Campus Quality Survey™ Interpretive Guide and Results

North Central State College

April 2005

Performance Horizons CONSULTING GROUP⌘

Campus Quality Survey™ Interpretive Guide and Results

North Central State College

April 2005

Performance Horizons CONSULTING GROUP⌘
N3499 Sun Ray Avenue New London, WI 54961-8845
Phone: (920) 982-4200 or (800) 638-1202
Fax: (920) 982-1515
E-mail: hillman@athenet.net

Campus Quality Survey™ Interpretive Guide and Results

Table of Contents

Section 1: Introduction to the Campus Quality Survey™ and This Report

The Basis and Content of This Report

This report is based on data gathered through the Campus Quality Survey™ instrument completed by 118 North Central State College employees in April, 2005

The data is reported in a series of charts and tables that provide graphic representations of the data. A narrative analysis interprets the data. Finally, a series of observations and recommendations is provided to form the basis for follow-up action.

The table below summarizes the profile of survey participants.

Personnel Level	2005
Support/Classified	29
Faculty/Instructor	46
Department Chair	7
Administrative/Professional	35
Blank	1
Total	118

Origin of the Campus Quality Survey™

The Campus Quality Survey™ is a unique instrument that uses the basic structure, format, and criteria of the Presidential Award for Quality. There is also a strong link to elements of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award.

The instrument was developed by adapting categories used in the prestigious Baldrige Award and the Presidential Award for Quality to fit the educational environment. Faculty and staff in education were asked to review the instrument and provide feedback. An extensive list of survey items was generated and pilot tested. The number of items was then reduced to create a focused instrument. Customized versions of this instrument have been developed for use in credit unions, federal organizations, and business and industry.

Eight Main Survey Categories

There are eight major components of a quality management system identified in the Presidential Award for Quality. They are comparable to the Baldrige Award criteria. These eight major categories are used as the basis for organizing and analyzing the first 50 items on the Campus Quality Survey™ instrument.

- **Top Management Leadership and Support**—Examines how all levels of senior management create and sustain a clear and visible quality value system along with appropriate management systems to guide the activities of the organization.

- **Employee Training and Recognition**—Examines efforts to develop the full potential of staff members for quality improvement, and analyzes training efforts, rewards, and incentives in place to support and recognize individuals.

- **Employee Empowerment and Teamwork**—Determines the effectiveness and extent of work force involvement in continuous quality improvement and the approaches used to enhance employee empowerment.

- **Strategic Quality Planning**—Examines the organization's quality planning process, and reviews how key quality requirements are integrated into the process.

- **Quality and Productivity Improvement Results**—Reviews the measurable results of the organization's quality improvement efforts.

- **Measurement and Analysis**—Reviews the validity, scope, application, and management of information and data that underscore the organization's continuous quality improvement system.

- **Customer Focus**—Assesses customer service systems and the responsiveness and ability of the organization to meet customer requirements and expectations.

- **Quality Assurance—**Examines the approaches used by the organization to design, assess, control, and improve processes.

Responses to specific survey items within each of the eight categories are reported in Section 2 of this document titled *Section 2: Analysis of Campus Quality Survey™ Statistical Charts*.

Expansion of the Campus Quality Survey™

The Campus Quality Survey™ instrument was expanded in 1998 when 30 survey items (51-80) were added. These items refer to the various programs, services, and activities generally available on campus to both students and employees. Respondents are asked to rate the items based on how they feel the programs, services, and activities are currently meeting the needs of students and employees.

The statistical analysis was expanded in 1999 with the addition of standard deviation calculations. Standard deviation figures reflect the amount of variation in participant responses to an item. A high standard deviation indicates a wider range of employee responses. A small standard deviation (less than 1.5) indicates a high level of agreement among employee responses; that is, a high consistency of staff perceptions.

Interpreting Your Campus Quality Survey™ Format

A sample Campus Quality Survey™ (CQS) is included at the end of this section to illustrate related explanations.

The CQS format is unique. The staff rate each item based on current issues and practices in the organization. Since each item relates to one or more of the eight quality elements, the data provides insights about these key functional areas of your organization. This enables you to focus precisely on areas of need in your continuous quality improvement process.

In a continuous quality improvement system, each employee fulfills a role as an internal customer to other employees, as together they strive to provide valued services to the organization's external customers.

Individual members of your work team have definite expectations about what they want from their work experience. Their job satisfaction depends on expectations being met or exceeded. It is critical for organizations to be aware of staff expectations, and to focus on achieving levels of satisfaction that ensure commitment to continuous quality improvement.

The survey instrument offered 91 statements for participants to respond to. Staff were asked to rate the organization from two perspectives—*How It Is Now* and *How It Should Be* for the first 50 items On the left side of each statement was a set of rating selections ranging from 1 to 5.

Staff were asked to record their perception of *how it is now* in the organization. On the right side, staff were asked to record their opinion of *how it should be* in the organization. The available rating selections follow.

ℵ   Strongly disagree

ℑ   Disagree

ℜ   Uncertain

℘   Agree

⊗   Strongly agree

Reporting of Results

Individual surveys were scored, and a variety of calculations were completed. Survey items 1-50, three mean scores were reported: *how it is now, how it should be,* and the *performance gap.* The mean values for *how it is now* and *how it should be* result from summing each respondent's rating and dividing by the number of respondents. A *performance* gap has been calculated for each item by identifying respondents who rated both *how it is now* and *how it should be* for each item. The gap was calculated for each item by subtracting the *how it is now* score from the *how it should be* rating. The individual gaps were averaged to determine the mean value of all *performance gaps.*

NOTE ON ROUNDING: Please note that sometimes the total of all response categories may be less than or more than 100%. This occurs because the program rounds each score to the nearest percent. For example, one response category may have been 16.4%, and was rounded to 16%. The next two response categories may have been 73.2% and 10.2%, respectively. Both would be rounded down. With each of the three numbers rounded downward, the total of all response categories equals 99%. This rounding feature does not create a meaningful problem and should be disregarded.

For items 51-80, a level of satisfaction rating was calculated as the average of all responses.

The aggregate scores for the items in each of the eight main survey categories are reported on the color charts 1—1 and 1—2 based on *How It Should Be, How It Is Now,* and *Performance Gap*.

Section 2:
Analysis of
Campus Quality Survey™
Statistical Charts

Definitions

The following basic definitions will aid the reader in interpreting this report.

Presidential Award for Quality—A recognition program of the Federal Government that uses eight categories of performance to measure the level of service quality provided by public agencies to their constituent.

Employee Groups—The four sub-groups of employees by which survey respondents are organized. They are: support/classified staff, faculty/instructor, department chair, and administrative/professional staff.

Range—The difference between the highest rating and the lowest rating on individual survey items.

Performance Gap—The difference between *how it is now* and *how it should be* as perceived by the survey respondents. A small *gap* means that employees' expectations are close to being met.

Standard Deviation—The average amount of fluctuation in employees' responses on an individual survey item. A high standard deviation indicates a wide range of individual responses from the mean value of all responses.

Interpreting the Charts and Tables

Several statistical charts included in this section summarize participant responses to individual survey items. Other charts summarize responses to items that relate to the eight main survey categories. Various tables are used to present survey statistics in a variety of other useful ways.

Each group of charts is formatted in a uniform way. Each chart contains a title that describes its content and indicates the way the items are sorted (e.g. the 10 areas of smallest performance gap). Each survey item or grouping of items in the eight main categories is depicted by three associated bars that illustrate the three scores that were calculated—*how it is now, how it should be,* and *performance gap.* Each bar graph shows the 1—5 rating scale that represents the possible rating an employee could have given each item on the survey.

A legend on each bar graph identifies what each of the three bars represents. To facilitate your interpretation, the mean value of all individual responses is listed at the end of each bar.

The Campus Quality Survey™ results are comprehensive and specific. There are several reports, and the interpretation of each should be straightforward.

Each chart provides unique information; however, there is planned overlap and you will find items reappearing on your reports in different formats. You should use the reporting format that is most meaningful to you.

Charts of Highest and Lowest Ranked Survey Items

This sub-section includes the following charts:

2—1   Survey Items with Ten Smallest Performance Gaps

2—2   Survey Items with Ten Largest Performance Gaps

The first two bar graphs show the highest and lowest ranked items from the first section (items 1—50) and customized questions (items 82-86) of the instrument. Each set of bars reflects averages from specific items on the instrument. The bars depict scores for *how it is now, how it should be,* and *performance gap* for each item listed. The rating scale is shown at the top of each graph, and the mean value of all responses is shown at the end of each bar. The first graph shows the survey items with the smallest performance gaps. The second graph shows the items with the largest performance gaps.

