Memo

To: LCCC College Council
From: Aaron Casteel, Mohamed Chakhad, Melvin Hawkins, Meghan Kelly, Caroline Ross, Jennifer Thompson, and Ann Murray
Date: February 20, 2015
Subject: Fall 2014 Noel-Levitz College Employee Satisfaction Survey Results Analysis and Recommendations

Executive Summary

At its January 16, 2015 meeting LCCC College Council (CC) established a cross-functional team to analyze the results of the Noel-Levitz College Employee Satisfaction Survey (NL CESS) in which LCCC participated during November 2014. The team, comprised of four CC members representing all employee constituencies and an additional representative from each of Faculty Senate and Staff Senate, was charged with analyzing the quantitative results and recommending priorities for systematic, institutional improvement strategies to College Council, as well as making recommendations on how to consider the qualitative (open-ended) responses in the development of those strategies. The team also developed recommendations to improve the process of analyzing and using the results from this survey next year.

It is evident from the survey results (quantitative and qualitative) that there are many opportunities for improvement. If the College recognizes this and there is strong will and consistent, systematic effort to transform LCCC, we shall succeed.

Recommendations

Based on the team's analysis, described below, the team recommends that the College focus on developing strategies for improvement in this order, based on the weighted average gap for items associated with these categories (described in more detail below).

Category
1. Planning & Decision-making
2. Culture and Values
3. Communication
4. Professional Development
5. Engagement
6. Employee Appreciation
7. Budget and Resources
8. Image

The team further recommends that efforts be focused on the first three categories.

Regarding the open-ended survey items, the team recommends that these be used as a resource for College Council and other campus groups as they develop strategies for improvement. For example, one strategy to address some communication concerns is to provide regular updates to the College community on changes being implemented, including how these changes support the strategic plan. Another strategy is to have agendas and minutes of all standing committees available online and to provide regular reminders of how to access these documents. While neither of these strategies address larger issues, they would address concerns about availability of information, a common theme among the comments.

Finally, to improve the employee survey process, the team recommends that an analysis team be established before the next survey administration and use the methodology that has been established to provide a consistent framework for using results. More detailed recommendations are found later in this report.

Methodology

Quantitative Data Overview

The quantitative survey results were separated into four sections, mirroring the survey instrument. These were

1. Campus culture and policies
2. Institutional goals
3. Involvement in planning and decision-making
4. Work environment

After reviewing the survey items in each of the four sections, the team determined that the information in Section 2, Institutional goals, would be most useful to the Board of Trustees in the development of LCCC's next strategic plan. The information in Section 3, Involvement in planning and decision-making, could be used to monitor the effectiveness of strategies for improvement in these areas but does not offer useful information for developing priorities for improvement. A next step in the analysis would be to examine these results to determine if there are differences among the employee groups in terms of their perceptions of employee involvement in decision-making (see Attachment 1).

For the first and fourth sections, respondents were asked to rate the importance of and their satisfaction with several statements. Results also included a gap score, the difference between the average importance and satisfaction ratings. These results provided the richest source of information to the team.

Analysis of Sections 1 & 4 Results

Before analyzing the results in these areas, the team reviewed the statements in these sections and developed categories for analysis purposes.

Category	Description/Key Words
Budget and Resources	Resources include personnel, technology, infrastructure, etc. Items related to professional development were excluded from this category.
Communication	Sharing information, opportunities for input or feedback, professional dialog

Category	Description/Key Words
Culture and Values	Mission, vision, values, policies, procedures, strategic plan, goals – are these consistently followed (i.e. does LCCC walk its talk?)? Also items providing historical context
Employee Appreciation	Recognition, benefits, excluding salary/wages
Engagement	How an employee is engaged in his/her work and the organization, relationships with others, including both favorable and unfavorable types of engagement
Image	Perceptions of LCCC (internal or external), engagement with our external community
Planning and Decision-making	How input is gathered or used in decision-making, planning processes and timelines
Professional Development	Professional development, orientation, training

Each statement was assigned a primary category; some statements were also assigned a secondary category. (See Attachment 2 for categorized statements.) The gap scores were then used to develop a priority ranking for the categories. (Recall that the gap score for a statement is the difference between the mean importance score and the mean satisfaction score.) For each category, a weighted average gap score was calculated. A statement's gap was weighted by 2 if the category was the primary category for that statement; otherwise, the gap was weighted by 1. This methodology produced the following prioritized order:

Category	Average Gap (weighted)
1. Planning and Decision-making	1.63
2. Culture and Values	1.56
3. Communication	1.52
4. Professional Development	1.34
5. Engagement	1.25
6. Employee Appreciation	1.15
7. Budget and Resources	1.11
8. Image	1.10

Analysis of Qualitative (Open-ended Question) Results

The team reviewed the open-ended results and categorized them using the same categories. Many comments addressed concerns in more than one category. (See Attachment 3 for a listing of the categorized items.) The number of comments associated with each identified category is shown in the table below.

Category	# of comments	% of all comments
1. Planning and Decision-making	149	53.6%
2. Culture and Values	181	65.1%
3. Communication	137	49.3%
4. Professional Development	13	4.7%
5. Engagement	163	58.6%
6. Employee Appreciation	66	23.7%

Category	# of comments	% of all comments
7. Budget and Resources	32	11.5%
8. Image	25	9.0%

Process Improvement Recommendations

The NL CESS Analysis Team recommends several strategies for improving the process of analyzing the results for next year.

1. College Council should establish a cross-functional analysis team, similar to this team, before employees are invited to participate in the NL CESS. The analysis team should receive the results and conduct its analysis before results are released to the college community. This will provide context for broader discussions about improvement strategies based on the results.
2. For continuity, as well as monitoring for improvement, future analysis teams should use the same methodology for analyzing the results as the current team.
3. The next analysis team should develop a rubric for analyzing the open-ended responses after they have been categorized. Examples of rubric criteria might include whether or not a comment offers a specific suggestion and how a comment might be used for systematic, institutional improvement.
4. The next team could also make recommendations on the use of disaggregation and historical comparisons for improvement and accountability.