in measuring overall satisfaction within this key-topic. The statement with the greatest impact was, “If I have a complaint in my department, it will be handled fairly” (N1) and “My department follows its hiring policies and practices” (N3) was also strongly correlated.

In measuring how much impact these items have on overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work, the analysis shows that all the statements in this key-topic area are statistically significant factors in driving overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work. As with overall satisfaction for this key-topic area, N1, “If I have a complaint in my department, it will be handled fairly” had the strongest effect.

Demographic Analysis

Supervisors are more satisfied with employee relations and gave significantly higher ratings for overall satisfaction with the way departments handle employee relations issues. University Staff gave higher ratings than Classified Staff for overall satisfaction with the way departments handle employee relations issues.

Females were more likely to say that their department follows its hiring policies and practices. They were also more likely to say they know where to get the information they need if they have a complaint or a question about employee policies and procedures. Younger employees were more likely to say they can get a fair hearing from their supervisor when there is a disagreement. Long-term employees are more satisfied with the way their departments handle employee relations issues.
Compensation and benefits

Compensation and benefits were analyzed separately. The factor analysis indicates that these are two distinct categories. Four of the items deal directly with pay so the regression analysis measures overall satisfaction with pay (O6) by statements O1-O4.

Overall satisfaction with pay was next to the lowest-rated overall item in the survey with a mean rating of 3.87. Overall satisfaction with retirement benefits (O9) was the second lowest mean in this section with a 4.95 mean rating.

Overall satisfaction with all other benefits received mean ratings above a 5.00 which is favorable. The highest-rated benefit was satisfaction with leave benefits with a mean rating of 5.67. Education benefits and life insurance benefits were also rated high with mean ratings of 5.39 and 5.28 respectively.

Figure VII-3 illustrates the percent satisfied with pay and benefits.

Figure VII-3: Overall Satisfaction Pay and Benefits

Performance Analysis of Pay

Four of the five items in this key-topic area were directly related to pay. The fifth item asks about benefits. This key-topic area then consists of eight overall satisfaction items. Of the four statements regarding pay, the highest-rated item was, “If I have a question about pay, I can get an answer quickly, accurately, and easily” (O1) with a mean rating of 3.10. More than three-fourths (79.7%) of the respondents said they agree with this statement.

The remaining three items all received much lower ratings ranging between 2.08 and 2.24. The lowest-rated item was, “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” (O2) with a mean of 2.08. Feeling that they are paid fairly (O3) and that changes are made fairly (O4) were rated 2.10 and 2.24 respectively.

Importance Analysis of Pay

All four of the items in this key-topic area related to pay were statistically significant in driving overall satisfaction with pay. The item with the greatest impact was, “I feel that I am paid fairly compared to the market” (O3).

As drivers of overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work, the item that asks the staff to rate their pay compared to other organizations (O2) was not a significant factor. All three of the remaining items were significant factors, and the item with the strongest effect was, “When changes in pay occur, they are made fairly” (O4) followed by “If I have a question about pay, I can get an answer quickly, accurately, and easily” (O1).

Demographic Analysis of Pay

Supervisors are more satisfied with pay and more likely to feel that they are paid fairly compared to the market. Education was not a statistically significant factor in overall satisfaction with pay. Females gave significantly higher ratings for feeling that they are paid fairly compared to the market and their pay is about the same or better than they would receive at another organization.

Staff who have been employed at the University for less than one year were significantly more satisfied with pay than more long-term employees. Employees between the ages of 25 and 54 were the least satisfied with pay. Those who are 18-24 years old gave much higher ratings for overall satisfaction with pay. No significant difference in overall satisfaction with pay by race; however, blacks were more satisfied than whites with many of the benefits offered by U.Va.
VIII Overall Analysis of Key-Topic Areas

The purpose of this analysis is to use statistical techniques to determine which key-topic areas contribute the most to employees’ overall satisfaction with the University as a place to work. This analysis allows identification of items on the survey that are most strongly correlated with, or predictive of, an employee’s overall satisfaction. Combined with the performance scores (mean ratings) of the overall key-topic evaluations, the results may suggest areas that could be of higher priority for bringing about an increase in levels of overall employee satisfaction.

Key-Topics Performance Ratings

Table VIII-1 contains the performance measures for each of the key-topic areas. The measures are the overall key-topic mean ratings given by the employees. Ratings of all key-topic areas were based on a seven-point scale. The scale for most items was reversed so that higher numbers indicate more favorable responses. There were no negatively worded items on the survey.

The performance ratings are divided into three levels of High, Medium, and Low. The ranking results for these items are also shown in Table VIII-1. The performance analysis shows the Academic Division staff’s high performance ratings on “Leave benefits” (O10), “Work facilities” (A8), “Technology” (A9), “Integrity of the employees you work with most” (L), “Your commitment to the University” (E8), “Diversity and equal employment opportunities” (M), “Your immediate supervisor” (I) and “Education benefits” (O13).