This information helps you to distinguish between areas in the organization that need attention immediately and those areas that can be addressed at a later time. If an item has a large performance gap, it is advisable to focus attention on improvement in that area as a priority. It should be noted that there is no specific performance gap numeric value that indicates a lack of need for concern. Improvement should always be considered possible. Close analysis of institutional functions addressed by individual survey items will reveal these improvement opportunities.

More on the Ten Smallest Performance Gaps

Chart 2—1 shows the items that are best meeting the expectations of the employees by having the ten smallest performance gaps. This means that of all the items rated by the employees, these ten items were closest to meeting the needs of the surveyed group. Although the performance gaps are smallest for these items, there are, none-the-less, opportunities for continuous improvement in the institutional functions addressed by these items.

As listed on this chart, the ten smallest performance gaps were recorded on the following survey items:

1.   I feel that my work makes a difference at the College.
2.   This institution has "user-friendly" computer systems to assist employees and students.
3.   Faculty and staff take pride in their work.
4.   Students believe faculty care about what they think.
5.   I have a favorable impression of the College.
6.   My department meets as a team to plan and coordinate work.
7.   I have the freedom to express my ideas regarding things affecting my work and me.
8.   I know what is expected of me.
9.   Our services to students are "user-friendly".
10. My supervisor helps me improve my job performance.

More on the Ten Largest Performance Gaps

Chart 2—2 shows the ten items with the *largest performance gaps* identified by North Central State College employees. The items, listed in descending priority order needing attention, relate to the following:

1.   There are effective lines of communication between departments.
2.   Employees are rewarded for outstanding job performance.
3.   Processes for selecting, orienting, training, empowering, and recognizing employees are carefully planned.
4.   Morale is high at the College as a whole.
5.   This institution plans carefully.
6.   This institution analyzes all relevant data before making decisions.
7.   The harder I work, the more recognition I receive.
8.   There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation in this organization.
9.   Each department or work unit has written, up-to-date service expectations.
10. Team efforts are effective in this organization.

These items should be studied. They have been identified by employees as being the greatest challenges of the organization.

Charts of Staff Perceptions of Performance in Eight Main Survey Categories

This sub-section includes the following charts:

2—3   All Campus Staff Perceptions of Performance in Eight Main Survey Categories

2—4   Support/Classified Staff Perceptions of Performance in Eight Main Survey Categories

2—5   Faculty/Instructor Perceptions of Performance in Eight Main Survey Categories

2—6   Department Chair Perceptions of Performance in Eight Main Survey Categories

2—7   Administrative/Professional Staff Perceptions of Performance in Eight Main Survey Categories

Staff Perceptions Reported by the Eight Main Survey Categories

As explained before, each of the first 50 survey items relate to one or more of the eight quality categories of the *Presidential Award for Quality* criteria. Charts 2—3 to 2—7 report the aggregate of all-staff responses to items in these eight main survey categories, based on *how it should be* and *how it is now*.

Summary Charts and Tables of Staff Perceptions of Performance in Eight Main Survey Categories

This sub-section includes the following charts and tables:

2—8   Summary of All Campus Staff Perceptions in Eight Main Survey Categories—In Descending Order of *How It Should Be*

2—9   Summary of Support/Classified Staff Perceptions in Eight Main Survey Categories—In Descending Order of *How It Should Be*

Summary of Faculty/Instructor Perceptions in Eight Main Survey Categories—In Descending Order of *How It Should Be*

2—10   Summary of Department Chair Perceptions in Eight Main Survey Categories—In Descending Order of *How It Should Be*

Summary of Administrative/Professional Staff Perceptions in Eight Main Survey Categories—In Descending Order of *How It Should Be*

The above charts report the same information as in the previous sub-section, but do so in a different form. Here the performance gap is listed for each category, as well as the standard deviation for each set of data.

P16   Perceptions in Eight Main Survey Categories

P16   Perceptions in Eight Main Survey Categories by Employee Group

Perceptions in Eight Main Survey Categories

The performance gaps depict the discrepancy between how something *is*, and how it is perceived by staff it *should be*. The smaller the gap, the more positive the response is; the larger the gap, the more urgent the perceived need for improvement. The performance gaps follow, listed in descending order:

Employee Training and Recognition	1.604
Quality and Productivity Improvement Results	1.491
Strategic Quality Planning	1.444
Top Management Leadership and Support	1.425
Employee Empowerment and Teamwork	1.395
Measurement and Analysis	1.384
Quality Assurance	1.343
Customer Focus	1.157

Perceptions in Eight Main Survey Categories by Employee Groups

The charts numbered 2—3 to 2—10 show how various employee groups feel their expectations are being met in each of the eight main survey categories. The performance gap data depicted by these charts is summarized in the table below.

Quality Categories	Campus Overall	Support/ Classified	Faculty/ Instructor	Dept. Chair	Admin./ Prof.
Employee Training and Recognition	1.604	1.791 (hi)	1.601 (hi)	1.563	1.491 (hi)
Quality and Productivity Improvement Results	1.491	1.731	1.395	1.604 (hi)	1.436
Strategic Quality Planning	1.444	1.639	1.439	1.486	1.291
Top Management Leadership and Support	1.425	1.696	1.346	1.545	1.314
Employee Empowerment and Teamwork	1.395	1.566	1.363	1.513	1.304
Measurement and Analysis	1.384	1.457 (lo)	1.418	1.519	1.276
Quality Assurance	1.343	1.627	1.242	1.077 (lo)	1.246
Customer Focus	1.157	1.519	1.017 (lo)	1.556	1.085 (lo)

Summary Charts of Staff Perceptions of Performance on Individual Survey Items

This sub-section includes the following charts:

2—11 to 2—13	Summary of All Campus Staff Perceptions of Performance on Individual Survey Items—In Descending Order of *How It Should Be*
2—14 to 2—16	Summary of Support/Classified Staff Perceptions of Performance on Individual Survey Items—In Descending Order of *How It Should Be*
2—17 to 2—19	Summary of Faculty/Instructor Staff Perceptions of Performance on Individual Survey Items—In Descending Order of *How It Should Be*
2—20 to 2—22	Summary of Department Chair Perceptions of Performance on Individual Survey Items—In Descending Order of *How It Should Be*
2—23 to 2—25	Summary of Administrative/Professional Staff Perceptions of Performance on Individual Survey Items—In Descending Order of *How It Should Be*

Charts of Item-by-Item Responses

These charts list the standard statistical information for each of the survey items. This allows a detailed analysis of individual topics addressed by the survey.

For items 1-50, three values are listed for each item. They are the average of all *how it should be* and *how it is now* responses, as well as the *performance gap.* The standard deviation is also calculated for each value.

List of Survey Items Included in Each of the Eight Main Survey Categories

This sub-section includes the following charts:

List of Survey Items Included in Each of the Eight Main Survey Categories

2—26	—Top Management Leadership and Support
	—Customer Focus
2—27	—Strategic Quality Planning
	—Quality Assurance
2—28	—Measurement and Analysis
	—Quality and Productivity Improvement Results
2—29	—Employee Training and Recognition
	—Employee Empowerment and Teamwork

It is helpful to review the relationship of individual survey items to the eight main survey categories that address a comprehensive quality improvement effort. These charts enable you to do that. Note that some survey items appear in more than one category.

Employee Perceptions of Institutional Programs, Services, and Activities

This sub-section includes the following chart and lists, based on survey items 51 to 80:

2—30   Employee Perceptions of Institutional Programs, Services, and Activities

p20   List of Five Highest-Rated Programs, Services, and Activities by Employee Group

p21   List of Five Lowest-Rated Programs, Services, and Activities by Employee Groups

Assessment of Programs, Services, and Activities

For survey items 51-80, respondents are asked to rate a list of programs, services, and activities available to students and employees. Using a rating scale ranging from 1 (poor and inadequate) to 5 (excellent), personnel rated these items based on their use and knowledge of the program, service, and/or activity listed. There is also a response to indicate that the item does not apply or the respondent does not know. The average ratings are reported on the chart 2—30 titled *Employee Perceptions of Institutional Programs, Services, and Activities*.

The items on the list are ranked using overall campus average ratings from the highest rated item to the lowest rated item. Items that were not rated by respondents because they did not apply or did not know were not included in the calculations. The mean score of the various employee groups are shown on the same chart. This enables the reader to note how the responses of each employee group compare with the all-staff responses.

