Welcome and thank you for joining us for “Manager Training for the Employee Engagement Survey Report.” My name is Teri Spillers, Consultant in Leadership and Talent Development, and I’ll be introducing and hosting this webinar.

Your presenter will be Dr. Jennifer Engler, Employee Engagement Manager in Leadership and Talent Development for the University of Minnesota. Jennifer served as the Assistant Dean of Students and Director of Student Services in the College of Education and Human Development since 2010. Jennifer has worked at the University since 1999 after completing her doctorate in Clinical Psychology.

Over the next ninety minutes, we’ll provide an overview of this year’s Employee Engagement survey report. Each manager in the U of M system who had 10 or more respondents to the 2015 employee engagement survey will receive an invitation from Hay Group to access their report once the executive presentations are made at their respective campus, college, or unit. These presentations will begin in early January and continue until spring break in March.

On this webinar, we’ll walk through each slide of the report with placeholder sample data to show what the data measures so that you better understand and can interpret the data when you receive your report. It’s our hope that this will allow all leaders across the system to feel comfortable sharing and discussing the data with their employees. Over the past two years of conducting the employee engagement survey,
we’ve found that the conversation with faculty and staff about the data is particularly helpful in supporting action. Employees can help clarify the meaning of responses, share ideas for how to refine or start action plans related to one or two items, and help identify areas of employee engagement that are strong and need to be celebrated and sustained.

Before we begin, a couple of details on how we will handle questions and any technical issues.

• So we can more easily keep track of your questions, we ask that you use the 'Q&A' window to submit them to me. You can send them in any time during the presentation.

• After the presentation, Jennifer will answer questions for about 30 minutes. We will likely not have time to get to all of the questions but we do plan to provide written response to all questions submitted and we will post these on the Employee Engagement website at z.umn.edu/engagedU.

• If you have any technical issues, please send a message privately to Benjamin Peck using the 'Chat' window. Ben will work with us to help resolve these.

• We will be recording the session and plan to make it available on our website for you to refer to once you have your own data. There will be a high level of detail in today’s presentation so we fully expect you will want to refer back to this script.

Now I will turn it over to your presenter, Dr. Jennifer Engler.
Thank you Teri.

I would like to begin by with a review of the agenda (read slide).
Here at the University of Minnesota, President Kaler and the Board of Regents support employee engagement because of the value it brings to leaders in identifying areas to improve the faculty and staff experience to allow the organization to achieve our highest strategic priorities. In addition to the value it brings to leaders, employee engagement brings value to staff and faculty as one of the ways for ALL voices to be heard and confidentially.

Employee engagement is the level of employee energy and motivation for their work supported or hindered by workplace environment and experience. A high level of engagement can align unit goals with effective workplace practices that drive optimal outcomes.

Research shows that great organizations require engaged employees. Organizations with low engagement may see high turnover, inefficient work practices, and lower productivity compared to organizations with high engagement.

Thus, employee engagement profoundly shapes the quality of experiences and outcomes for faculty and staff in the workplace. High engagement fosters collaboration and innovation along with resilience, wellbeing, and the ability to sustain a high level of performance.
Public higher education faces a series of unprecedented challenges, including increasing global competition for top talent—particularly field-shaping faculty and top students—as well as shifting enrollment trends, rapid changes across disciplines, intense competition for grants, and the need for greater interdisciplinary research collaboration. All of these challenges can affect the engagement of faculty and staff. In addition, these challenges require new ways of thinking and working together.

These challenges can put added pressure on leaders to support faculty and staff success. The employee engagement initiative is intended to provide data and tools to support and inform ongoing efforts by departments, colleges, units, and campuses to address these issues and to sustain high levels of faculty and staff engagement.
Engagement data is best used as information for planning and goal-setting at the local level to enhance faculty and staff development and create an inclusive and positive environment.