The areas of medium performance include “Dignity and worth you feel when performing your work” (C), all other benefits (O), and “University leadership” (J).

The three areas of low performance are “The process for your performance evaluation” (D), “Pay” (O6), and “Opportunities for promotion” (G).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key-Topic Areas</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave benefits</td>
<td>O10</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work facilities</td>
<td>A8</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>A9</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The integrity of the employees you work with most in delivering services to the University</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your commitment to the University</td>
<td>E8</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and equal employment opportunities by the University and your department</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your immediate supervisor</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education benefits</td>
<td>O13</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The level of dignity and worth you feel when performing your work</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life insurance benefits</td>
<td>O12</td>
<td>5.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork you experience at the University</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability benefits</td>
<td>O11</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The empowerment you have in the workplace</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefits</td>
<td>O7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness benefits</td>
<td>O8</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way your department handles employee relations issues</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training you receive</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement benefits</td>
<td>O9</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University leadership</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication within the University of Virginia</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>4.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of the University to you as your employer</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process for your performance evaluation</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>O6</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion at the University</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Importance of Topics to Employees

Perceived Importance Analysis

In addition to the ratings of the individual items contained in the various key-topic modules, U.Va. Academic Division staff were asked to identify the issues they thought were most important for the University to address. A list of fourteen categories that closely paralleled the key-topic areas covered in the questionnaire was used for this purpose. The question was asked in a multiple mentions format and employees could choose up to four categories as most important to them.

Table VIII-2 presents employees’ responses on these items. The numbers in the “count” column under the heading “Responses” on the table indicates the number of times a particular category was chosen, which adds to 8,939 responses. The numbers under the “% of cases” column represent the percentages of respondents who selected each item of the list. On average, each employee selected 3.33 responses.

“Pay and Benefits” topped the list of issues that are most important to employees, mentioned by nearly three-quarters of respondents (73.4%). “Promotion opportunities” and “The performance evaluation process” were also near the top of the list. These two items were chosen by 51.6 percent and 37.1 percent, respectively. Next on the list of most important issues for U.Va. to address, according to employees, is a cluster of seven issues all named by about fifteen to twenty percent of employees. They are found in the Medium” category in Table VIII-2.

The five least important issues are found in the “Low” category in Table VIII-2. They comprise four intangible aspects of employment at U.Va., and “Diversity and equal employment opportunities.” It should be noted that diversity and equal employment issues, by their very nature, may not be perceived as a problem by a majority of any workforce.

Table VIII-2: Ranked List of Issues by Category, 2011
Priority Analysis

In interpreting these results, it can be useful to combine the analysis of perceived importance (as selected by employees) on the one hand, and the measures of performance on the other, to examine where each key-topic area falls on these two dimensions. Using a single “Priority Matrix,” Figure VIII-1 combines the High, Medium, and Low perceived importance levels with the High, Medium, and Low performance levels. Information in the matrix can be suggestive of areas of strength for U.Va., revealing high performing areas that are also high in importance. The matrix can also suggest areas that are the highest priority for change; areas which are high in importance, but low in performance. These high-priority cells are located in or near the lower, left corner of the matrix.

Figure VIII-1: Schematic of a Priority Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Importance (Perceived or Derived)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure VIII-2 presents the 2011 priority matrix for the perceived importance and performance ratings. “Pay and benefits” is shown in quotation marks because respondents were presented with only that option when asked to choose the four most important areas for U.Va. to work on. We know from the performance ratings and open-ended comments that this low performance rating is specific to pay. Benefits are rated more highly and are discussed by staff much more favorably than is pay.

It is valuable and important to first note the strengths identified in this analysis. Based on the perceived priority and performance ratings matrix, “Education benefits” and “Leave benefits” represent the areas of strength.

The key-topic areas of “Pay,” “Performance evaluations” and “Opportunities for promotion” are found in the high priority area of the matrix.

The area of second priority in the matrix contains all of the other specific employee benefits for which overall ratings were collected on the questionnaire. This is a judgment call (as noted earlier) and is open to discussion.

There are no key-topic areas in the area of third priority.

**Figure VIII-2: Priority Matrix: Perceived importance and Performance Ratings, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance (Mean Performance Scores)</th>
<th>Perceived Importance (Employee Choices)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work facilities</td>
<td>Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Immediate supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Dignity and worth you feel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment you have</td>
<td>Employee relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee relations</td>
<td>Training and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Communication within U.Va.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of U.Va. to you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>“Pay and benefits”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluations</td>
<td>Promotion opportunities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Derived Importance Analysis

The derived importance of the key-topic areas in determining overall Academic Division employee satisfaction with U.Va. as a place to work is determined through the use of standardized beta coefficients from a multiple regression analysis.