List of the Five Highest-Rated Programs, Services and Activities

The five North Central State College programs, services, and activities that received the highest overall campus ratings are as follows:

- Payroll services

- Library and learning services

- Switchboard and telephone services

- Business office services

- Computer information systems and services

The following page list the five areas rated lowest by each employee group.

These low-rated functional units of the College identify priority focus areas for analysis and improvement efforts.

**List of Five Lowest-Rated Programs, Services,
and Activities by Overall Campus and Employee Groups**

<u>**All Campus Staff**</u>
- Research and planning services
- Communication with other departments
- Recruitment and orientation of new employees
- Continuing education and community programs and services
- Career information and planning services

<u>**Support/Classified Staff**</u>
- Research and planning services
- Communication with other departments
- Recruitment and orientation of new employees
- Parking for faculty and staff
- Affirmative action

<u>**Faculty/Instructor**</u>
- Research and planning services
- Communication with other departments
- Recruitment and orientation of new employees
- Career information and planning services
- Health and nursing services

<u>**Department Chair**</u>
- Research and planning services
- Continuing education and community programs and services (tie)
- Health and nursing services (tie)
- Communication with other departments (tie)
- Marketing, advertising, and public relations (tie)
- Student admissions and registration services

<u>**Administrative/Professional Staff**</u>
- Research and planning services
- Continuing education and community programs and services
- Communication with other departments
- Cafeteria and food services
- Recruitment and orientation of new employees

Summary Chart and Tables of Survey Items 81, 93, 94, and 95

This sub-section includes the following chart and tables:

Summary of Items 81, 93, 94, 95
and Customized Questions

Chart 2—31, titled *Summary of Responses to Survey Items 81, 93, 94, and 95,* shows the total number of respondents. While there were a total of 118 employees who completed the majority of the items on the survey form, several people did not complete all the items; therefore, the number of respondents for some questions does not equal 118

Item 81—Level of Satisfaction with Employment

In this survey item, North Central State College employees rated their overall satisfaction with employment. A summary of those ratings follows:

Very satisfied	23	20%
Satisfied	53	47%
Neutral	17	15%
Somewhat dissatisfied	17	15%
Not satisfied at all	3	3%

Blank: 5

Summary: While the majority (67%) of the respondents are *satisfied* (47%) or *very satisfied* (20%) with their employment at North Central State College, 18% are *somewhat dissatisfied* (15%) or *not satisfied at all* (3%).

See page 36 for a comparison of the 2003 and 2005 results.

Item 93—Employment Status

This survey item was used to identify members of the four employee groups used to organize and report survey findings.

Item 94—Overall Impression of Quality

In this survey item, employees were also asked about their overall impression of quality at North Central State College. The ratings of 117 respondents to this item are as follows:

Excellent	17	15%
Good	50	43%
Average	41	35%
Below average	8	7%
Inadequate	1	1%

Summary: The small majority (58%) of the respondents rate their overall impression of quality at North Central State College as either *good* (43%) or *excellent* (15%). The *average* category got 35% of the ratings.

Item 95—Quality Class Participation

In this item, survey respondents indicated whether they have attended any training or professional development activities related to a quality improvement initiative. Of the 117 respondents to this question, 74 (63%) answered *yes;* 43 (37%) answered *no.*

North Central State College Customized Questions

The table below shows how each employee group responded to the survey items prepared by North Central State College. The ratings indicate the perceptions of each employee group regarding *how it is now*.

	Question	Campus Overall	Support/ Classified	Faculty/ Instructor	Dept. Chair	Admin./ Prof.
82.	In the last 6 months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress.	2.894	2.818	3.029	4.250	2.706
83.	I have the freedom to express my ideas regarding things affecting my work and me.	3.761	3.727	3.750	4.000	3.800
84.	I have a favorable overall impression of the College.	3.613	3.636	3.603	4.250	3.588
85.	My job performance is evaluated fairly.	3.538	3.515	3.529	3.000	3.608
86.	The harder I work, the more recognition I receive.	2.283	2.364	2.088	3.250	2.440
87.	My compensation is fair for the job I am asked to do.	2.494	2.424	2.235	2.500	2.882
88.	Morale is high at the College as a whole.	2.106	2.394	2.059	2.250	1.941
89.	The workload is divided fairly among the people in my department.	3.375	2.879	3.588	4.000	3.353
90.	I feel that my work makes a difference at the College.	3.925	3.667	4.015	4.250	3.980
91.	I feel that positive change will come about as a result of this survey.	2.825	2.818	2.868	3.000	2.784

Section 3:
Analysis of
Campus Quality Survey™
National Norm Charts

Comparison With National Norms

Performance Horizons provides information to enable administrators to compare their institution's results with averages from all other schools that have completed the survey. These are grouped in four categories: Composite Averages of All Other Institutions, Two-Year Colleges, Two-Year Career Schools, and Four-Year institutions.

The 10 smallest and 10 largest performance gaps on individual survey items are displayed on charts 3—1 through 3—6 for the three types of schools. These charts correspond to charts 2—1 and 2—2 in the previous section that list data for your institution. Being able to make these comparisons helps you to determine how the survey items on your list of 10 smallest and 10 largest performance gaps compare to the 10 smallest and 10 largest gaps indicated by national norms for similar and different types of institutions.

Charts 3—7 and 3—8 compare your institution's staff ratings with national norms in the eight main survey categories. Here you can compare your institution's mean ratings in these eight categories to those of other types of schools as well as all institutions in the database.

Decisions made on the basis of these comparisons must be thoughtfully considered. It should not be assumed that your faculty, staff, and administration have the same needs and expectations as others at similar institutions. Therefore, interpret the report carefully so that you have a clear understanding of what is important to your employees. Do this before using normative data to make decisions to change the systems, processes, and services of your institution.

Charts of National Norms for Two and Four-year Schools

This sub-section includes the following charts:

Two-Year Colleges

3-1   National Norms for Two-Year Colleges—Ten Smallest
                     Performance Gaps on Individual Survey Items

3-2   National Norms for Two-Year Colleges—Ten Largest
                     Performance Gaps on Individual Survey Items

Two-Year Career Schools

3-3   National Norms for Two-Year Career Schools—Ten
                     Smallest Performance Gaps on Individual Survey Items

3-4   National Norms for Two-Year Career Schools—Ten
                     Largest Performance Gaps on Individual Survey Items

Four-Year Institutions

3-5   National Norms for Four-Year Institutions—Ten
                     Smallest Performance Gaps on Individual Survey Items

3-6   National Norms for Four-Year Institutions—Ten Largest
                     Performance Gaps on Individual Survey Items

<u>Charts Comparing Your Campus with All National Norms</u>

This sub-section includes the following charts:

3-7   National Norms in Eight Main Survey Categories—All
                                      Staff Perceptions of *How It Should Be*

3-8   National Norms in Eight Main Survey Categories—All
                                      Staff Perceptions of *How It Is Now*

3-9 and 3-10   Comparison with All National Norms in Eight Main
                                      Survey Categories— All Campus Staff Perceptions of
                                      How It Should Be

3-11 and 3-12   Comparison with All National Norms in Eight Main
                                      Survey Categories— All Campus Staff Perceptions of
                                      How It Is Now

National Norm Summary Analysis

The summary charts numbered 3—7, *How It Should Be,* and 3—8, *How It is Now,* reveal the following information:

1.   North Central State College overall average ratings in the category *How It Should Be* are lower in six quality categories and higher in two (*Quality and Productivity Improvement Results* and *Measurement and Analysis*) than the average ratings of all other institutions in the data bank. Refer to the color charts 3—9 and 3—10.

2.   In the category *How It Is Now,* North Central State College overall average ratings are lower than the average ratings of all other institutions in the data bank in all eight quality categories. Refer to the color charts 3—11 and 3—12.

3.   When comparing North Central State College composite *How It Is Now* average ratings with those of two-year institutions in the data bank, North Central ratings are lower in all eight categories.

Quality and Productivity Improvement Results	-.337
Employee Training and Recognition	-.305
Measurement and Analysis	-.273
Employee Empowerment and Teamwork	-.249
Top Management Leadership and Support	-.243
Quality Assurance	-.242
Strategic Quality Planning	-.238
Customer Focus	-.156

Charts of National Norms for Two and Four-year Schools

This sub-section includes the following charts:

Two-Year Colleges

3-13 to 3-15   National Norms for Two-Year Colleges—All Standard Questions

Two-Year Career Schools

3-16 to 3-18   National Norms for Two-Year Career Schools—All Standard Questions

Four-Year Institutions

3-19 to 3-21   National Norms for Four-Year Institutions—All Standard Questions

Section 4:
Comparison with Previous
Survey Results

Two-Year Comparison

This is the second time that the Campus Quality Survey™ has been conducted at North Central State College. In this section the results of the current survey are compared with the 2003 survey responses. The number of respondents in each employee group for each year is shown below:

Year	Overall Campus	Support/ Classified	Faculty/ Instructors	Department Chairs	Administrative/ Professional	Blank
2003	177	37	77	5	53	5
2005	118	29	46	7	35	1

How It Should Be **Comparisons**

As shown on the following table, there have been increases in six categories in the *How It Should Be* ratings. *Employee Training and Recognition* and *Top Management Leadership and Support* decreases slightly. The amount of change from 2003 to 2005 is shown in the column on the right. Also see charts 4—1.