The most effective way to increase engagement is to share and discuss the engagement information and connect it to one or two actions relevant and specific to a unit’s local plans for achieving its highest priorities. This ensures that the actions taken in response to the survey results are relevant, useful and fit the environment.

Leaders who work on understanding and using their engagement data to take action should know that research shows that engaged employees:

- Are more productive,
- Are more collaborative and innovative
- Have fewer performance problems,
- Are safer, and,
- Are absent less often and have lower turnover

In summary, there are three important things that every leader should know about employee engagement:

**#1: A survey alone does not create positive change.** Only involving leaders, faculty, and staff in responding to survey results can create positive change in the work environment.
**#2: Share your results.** Disengagement begins when people who take time to respond to a survey don’t hear their results from their leaders.

**#3: Take action.** A few small, simple actions can have a large impact. Be certain to let faculty and staff know when actions were taken based on their survey feedback.

Next, we’re going to move on to the survey report.
This slide begins this year’s survey report. All of the following slides are what will be included in the 2015 report.

Today’s report uses sample data for our presentation to illustrate data interpretation and help you to identify areas of both opportunity and strength to enhance and leverage.

The photograph is of Morse Alumni Distinguished Teaching Professor, Rashné Jehangir [RASH-NAY JAY-HAN-GIR]
The survey was administered between October 12 and 30 of 2015.

The survey has been administered during the same weeks in October each year for the past three years.

There were a total of 36 questions on this year’s survey. These questions were exactly the same and in the same order as last year.

There are two separate surveys: one for staff and another for faculty. The majority of questions on the two surveys are identical.

Hay Group is the external vendor that has handled survey administration for all three years to ensure confidentiality and consistency in survey methodology.

All benefits-eligible employees who were employed by August 24, 2015 were sent a survey by Hay Group.

The faculty response rate this year was 56% and the staff response rate this year was 70%.

Each year we have broken response rate records and this year all senior leaders throughout the system received at least 50% response rate overall for their unit, college
or campus.
The University of Minnesota engagement model consists of two key metrics which make up engagement. These are:

- **Commitment and Dedication** – Motivating employee commitment and dedication to excellence

- **Effective Environment** - Supporting employees’ success with the tools and resources of an effective work environment.

Each key metric is composed of five separate drivers. Drivers are areas where leaders, faculty, and staff can take action. The survey content has been divided into these two sections to help more clearly identify and target areas for meaningful action.

The drivers for Commitment and Dedication help us understand how to impact engagement. The drivers are:

- **Clear and Promising Direction** which supports faculty and staff in connecting their work to the goals of the department, college, and University. This is critical to creating a high level of engagement.

- **Commitment to Excellence**. Ensuring that employees are working together toward achieving excellence requires an environment that encourages
teamwork, promotes innovation, and strives for continuous improvement.

- **Confidence in Leaders.** Leaders influence the way that faculty and staff perceive the college, unit or work group as a whole and play a critical role in reinforcing strategy and goals.

- **Development Opportunities.** Employee development includes the ongoing learning and development of skills and knowledge—including job mastery and professional development—coupled with career-planning activities.

- **Respect and Recognition.** Faculty and staff who feel respected in their workplace will show respect for their work and for the organization.

The second key metric is Effective Environment, which helps to identify ways we can support employees’ success with the tools and resources of an effective work environment.

The Drivers for Effective Environment help us understand how to impact engagement. The drivers are:

- **Authority and Empowerment.** Employees with appropriate autonomy and discretion to complete their work are enabled to be more productive and effective.

- **Clear Expectations and Feedback.** All employees need ongoing feedback about expectations and performance to continuously deliver high-quality services.

- **Collaboration.** Good cooperation and teamwork helps work groups develop better ways to get work done and react more quickly to changing needs.

- **Support and Resources.** Engaged employees who have the knowledge and resources to perform optimally require workplace support to be successful in their responsibilities.