The standardized beta coefficient reveals the relative association of each independent variable with the employee overall satisfaction score, taking into account all other independent variables in the equation. Positive numbers indicate positive relationships (e.g. high ratings on overall satisfaction being associated with high key-topic ratings) and negative numbers represent negative relationships (low ratings on overall satisfaction being associated with high key-topic ratings). The strength of the relationship is given by the magnitude of the beta coefficient. Results of the regression analysis are presented in Table VIII-3.

Based on the derived importance analysis, “Your commitment to the University” is the most important issue in determining satisfaction of employees. The standardized beta coefficient for this key-topic area is .239. Next on the list of most important issues are “Pay” (coefficient=0.139) and “Dignity and worth you feel when performing your work” (coefficient=0.137). The remaining key-topic areas ranked in the “High” category are “University leadership” (coefficient=0.119) and “Commitment of the University to you as your employer” (coefficient=0.116).

The key-topic areas “Diversity and equal employment opportunities,” “Employee relations issues” and “Training you receive” are the least important key-topic areas to employees. It should be noted that these items, by their nature, may not be perceived or directly experienced by a majority of employees. The remainder of the items represents the areas of moderate importance (see Table VIII-3).

Table VIII-3: Overall Key-Topic Derived Importance, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key-Topic Areas</th>
<th>Standardized beta coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your commitment to the University</td>
<td>0.2387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>0.1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity and worth you feel when performing your work</td>
<td>0.1374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University leadership</td>
<td>0.1187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of the University to you as your employer</td>
<td>0.1155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The empowerment you have in the workplace</td>
<td>0.0796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefits</td>
<td>0.0659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability benefits</td>
<td>-0.0620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork you experience at the University</td>
<td>0.0601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The integrity of the employees you work with most</td>
<td>0.0555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The function and safety of work facilities</td>
<td>0.0465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave benefits</td>
<td>0.0388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication within the University of Virginia</td>
<td>0.0340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness benefits</td>
<td>-0.0305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life insurance benefits</td>
<td>0.0285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education benefits</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion at the University</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your immediate supervisor</td>
<td>0.0255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process for your performance evaluation</td>
<td>-0.0235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement benefits</td>
<td>0.0231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities and technology</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and equal employment opportunities</td>
<td>-0.0083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee relations issues</td>
<td>0.0074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training you receive</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority Analysis

Figure VIII-3 combines the High, Medium, and Low derived importance levels with the High, Medium, and Low performance rating levels. The major strength of the University for Academic Division staff is “Your commitment to the University.” Areas of moderate strength are the “Integrity of the employees you work with most,” “Work facilities,” “Leave benefits,” “Education benefits,” “Technology” and “Immediate supervisors.”

“Pay” is the single issue in the area of high priority (the lower-left cell of the matrix). The area of second priority for 2011 consists of “Dignity and you feel when performing your work,” “University leadership” and “Issues concerning managers.” These key-topic areas have high impact on overall ratings of U.Va. as a place to work, and moderate performance ratings.

In the area of third priority are two key-topic areas: “Opportunity for promotion” and “The process for performance evaluations.” These key-topic areas have moderate impact on overall ratings of U.Va. as a place to work, and low performance ratings.

Figure VIII-3: Priority Matrix: Derived Importance and Performance Ratings, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derived Importance (Regression Analysis)</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scores</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your commitment to U.Va.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity of employees you work with most</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and equal opportunity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dignity and worth you feel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment of U.Va. to you</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment you have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellness benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life insurance benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication within U.Va.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Overall, U.Va. Academic Division Staff report high levels of satisfaction with U.Va. as a place to work. Many of the respondents also used some of the open-ended responses to express their thanks for begin surveyed. As is often the case in employee surveys, several intangible aspects of the job such as commitment and the dignity felt while performing the job have a strong statistical (derived) impact on overall satisfaction, while employees report that extrinsic factors such as pay and performance evaluations are most important for the University to work on and are not performing well.

Notably in the 2011 Academic Division Staff Survey, however, “the three P’s” of Pay, Performance Evaluations and Promotion Opportunities show up as areas recommended for attention in both of the priority matrices. These key-topic areas are not only occupying their traditional place in the matrix based on perceived importance, they are also statistically related to overall ratings of U.Va. as a place to work. They threaten to overtake the strengths that employees perceive in the intangible aspects of the job.

The open-ended comments provide an opportunity to explore the intensity and variety of opinion about various issues, and to learn about issues that may be faced by a minority of employees but that can have significant impacts on organizational performance. It is well worth the time to review these responses. Some of the publicly available responses were edited by CSR and UVA HR for language, to avoid identification of individuals, and in a few cases to meet legal restrictions. The unedited responses were made available to President Sullivan to fulfill the promise made to employees that their input was wanted and that they should be honest and forthcoming.

The survey results should be viewed as a conversation-starter, not a conversation-ender. They describe much to celebrate in areas of strength and pride. They also indicate areas for improvement. It will be important to sustain a process for making fuller meaning from the data, within the contexts of various departments and work units of a large and diverse organization.