Quality Category	2003	2005	2003 2005 Change
Employee Training and Recognition	4.461	4.435	-.026
Top Management Leadership and Support	4.501	4.467	-.034
Measurement and Analysis	4.388	4.426	+.038
Quality/Productivity Improvement Results	4.392	4.407	+.015
Customer Focus	4.356	4.359	+.003
Strategic Quality Planning	4.386	4.392	+.006
Employee Empowerment and Teamwork	4.462	4.442	+.020
Quality Assurance	4.353	4.372	+.019

How It Is Now Comparisons

The table below shows there have been increases in all eight categories in the *How It Is Now* ratings. The amount of change from 2003 to 2005 is shown in the column on the right. Also see chart 4—2.

Quality Category	2003	2005	2003 2005 Change
Employee Training and Recognition	2.575	2.832	+.257
Top Management Leadership and Support	2.919	3.042	+.123
Measurement and Analysis	2.736	3.042	+.306
Quality/Productivity Improvement Results	2.729	2.916	+.187
Customer Focus	2.988	3.202	+.214
Strategic Quality Planning	2.704	2.948	+.244
Employee Empowerment and Teamwork	2.798	3.046	+.248
Quality Assurance	2.875	3.028	+.153

Performance Gap **Comparisons**

As explained before, the *performance gap* is derived by subtracting the average *How It Is Now* rating from the *How It Should Be* rating. A smaller *performance gap* in the current survey indicates an improvement from the previous survey.

The table below shows the performance gap for the eight main categories of each survey. Note that there are performance gap decreases, reflecting an increase in employee satisfaction in all eight categories.

Quality Category	2003	2005	2003 2005 Change
Employee Training and Recognition	1.886	1.604	-.282
Top Management Leadership and Support	1.581	1.425	-.156
Measurement and Analysis	1.652	1.384	-.268
Quality/Productivity Improvement Results	1.662	1.491	-.171
Customer Focus	1.368	1.157	-.211
Strategic Quality Planning	1.682	1.444	-.238
Employee Empowerment and Teamwork	1.664	1.395	-.269
Quality Assurance	1.478	1.343	-.135

Item 81—Level of Employee Satisfaction

In this survey item, respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with their employment. Comparison of the 2003 and 2005 results shows the percentage of *satisfied* and *very satisfied* increased (58% to 67%). There was a decrease of *somewhat dissatisfied* and *not satisfied at all* (24% up to 18%).

	2003		2005	
	N	%	N	%
Very satisfied	17	10%	23	20%
Satisfied	79	48%	53	47%
Neutral	30	18%	17	15%
Somewhat dissatisfied	37	22%	17	15%
Not satisfied at all	3	2%	3	3%
Number of respondents out of surveys returned	166 of 177		113 of 118	

Item 94—Overall Impression of Quality Comparison

In this survey item, respondents were asked to indicate their overall impression of quality at North Central State College. Comparison of the 2003 and 2005 results below reflect an increase in the combined *excellent* and *good* responses from 53% to 58%. The *below average* and *inadequate* responses decreased from 14% to 8%. There is still a large percentage of respondents rating quality as *average* (35% up from 33% in 2003).

Overall Impression of Quality	2003		2005	
	N	%	N	%
Excellent	14	8%	17	15%
Good	78	45%	50	43%
Average	56	33%	41	35%
Below average	23	13%	8	7%
Inadequate	1	1%	1	1%

Number of respondents out of surveys returned	172 of 177	117 of 118

Item 95—Quality Class Participation

The table below shows employee responses to the question *Have you ever attended any training or professional development activities related to your institution's quality improvement initiative?*

Quality Class Participation	2003		2005	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	67	40%	74	63%
No	101	60%	43	37%
Number responding out of number of respondents	168 of 177		117 of 188	

Customized Questions

The following table shows the mean scores for the North Central State College questions (items 82-91) based on *How It Is Now.* The 2005 ratings are shown in red above the 2003 ratings. Overall campus ratings for six items went up; four items went down.

	Question	Campus Overall	Support/ Classified	Faculty/ Instructor	Dept. Chair	Admin./ Prof.
82.	In the last 6 months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress.	2.886 2.894	2.846 2.818	3.050 3.029	3.500 4.250	2.563 2.706
83.	I have the freedom to express my ideas regarding things affecting my work and me.	3.714 3.761	3.731 3.727	3.600 3.750	3.167 4.000	3.938 3.800
84.	I have a favorable overall impression of the College.	3.762 3.613	3.692 3.636	3.750 3.603	3.833 4.250	3.813 3.588
85.	My job performance is evaluated fairly.	3.524 3.538	3.385 3.515	3.825 3.529	3.667 3.000	3.281 3.608
86.	The harder I work, the more recognition I receive.	2.390 2.283	2.308 2.364	2.300 2.088	2.833 3.250	2.500 2.440
87.	My compensation is fair for the job I am asked to do.	2.913 2.494	2.692 2.424	2.650 2.235	3.333 2.500	3.323 2.882
88.	Morale is high at the College as a whole.	2.481 2.106	2.231 2.394	2.475 2.059	2.833 2.250	2.581 1.941
89.	The workload is divided fairly among the people in my department.	3.417 3.375	3.231 2.879	3.564 3.588	3.333 4.000	3.387 3.353
90.	I feel that my work makes a difference at the College.	4.212 3.925	4.154 3.667	4.225 4.015	4.167 4.250	4.258 3.980
91.	I feel that positive change will come about as a result of this survey.	2.699 2.825	2.500 2.818	2.650 2.868	2.667 3.000	2.933 2.784

Section 5: Employee Comments and Suggestions

Employee Comments and Suggestions

Professional development days are generally a waste of time and effort – Marginal benefit professionally.

Top admin. – specifically President – micro-managing still despite all the reorganization efforts – New staff and faculty organizations no more effective than four years ago.

I am disappointed and angry – we spent $ and time w/no real results – yet President thinks everything is good – he does not "hear" us.

My immediate supervisor and Dean are very supportive and any negative results are not a reflection of their efforts. The students, my colleagues, the support staff in my department and my supervisor help to make this job very satisfying in spite of the poor communication and morale that seems to be the culture of this institution. Nothing has really changed since the last survey. Many faculty and staff have given up the attempt to change the environment and now focus their energy where they can make a positive difference and this is with the students.

Recruitment, public relations and communication, i.e., send and receiving of messages – LISTENING need to be NCSC's preouts – NOT semester, expansion and innovative conceptually. (whatever) We need to return to our roots and reestablish who and shy we are… Thank you for the opportunity.

While I feel in my dept. evaluations are fair & praise is given for a job well done, I feel that the college overall is lacking in this area. Also, pay scales and classifications are not fair and equal across the board.

School needs to expand in new classes, new programs, more full-time faculty and staff. School needs an equipment upgrade in some classrooms. School switchboard needs to operate till 9 pm.

Wage scale here needs to be adjusted. I understand that we are an educational institution, but too much emphasis is put on education instead of overall job knowledge and performance. I would also like to see more employees be promoted from within. Better communication between divisions.

Actions based on last survey were of no benefit to the college.

Leadership still lacking. Strategic plan now existent. Another survey after no relevant action based on previous survey kills credibility.