- **Work, Structure, and Process.** Operating efficiency ensures a productive workforce while increasing motivation and reducing frustration among faculty and staff.

The U’s model is unique because it provides the ability to more clearly define areas that are related to motivation and performance of the individual (Commitment & Dedication) versus the workplace environment (Effective Environment).
As we begin to discuss the interpretation of the survey data, the most important thing is to connect engagement to the mission and goals of your unit, because organizations solve problems more effectively, provide better service, and meet their mission through engaged employees. We will come back and explore this connection in more depth at the end of this webinar.

In terms of the data, most units system wide will now have three years of data for both faculty and staff at ideally the same or higher rates of participation. It’s important to note that the current employee engagement survey will not be conducted in the fall of 2016, but we do plan to survey again in Academic Year 2017. We will use this time to continue to work closely with campuses, colleges, and units to help faculty and staff understand what these three years of data show while also developing the next iteration of the survey.

Since we have asked the same questions, in the same format of administration, at the same time of year, we have collected three years of data to serve as a baseline for most managers in terms of their overall themes for areas of opportunity as well as areas of strength.

We also have two survey administrations in which we can make year-to-year comparisons in terms of trend-like patterns, particularly directional patterns. The University community will have a full year to dig more deeply into action planning to
address areas of opportunity plus leverage and celebrate strengths.

We are building the reports this year so that we can help managers in how to think about the data they've been able to collect over the three years, including the year-to-year comparisons and this year’s benchmark comparisons. The nuances in the data are often specific to the organization, especially considering the variance in levels of participation and whether groups received data each year.

I will talk through data interpretation so that today’s webinar participants’ can feel more comfortable in understanding and sharing the data with their employees and in selecting areas to celebrate and to improve. The guidelines provided today should be applied in the context of what leaders know about their employees and their local work environments.

As we begin, it’s important to remember that researchers have found that the world’s most admired organizations that consistently achieve high levels of engagement do the following:

- Communicate to build confidence in leaders by connecting the efforts of their faculty and staff to the organization and it’s highest priorities.

- Create clarity in the goals and objectives that support achieving the highest priorities.

- Help to organize work efficiently.

- Treat employees as individuals and listen to their ideas to drive improvement, innovation, and to challenge the status quo.

- Finally, these organizations encourage their staff and faculty to develop, particularly to support their ongoing ability to contribute to the strategic priorities.
The report now moves into a discussion of survey interpretation on this and the following two slides.

This first slide provides the sample bar graphs which show the percent favorable, neutral or unfavorable responses provided by employees.

The percent favorable responses include: “strongly agree,” and “agree,” or “very good,” and “good.” The percent neutral responses include: “neither agree nor disagree,” and the percent unfavorable responses include: “strongly disagree” and “disagree,” or “poor,” and “very poor”. The number in the bar shows the percent of responses in that category.

The percent favorable difference area shows how the 2015 results for the specific unit compare to the benchmarks of the 2013 and 2014 same-unit results (when available), the total college or unit, the specific campus and the total University. The system campus benchmarks are total campus and total University, such that the same unit results are compared to the specific system campus and then to the total University. A plus-sign indicates that the 2015 score for that unit is percentage points higher than the benchmarks, while a minus-sign indicates the 2015 score for that unit is percentage points below the benchmark.

The benchmarks are always based on the percent favorable. Moving across the grid,
there are comparisons to scores in 2013 and in 2014 (where available) as well as comparisons to the 2015 scores for the total campus and the total University (which includes all campuses).

Sometimes the percentages do not always total exactly 100. In some instances, rounding to the nearest whole number will cause the percentages on data bars to add up to either 99 or 101. This is not an error, just a function of rounding the numbers. For example, assume 12 people responded to a question and 4 were favorable, 4 were neutral and 4 were unfavorable. The percent favorable would be 33%, neutral 33% and unfavorable 33%, adding to a total of 99%.