There are the usual collegiate issues here, but also a distinct and growing disconnect on trying to tackle "big" issues do to attitude of senior administration until something changes, discontent will continue.
Keep employees informed and an active participant in future planning at the College.
Listen to and take the suggestions of the many creative people here, not just those who go along with the Presidents views.
We need performance evaluations and merit-based raises.
Supervisors need to apply policies consistently like dress code and turning in time off. Why are there two "assistants to the President"? Why do they still make the same amount of money?
Very little substance in changes made after first survey. Reorganization looked good on paper, but little or no true action. Room scheduler making $107,000, assistant to President making $90,000. Extremely poor use of limited dollars!! When the bottom falls out, who will go first?
I am all for equal employment, but I am feeling very frustrated by the few who chose to abuse their situation to benefit themselves personally. How far will we let these individuals go? We as employers have rights to don't we?
In answering the administrative questions, I am referring to Dr. Abrams and the board of trustees. I think Lew Milner is doing a great job and listens and follows through as much as he is allowed.
Despite the fact that the President has not developed a strategic plan, the student services area has been reorganized twice – both times poorly and with little thought for how it would affect students and staff.
A transition team was created after the last survey. However, the President was on the team and selected all the members. What a joke!!!
In my department we are not given the opportunity to evaluate the job performance of our immediate supervisor. Is it this way in all departments?
More classes and activities should be offered on the Shelby campus. My students are getting turned down for jobs because I do not have the equipment to train them properly to get jobs.
Students, activities and faculty at Shelby do not feel included in main campus activities and communication.
Breastfeeding in lobby of Kehoe does not provide a professional college environment.

We did not find out about construction under our classroom at Kehoe until the day it started. Noise was so loud, that teaching was impossible.
I have always felt very blessed to be part of the NC State "family".
Most of the administrative assessment was based on local. They could have been higher if it was evaluated totally my direct supervisors.
It would be nice for Adjunct instructors to have the opportunity to be a part of some of these change comm.
Some of us enjoy working/teaching here and would like to contribute to the future of the College as a whole.
Directives seem to be made without consulting the people who are most effected and sometimes we have good ideas that could case implementation or that make the directive inappropriate.
No real teamwork – everyone does their own thing. Suggestions do no seem to be taken seriously unless they come from the right people.
Not everyone treats students as top priority and are rude in delivering information – but others are helpful, go out of their way to help the student. It's hard to replace a bad impression that someone has left with a student. There is some teamwork, but not like there should be between depts... Some still don't have e a clue what other departments do, misdirect students.
Recognition comes from the students and is very rewarding on a daily basis, other than my dept. I have yet to be recognized for hard work. A cash bonus would be a nice gesture.
This will not help at all!
As a part time faculty member it would be nice to feel more as apart of a team. (Human Services)
Example – Teri Kofod invites all part time instructors to her meetings and get togethers. I feel very supported by her.
#58 – Has been good with most recent person in that position, but might change since she has resigned.
The step system of compensation is a mess. There is no clear definition of how you should be placed on a step based upon "education, professional experience and years of service to the College". Instead, you place people on the same step as the person they replace. It makes no sense.
I am an employee of Alumni of NC State College. I feel that is a positive aspect of this College.

Maybe more effective is there was on "uncertain" category and #3 was "somewhat" or "getting there" in the first section.
While I see attempts being made for improvement there are still at least two areas that have never changed – too few support/classified staff positions for the amount of work required and new support/classified staff hires being hired for who they know and not for their knowledge, skills, experience and abilities.
I feel things on the whole have improved steadily in the last year. The College needs to do a better job of taking a leadership role in the local economy.
We are going AQIP, semester because the President wants this. He tries to take this as if we had any input.
I think the evaluations and raises should be available for employees who continually go above and beyond what is expected of them. The overall raises are nice but everyone gets the same amount regardless of the fact they bust their butts to work hard or slack off.
I love my job!
Make all job postings fair and open – some have just been appointed.
Start a planning process known by all, contributed to by many.
Use evaluations of all employees in personal decisions.
The climate for positive change and communication must be demonstrated from the top.
Put the results of this survey to good use!
Real problems are not addressed. We reorganized and restructure, move people around, but don't ever seem to address the real issues.
Administrators need to get their heads out of the sand and start noticing what is going on. All the departments seem to do their own thing. No unification across the campus. Administration doesn't like to give anyone a chance unless you're "really" kissing-up to them. "Some" people are doing "all" the work while others slack off! Wake up and take notice!!!
I do have a concern about admissions and counseling services being more concerned with merely reflecting student attitudes and expectations rather than shaping them. We are more than a retailer of student thoughts. We should seem to shape student attitudes both in services and in teaching.
Establish a system of recognition/reward for those faculty that contribute to the College's work through committees, etc. Those faculty who go beyond their own classes/courses.
I believe a professional communication audit should be given.

As before, a weakness of this survey is the fact that most employees have multiple supervisors. I would "strongly agree" that one supervisor provides what I need to be an effective employee, but another supervisor does nothing in that regard. Therefore, my overall response is relatively negative to questions about supervisors.

If I were only able to make one point, it would be this:

Yes, NCSC does well in asking for feedback and in carrying out evaluations of staff, faculty and services.

What the college leadership does not do is listen to what those evaluation tools say or, if they do, communicate to college employees how they used that information in making the decisions that they do. The relationship between evaluations/feedback and the decisions actually made is often unclear and, at time, quite contradictory.

Question#2: Employees are involved but that doesn't necessarily mean that their input has any influence on a decision.

Question #5 and #15: Student questionnaires are given out in classes only for faculty whose contract is up for renewal. This may not happen very often. As far as I know, other faculty aren't required to survey their students.

Questions #6 and #48: I've been on several committees, put in time and effort, only to have our recommendations vetoed by one upper management person. It's discouraging.

Questions#12: Procedures are defined for job expectations but what about things I shouldn't be expected to do for my supervisor like washing his/her dishes or watering plants in supervisor's office.

As an institution, we are lost when the topic is Quality Improvement. We have made a good decision in choosing AQIP as an accreditation system. But, we have a lot of work to do before the general employee understands the implications of the process and what it means to their work and the impact that Continuous Quality Improvement systems will have on the institution and those that we serve. The biggest single need for the implementation of this process is the training of every employee. We all need to understand how the process will work and what we each need to do for the process to help the institution provide the quality services that the community expects. There does not appear to be any plan in place to deal with this training need and we certainly have not made any progress in the area of Quality Improvement since the last survey.

I commend the President for moving in the direction of Continuous Quality Improvement. However, he has not taken the bold steps necessary to assure

effective implementation. Rather, he has chosen to "approve" the choice and not get in the way of the efforts of those who are willing to step out and push to develop change in the institution. This behavior is to be expected from a leader who continues to avoid any responsibility for planning and apparently thinks that his effort to transfer that responsibility to the Board of Trustees is a model for institutional greatness? But then again all decision making is done at the President's staff level (i.e. the President makes all the decisions) so maybe there is n need for planning. No one else needs to know the direction the institution is moving since there is no expectation that anyone but the President make any decisions. Plans are only useful as a guide to use when making decisions at lower levels. Besides, if you do not make plans no one can ever ask why you did not accomplish something that you had stated in a previous plan.

We are doing a pretty good job of providing services to the community. But, we could be doing it so much better and so much more effectively if we only had leadership that was pointing us toward a better tomorrow and providing inspiration. Instead most of us are just trying to do what we think is best at the moment and hoping that no one notices what we are doing because we can't be sure if we are doing what is expected or what the President thinks we should be doing.

First of all, I appreciate the College's decision to conduct this survey this year, as a two-year follow-up to the same survey conducted in 2003. I appreciate the College's willingness to ask its employees the questions that this instrument was designed to ask. It is my sincere hope that the Board examines carefully the results of this survey two years after its initial administration and that it finds the courage to act in ways that – while difficult – will, nevertheless, serve our students and ultimately the institution well in the long-term.   Do not feel that the Board found a way to do that following the initial administration of this instrument. But in fairness to the Board, the results of that first survey had no real "context" within which to fit. It is my hope that the results of this second survey might "confirm" the sad truth(s) that the first survey's results suggested to any of us.

Many of the comments that were offered (by many different individuals) in conjunction with the administration of that first survey (2 years ago) helped to illuminate the real cause(s) of the low morale and the institution-wide dysfunction that many seem content to simply accept as parts of the status quo at the institution. In my opinion, many of those factors mentioned in conjunction with the first survey continue today to play a role in making the institution considerably less effective than it has the potential to be.

There are so many good people at this institution with such good intentions and with the potential to do such effective work. It is a shame to see such

potential left to waste, floundering – as it is in an environment characterized by poor communication, a lack of clear vision from the top, the refusal of top-level managers to deal effectively and in a timely way with small management-related problems before they become bigger than they ever need to become, and a culture that promotes not innovation but, sadly, resignation and acceptance of an ineffective and unproductive status quo.

Since the President came to this institution, he has (rather consistently and steadily) served as a very good example of exactly how miss-management at the highest level of an institution can adversely affect the ability of its employees to accomplish what they have the very real potential to accomplish. If I have learned one thing of great value from this man, it is this: that the administrative head of an organization truly has the power – by virtue of the example he sets, as well as by the tone and the policies and the procedures that he puts in place – to effectively paralyze" and "cripple" an institution… whether or not that might be the individual's intention.

Sadly, I believe that the "man at the top" of this organization probably has the best of intention. I believe he truly understands and genuinely believes in the value of post-secondary education, particularly at the community/technical college level. I believe he spends time reading and trying to educate himself, both about higher education and about management philosophy, and I believe he does this with the best of intentions. And I further believe that in his heart, he believes that he is trying to do the right thing(s) here at the College, things that will ultimately help the College and, in turn, the students and the larger community we serve. For all of this, I give him credit.

Unfortunately for this College (and its employees, whose work environment has been adversely affected by this man's personal example and his professional policies and procedures – and ultimately its students, whose personal educational experience is put at risk, as a trickle-down result of the unfortunate work environment that he has effectively instilled at this institution), the "man at the top" has proven himself woefully inadequate in the areas of personal communication skills, personal and group-level interpersonal skills, and sound management practice.

In terms of his demonstrated lack of communication skills, the "man at the top" has consistently proven himself incapable of truly listening to his employees whenever they have anything to say that he doesn't want to hear. His typical response, both in one-on-one conversations and also in group settings, when he hears something that counters his personally held belief, is either "I think you're wrong (period)," or "That's not what I'm hearing (period)." And that truly is the end of the discussion as far as he is concerned. He really doesn't know how to listen (and effectively use) anything that might properly be termed his "opposition." He simply dismisses it and moves on. That inability to really

listen on his part has proven itself over the years to be the real "Achilles" heel of his administration. And, in addition to demonstrating that he has virtually no real "listening" skills to call upon as a manager, the "man at the top" has also consistently demonstrated the unfortunate ability to effectively alienate listeners when he tries to "send" his message. This has happened on so many occasions that many choose simply not to go and hear what he has to say anymore, as he has proven himself to be so ineffective a communicator of such departments. To my knowledge, he still refuses to put his charge to committees and various work teams in writing, thereby reserving himself the right – after the fact, after the committee has spent considerable time and energy to meet its charge, after the committee has made a genuine effort to fulfill its charge in good faith – to dismiss the committee's recommendations with a simple "That's not what I asked you for," at which point he articulated what is (and what some suspect has been all along) his intention to do!

In terms of his interpersonal skills, the "man at the top" has demonstrated a truly unfortunate inability to interact effectively with faculty and staff and (as far as I can tell) with many members of his own administration as well. Part of this inability is related, certainly, to his unfortunate inability to listen and to communicate his ideas effectively, but his inability to interact effectively with the College's employees goes beyond this. He rarely goes out to staff and faculty, to meet them on "their turf," to find out about their world, and to ask them what they think. He claims to have an "open door," yet he fails to understand his role – given the position he holds – in trying to make people feel comfortable enough to make use of that" open door." He doesn't invite true and honest dialogue about issues of importance. Lately he has gone through what seem to be a few sad "motions" indicative of someone interested in honest dialogue, perhaps at the urging of the Board to address this sad inadequacy. But for many College employees, it is simply too little too late. And for many more, the motions are so sadly NOT genuine that his efforts are almost painful to watch. He doesn't seem to know how to make himself truly "present" to what someone else might really care about. And so we end up with the situation we have now, wherein people are certainly free to say whatever they want to say – about the workplace, about problems that need to be addressed, etc. – as long as they don't go so far as to actually expect anymore to genuinely "act" on those suggestions or concerns or complaints.

In terms of his poor management skills, the "man at the top" has consistently demonstrated an unfortunate inability to use his human resources effectively. As a manager, he seems to be more comfortable playing to his people's "weaknesses" and less interested in playing to (or perhaps truly unable to play to) their "strengths." He prides himself still on creating "dynamic tension" – the same "dynamic tension" that the Gardner/Shaw team strongly urged him 2 years ago to stop trying to create. (I suppose we should give him credit for

consistency here, if nothing else!)

However, the "dynamic tension" that he purposely insists on continuing to create has done nothing but "wear good people down," and sadly he doesn't even seem to recognize this. Or if he does, he appears to take a perverse kind of pride (and/or pleasure) in that "wearing down," insisting that it is merely some kind of precursor to some very positive change he is on the verge of achieving. Sadly, he has so sold himself on this idea – and many of us fear he has sold the Board itself on this idea, as well – that he simply cannot "see" the real damage that he has inflicted and continues to inflict on his human resources in his role as a top-level administrator.

I think this is the saddest thing of all: that even the "man at the top," the man most clearly responsible for the problems that the institution continues to face two long years after the first survey was administered and the Gardner/Shaw group was brought in to help the institution create a plan of action designed to address the challenges that the last survey so clearly identified, even this man probably means well. Like so many individuals at the institution, he is a well-intentioned individual with much strength to draw upon. Unfortunately for the institution, however, his weakness in the area on (1) communication skills, (2) interpersonal skills, and (3) human resource management skills undermine so many of his good intentions. He has done and continues to do (albeit perhaps – in fairness to him – unintentionally) so much damage to morale at the College. And that damage, in turn, has "worn down" so many, and effectively "paralyzed" so many more, that the College is now beginning to pay what some believe will be a "long-term" price in the areas of (1) delayed quality improvement, (2) ineffective team building efforts and (3) a less than successful effort to truly improve the College's ability to meet the ever-changing needs of its students and the larger community it serves.

It is certainly my hope and I believe the hope of many good employees here at the College – that the Board finds the courage to take a good, hard look at the unfortunate failings of the "man at the top." Give him credit, by all means, for the good things that he has done since coming to NC State College, and I suspect he has done many good things outside the realm of human resource (miss-) management, things for which he no doubt deserves well-earned credit! And give him credit for the genuinely good intentions he has had, even in those areas in which he has failed so miserably. But please, have the courage to say to him what only the Board is in a position to say to him, and that is this: that he (and he alone) is largely responsible for the morale problem at the institution, as well as for the inability of the institution to function effectively at a human resource level, and that the time has come (please!) for those problems to (finally) be addressed!

I believe the recommendations offered by the Gardner/Shaw group following

the initial administration of this same survey instrument (2 years ago) really held a lot of value for the institution. Had the Board found a way to actually follow those recommendations as many believe Gardner/Shaw intended them – rather than having chosen instead to follow the Interpretations of those recommendations as offered by the "man at the top" himself (!) I (and others) think some real progress might have been made between then and now. Unfortunately for the institution, however, that does not seem to be what happened following the administration of the initial survey. For all of our sakes, I hope the Board gets it right this time. Surely we all share responsibility for the unfortunate state of affairs (when it come to poor institutional morale and serious institutional dysfunction), but surely the "man at the top" holds the lion's share of responsibility for these institution-wide problems, and until the "man at the top" is urged by the Board to truly commit to some serious changes, at the personal level,…sadly, the real problems that plague the institution will continue, largely untouched and unaddressed.

Section 6: Observations and Recommendations

Using the Survey Results
To Improve Your Organization

The survey results detailed in this report give you significant information about the following:

- The aspects of your organization that are perceived to be most important by your staff and contribute most to their satisfaction.

- The areas in which you may already be meeting or exceeding staff expectations.

- The highest and lowest performance gaps.

- Strengths and weaknesses of your organization's quality improvement process.

- Employee ratings about the quality of programs, services, and activities available to students and staff.

- Changes needed to create an organization that provides higher levels of personal satisfaction and professional fulfillment to your staff.

After you examine and reflect on the contents of this report, there are a variety of options for follow-up action. Some of these are listed below, and others will be identified through discussions within your organization.

Market your strengths. Capitalize on the areas indicated by the Survey as areas of strength. Promote these strengths to your prospective staff, and publicize your successes in areas where expectations are being met. You may also use this information to recruit staff more effectively.

Implement possible quick-fix remedies. While many areas of deficiency require strategic action, some changes can be implemented immediately. Quick action on items with high performance gaps can bring rapid and significant returns to the organization in increased staff satisfaction and better service to customers.

Make minor budget adjustments. Since the CQS can identify areas staff reported not being very important, money, personnel, and energy may be reassigned to more important areas where there is greater indication of need for improvement.

Include results in long-range planning. The information provided by the CQS can be very useful in long-range planning. It shows payoff areas where expanding efforts, focusing budgets, and developing operational results can bring important results.

Change the climate. The lack of a sense of community in an organization should be of great concern to administrators. Staff feelings about the organizational climate relate directly to their level of satisfaction. When staff feel like they belong, they are likely to deliver higher quality service to customers. They are also more likely to build their careers and continue employment rather than look elsewhere.

Provide competitive advantage. Regularly assessing staff expectations and levels of satisfaction should give you a definite edge over other organizations.

The results of this measurement activity will be most valuable if monitored over time. The focus should be on continuous improvement, measured and compared each time the survey is administered.

Administrators should avoid comparing results from department to department. Rather, the goal should be to determine if meaningful change is occurring throughout the organization.

This report is designed to establish a baseline status of the organization as viewed by the people who make it work. With this information, precise benchmarking and meaningful, long-term improvement is possible. Careful documentation of progress over time will track your organization's success in the quest for continuous quality improvement.

Overall Composite Observations and Recommendations

Introduction

This is the second time the Campus Quality Survey™ has been used at North Central State College

There are both positive and negative factors revealed by the findings, providing much opportunity for analysis, reflection, and action.

The Campus Quality Survey™ results provide a snapshot of employee perceptions at a given time. The information is useful as a basis for analysis of the past. However, the data is even more valuable for charting the future of the college.

Some educational organizations choose to distribute Survey results to all employees. This is an excellent idea, as it affirms that their input has been valued and they can see how the organization as a whole has responded. This sharing can be accomplished by referencing and highlighting the various charts, tables, observations, and recommendations in staff communications. Some institutions place copies of the entire report in their resource center for check-out by employees or post the report on their internal Web site. This helps instill confidence by avoiding the perception that results are selectively revealed.

The Basis for These Observations and Recommendations

The observations and recommendations in this section are based on a comprehensive analysis including the following:

1. Data obtained from the objective survey responses is reviewed. This includes analysis of the:
   - smallest and largest performance gap items
   - results of the composite averages of survey items related to the eight Presidential Award for Quality categories
   - results of survey data for items 51-80 showing ratings of institutional programs, services, and activities
   - staff ratings for item 81 (employee satisfaction) and 94 (impression of quality)
   - employee comments and suggestions

2. Overall composite data is compared to averages from all other institutions in the Performance Horizons data bank. Note that there are further comparisons of data with two-year institutions.

3. Customized question responses are reviewed.

4. Data from the current survey is compared with the previous survey.

While all four approaches yield valuable information, caution should be exercised when comparing data and results with other institutions. The size and types of institutions influence national data norms. Other factors include the number of overall responses, number of survey participants in each employee group, and variables unique to individual institutions.

Observations and Recommendations

1. Effective quality improvement is the result of a thousand things done a little bit better, not a few things done a lot better. The four key features of an improvement system are:

   - Measurable indicators of quality for all key processes
   - Focused improvement effort for each quality indicator
   - Continuous measurement, strong customer service, and process fine-tuning
   - Strong leadership that includes total staff participation

   We recommend that improvement initiatives being employed currently be analyzed for conformance to the above listed four key features. Adjusting of improvement processes accordingly should yield positive results.

2. Individuals responsible for the five functional areas that received the highest overall ratings should be commended for their commitment to providing exemplary services to students and others who use their services. These services are detailed in chart 2-30 titled *Employee Perceptions of Institutional of Programs, Services, and Activities* and listed below:

   • Payroll services*
   • Library and learning resources*
   • Switchboard and telephone services*

- Business office services
- Computer information systems and services

The three areas marked with an asterisk (*) were among the top five rated areas in 2003.

3. As noted in Section Four: Comparison with Previous Survey Results, there have been improvements as follows:

- *How It Should Be* ratings increased in six categories and decreased in two categories (*Employee Training and Recognition* and *Top Management Leadership and Support*).
- *How It Is Now* ratings increased in all eight categories.
- *Performance gaps* decreased in all eight categories.

4. Again, *Employee Training and Recognition* is the quality improvement category identified as needing attention. This is indicated by the largest performance gap overall (1.604) and in three of the employee groups (Support/Classified, 1.791, Faculty/Instructor, 1.601, and Administrative/Professional, 1.491).

Nationally, *Employee Training and Recognition* is the largest performance gap item at Two-year Institutions (1.350) and All Other Institutions (1.325).

It is recommended that professional development and employee recognition be examined to determine where improvement is needed. Some suggested strategies include:

- Appoint a study team to review professional development and recognition programs for faculty, staff, and administration.

- Study the current professional development and recognition processes and determine where they can be improved.

- Hold focus group sessions with personnel at all levels to get feedback about current professional development and recognition programs.

- Survey personnel at all levels to determine their perceived professional development needs.

- Analyze the data obtained, and design an action plan that details the goals and strategies for improvement, together with

measurement criteria and a responsibility chart. See sample Action Plan format in the Appendix.

The specific survey items that make up the *Employee Training and Recognition* category are shown on page 2—29. Of the eight items in the category, Item 26, *Employees are rewarded for outstanding job performance,* has the second largest performance gap. In 2003, Item 26 had the fourth largest performance gap. Staff responses to this item are shown below with the 2005 data in red above the 2003 data. The six columns provide a variety of data. Each column offers a useful perspective from which to analyze overall and employee group responses. This information should be carefully studied to identify opportunities for improvement initiatives. Note that the *How It Is Now* ratings increased and the performance gaps decreased overall and in each of the employee groups since the 2003 survey.

Item 26	NCSC How It Should Be	NCSC How It Is Now	NCSC Performance Gap	2-Year National Norm *How It Should Be*	2-Year National Norm *How It Is Now*	2-Year National Norm *Gap*
Overall Campus	4.451	2.416	2.035	4.526	2.723	1.803
	4.518	2.161	2.357	4.533	2.705	1.829
Support/Classified	4.556	2.296	2.259			
	4.676	2.206	2.471			
Faculty/Instructor	4.422	2.333	2.089			
	4.459	2.297	2.162			
Department Chair	4.500	2.667	1.833			
	3.500	2.500	1.000			
Administrative/Professional	4.412	2.559	1.853			
	4.577	1.904	2.673			

North Central State College customized question 86, which states *The harder I work, the more recognition I receive* provides further analysis. Staff responses to this item are shown below with the 2005 data in red above the 2003 data. The *How It Is Now* ratings went up overall.

Item 86	How It Should Be	How It Is Now	Performance Gap
Overall Campus	4.295	2.390	1.905
	4.390	2.283	2.107
Support/Classified	4.538	2.308	2.231
	4.455	2.364	2.091
Faculty/Instructor	4.325	2.300	2.025
	4.368	2.088	2.279
Department Chair	4.000	2.833	1.167
	3.750	3.250	0.500
Administrative/Professional	4.125	2.500	1.625
	4.420	2.440	1.980

North Central State College customized question 87, states *My compensation is fair for the job I am asked to do.* Staff responses to this item are shown below with the 2005 data in red above the 2003 data. The *How It Is Now* ratings went up overall and performance gaps went down in all employee groups.

Item 87	How It Should Be	How It Is Now	Performance Gap
Overall Campus	4.385	2.913	1.471
	4.456	2.494	1.963
Support/Classified	4.654	2.692	1.962
	4.576	2.424	2.152
Faculty/Instructor	4.350	2.650	1.700
	4.412	2.235	2.176
Department Chair	3.833	3.333	0.500
	4.000	2.500	1.500
Administrative/Professional	4.323	3.323	1.000
	4.451	2.882	1.569

As in 2002, Item 8, *Processes for selecting, orienting, training, empowering, and recognizing employees are carefully planned,* has the third largest performance gap. Staff responses to this item are shown below with the 2005 data in red above the 2003 data.

Item 8	NCSC How It Should Be	NCSC How It Is Now	NCSC Performance Gap	2-Year National Norm *How It Should Be*	2-Year *National Norm How It Is Now*	2-Year *National Norm Gap*
Overall Campus	4.449	2.458	1.991	4.481	2.900	1.581
	4.547	2.176	2.371	4.486	2.862	1.624
Support/Classified	4.500	2.577	1.923			
	4.571	2.457	2.114			
Faculty/Instructor	4.357	2.333	2.024			
	4.533	2.067	2.467			
Department Chair	4.500	2.333	2.167			
	4.250	2.250	2.000			
Administrative/Professional	4.531	2.531	2.000			
	4.558	2.135	2.423			

5. Communication is a focus area that continues to warrants further study. As in 2003, the largest performance gap of the survey was tabulated for item 27, which states: *There are effective lines of communication between departments.* Staff responses to this item are shown below with the 2005 data in red above the 2003 data. *How It Is Now* ratings and *performance gaps* improved overall and in every employee category.

Item 27	NCSC How It Should Be	NCSC How It Is Now	NCSC Performance Gap	2-Year National Norm How It Should Be	2-Year National Norm How It Is Now	2-Year National Norm Gap
Overall Campus	4.531	2.442	2.088	4.508	2.666	1.842
	4.571	2.124	2.447	4.514	2.635	1.879
Support/Classified	4.630	2.259	2.370			
	4.743	1.914	2.829			
Faculty/Instructor	4.467	2.400	2.067			
	4.520	2.187	2.333			
Department Chair	4.333	2.333	2.000			
	4.500	2.250	2.250			
Administrative/Professional	4.559	2.647	1.912			
	4.538	2.154	2.385			

Communication impacts all operating systems of an organization. It also plays an important role in the overall atmosphere and staff morale. Thus, communication must be considered among the highest priority areas of a campus' quality improvement process.

It is recommended that a cross-functional team study the processes related to communication between departments. The following techniques may be effective:

- Review all the charts, tables, and data in this report, with special emphasis on items related to communication.

- Conduct interviews and focus group sessions among personnel levels.

- Survey employees at all levels on specific aspects of communication.

- Analyze the data obtained, and design an Action Plan that details goals and strategies for improvement, measurement criteria, responsibilities, and timelines. See sample Action Plan format in the Appendix.

- The action plan should include the development of written procedures for all cross-functional operating processes. The written processes should help support more systematic interdepartmental communication.

6. Item 81 reflects the overall level of satisfaction with employment. Satisfaction improved in 2005, with 67% of the 113 respondents to this item indicating they are *satisfied* (47%) or *very satisfied* (20%). This compares to 58% of the 166 respondents indicating they were *satisfied* (48%) or *very satisfied* (10%) in 2003. The *somewhat dissatisfied* and *not satisfied at all* dropped from 24% in 2003 to 18% in 2005.

    Respondent overall impression of quality ratings reflect a similar improvement. There is an increase in the combined *excellent* and *good* responses from 53% to 58%. The *below average* and *inadequate* responses decreased from 14% to 8%. There is still a large percentage of respondents rating quality as *average* (35% up from 33% in 2003).

North Central customized survey Item 88, which states: *Morale is high at this College as a whole* assesses another dimension of employee satisfaction. Staff responses to this item are shown below with the 2005 data in red above the 2003 data. While the *How It Is Now* ratings went up overall and in three employee groups, Support/classified ratings went down.

Item 88	How It Should Be	How It Is Now	Performance Gap
Overall Campus	4.462	2.481	1.981
	4.531	2.106	2.425
Support/Classified	4.654	2.231	2.423
	4.515	2.394	2.121
Faculty/Instructor	4.525	2.475	2.050
	4.471	2.059	2.412
Department Chair	4.167	2.833	1.333
	4.750	2.250	2.500
Administrative/Professional	4.290	2.581	1.710
	4.588	1.941	2.647

It is recommended that the administration look for contributing factors. The Comments and Suggestions section reflects a variety of employee perceptions.

7.   It is recommended that the lowest rated services, summarized on page 21, be examined and improvement efforts concentrated as needed. The areas rated lowest by the overall campus and two or more personnel groups are:

- Research and planning services*
- Communication with other departments*
- Recruitment and orientation of new employees*
- Continuing education and community programs and services

The three items with an asterisk(*) were among the five lowest rated in the 2003 survey.

8.   It is recommended that the Campus Quality Survey be repeated in 2006. This should help identify progress in closing the performance gaps as a result of planned continuous quality improvement initiatives.

Some Thoughts on the Validity of the Campus Quality Survey™
Provided by Performance Horizons Consulting Group

Groups and individuals completing the Campus Quality Survey sometimes inquire about the validity of Survey results. These results are communicated through the Campus Quality Survey Report, based on the data gathered from individual survey participant responses. Concern about validity is appropriate and should be discussed.

Generally, validity may be defined as the accuracy and reliability with which a survey confirms known facts or predicts outcomes that can be confirmed through other measurements or observation. The Campus Quality Survey seeks to quantify subjective perceptions of various aspects of an organization's functions and circumstances to the individuals working within it. Survey validity does not address objective facts.

With this in mind, the validity of the Survey can be addressed in two ways.

1.   HOW VALID ARE SURVEY QUESTIONS? Individual survey questions may be considered valid because they address issues that staff members in educational institutions have indicated to be significant in determining levels of satisfaction within their job environments. This satisfaction is important, as it is generally related to functional effectiveness and personal and professional fulfillment. The questions have been tested in hundreds of surveys involving many thousands of individual respondents. Survey customers indicate a remarkable correlation between positive survey scores and a happy work environment. Negative survey results generally indicate a stressed work environment.

Individuals answer Survey questions in a variety of ways depending on personal perspective. For example, some Survey respondents feel satisfied about a particular aspect of an organization's operation, while others may feel entirely differently about the same observable phenomena or their experiences with the phenomena. Thus, the survey documents subjective information that becomes significant by virtue of the reporting of individual responses as aggregate arithmetic and statistical values. These values are meant to be analyzed and considered "good" indicators, or indicators that suggest remedial action, largely based on the established standards of the institution.

2.   HOW VALID IS THE SURVEY REPORT? The Survey Report is constructed thoughtfully, and reports summary data based on

individual survey participants' responses. The data is derived using valid statistical analysis tools and processes. The Report clearly presents data that has been deemed useful by Survey customers over a period of more than ten years.

Though each of the measures involved in the Campus Quality Survey deals with subjective judgment, each addresses an issue that can significantly impact the overall success of an organization, where the hearts as well as the minds of individuals must be engaged toward fulfilling the mission of the enterprise.

Survey data provides a means to identify areas of strengths as well as areas that call for remedial action. Thus, the Survey offers an important and economical way to engage the individuals working in the organization in building a more effective, functional, and satisfactory place to work.

Appendix

Observations and Recommendations

1. Effective quality improvement is the result of a thousand things done a little bit better, not a few things done a lot better. The four key features of an improvement system are:

    - Measurable indicators of quality for all key processes
    - Focused improvement effort for each quality indicator
    - Continuous measurement, strong customer service, and process fine-tuning
    - Strong leadership that includes total staff participation

    While this is the first time North Central State College has used the survey, the results compare very favorably with other institutions, especially with other two-year colleges. North Central State College *How It Is Now* ratings are higher in all eight quality categories. This seems to indicate that on-going improvement efforts are satisfactory.

    Further, item 43: *This institution believes in continuous quality improvement* is among the smallest performance gap items (0.491) indicating strong employee awareness and support for the efforts.

    Nevertheless, we recommend that current improvement initiatives be continually analyzed for conformance to the above listed four key features. Adjusting of improvement processes accordingly should yield positive results.

2. Staff development efforts deserve recognition. Heading the list of smallest performance gaps are items 86: *I have taken part in staff development activities this academic year* (0.206) and item 50: *professional development training programs are available to assist employees in improving their job performance* (0.310).

    - Appoint a study team to review items shown on page 2—28.

    - Analyze the data obtained, and design an action plan that details the goals and strategies for improvement, together with

measurement criteria and a responsibility chart. See sample Action Plan format in the Appendix.

6. Communication is a focus area that needs further study. The largest performance gap, item 27, refers directly to communication: *There are effective lines of communication between departments.* Staff responses to this question are as follows:

Employee Group	*How It Is Now*	*Performance Gap*
Campus Overall	2.793	1.707
Support/Classified	2.676	1.784
Faculty/Instructors	3.097	1.355
Department Chairs	3.500	0.000
Administrative/Prof.		

It is recommended that processes related to communication between departments and satellite campuses be studied. The following techniques may be effective:

- Review all the charts, tables, and data in this report, with special emphasis on items related to communication.

- Conduct interviews and focus group sessions among personnel levels.

- Survey employees at all levels on specific aspects of communication.

- Analyze the data obtained, and design an Action Plan that details goals and strategies for improvement, measurement criteria, responsibilities, and timelines.

7. The overall impression of quality is generally high with 76.5% of the 114 responses in the *good* (45.5%) or *excellent* (31%) columns. It is also noted that several of the items in the ten smallest performance gap chart 2-1 are directly related to the continuous improvement initiative. This reflects general support for the initiatives.

8. The majority (77%) of the respondents are *satisfied* (34.5%) or *very satisfied* (42.5%) with their employment at North Central State College. These percentages are high compared to other institutions in the data bank.

9. There are a few negative comments in the comments and suggestion section (page 32), however, general support is reflected in results throughout the survey.

10. It is recommended that this survey be repeated in 2003. This should help identify progress in closing the performance gaps as a result of planned continuous quality improvement initiatives.

Appendix

Sample Action
Plan Format