The “Valid N” column in the table, which appears just to the right of the question, represents the total number of people who provided a favorable, neutral, or unfavorable response to a question. Respondents who may have skipped questions or answered “Don’t Know/Not Applicable” are not counted in that question.
This slide helps you to understand the ranges of scores that may suggest an area for action and thus help with prioritization. Again, it is also important to connect areas for action to the survey items and overall metrics that are most critical to your ability to achieve your strategic goals.

Most often, scores in the 70% favorable range or above are considered a strength, scores of less than 60% favorable may be an indication that more information is necessary. Unfavorable scores of greater than 20% indicate that action may be needed.

A large percentage “neutral” (greater than 20%) means that faculty and staff neither agree nor disagree with a statement. For example, they may have mixed experiences with the topic the question asks about, or are awaiting further information to help them decide whether they agree or disagree. Neutral responses, higher than about 20%, should be viewed as an opportunity to gather more information to support the possibility of moving the neutral response in the favorable direction.

Finally, it is important to consider the “Valid N” size in terms of the practical significance of the percentage favorable differences. As we just reviewed, each item in the report will have a “Valid N” column where you can see the total number of responses to an item. It is important to keep in mind that the size of the group affects the practical significance of group differences. In smaller units, when the differences in percentages appear large, it is important to consider the actual number of employees who
responded favorably, neutral, or unfavorably to a given item. For a small group, a seemingly large change may reflect changes in the responses of 2 or 3 people. In other words, the smaller the group, the bigger the difference in percentage points needed to conclude that a meaningful difference exists.

As a side note, the total N is your benefits eligible employees hired by August 24, 2015. If you need the official number, your HR staff can provide it for you once you receive your report.
Our last slide on results interpretation covers how results can be compared to important benchmarks.

Few institutions of higher education are measuring employee engagement and none of those doing so are comparable to the University of Minnesota system in size or complexity. Thus, most of our benchmarks are compared against ourselves.

As mentioned, all benchmark comparisons are made based on percent-favorable responses, not neutral or unfavorable.

The first two benchmarks, labeled “2013 same unit results” and “2014 same unit results” show how much the 2015 percent favorable score is above or below the percentage of favorable responses for 2013 and 2014, respectively.

Thus, you can discern a directional path of up or down from 2013 to 2014 on a particular metric, driver or item. It is easiest to do so by first calculating the percent favorable score for 2013 by subtracting the 2013 same unit result column from the 2015 percent favorable number in the bar graph. Calculate the 2014 score by subtracting the 2014 same unit result column from the 2015 percent favorable number in the bar graph. You can now compare the 2013 and 2014 scores.

We will walk through specific examples when we move to the data slides.
The percentage of favorable difference between 2013 and 2014 is not as relevant for smaller organizations with a smaller N size as this may be more random fluctuation.

When making meaning of these changes in terms of the trend data between this year (2015) and last year (2014), we consider a low likelihood for meaningful change to be less than 5 percentage points above or below the 2014 data. There is a medium likelihood for meaningful change between 5 and 10 percentage points above or below the 2014 data, and a high likelihood for meaningful change is typically greater than 10 percentage points above or below the 2014 data. These are rules of thumb only. Keep in mind, the practical significance of these differences based on the valid N size, and that the directional path may be more helpful in the context of a smaller N size.

The Guide to Employee Engagement Survey Data and Action Planning is being updated and will be uploaded to z.umn.edu/EngagedU in January, and it provides data interpretation slides that may be useful as a customized PowerPoint presentation when presenting results to faculty and staff.

In summary, it is best to review the survey data through three lenses:

• First, absolute scores in key metrics and drivers

• Second, a comparison of data with benchmarks (University, campus, college, and 2013 and 2014 same-unit data, when available)

• And finally, strengths and opportunities, which we will discuss shortly

In addition, qualitative data is important because it includes the larger context in which this data was gathered. It helps us understand what’s going on within the unit that might explain these results. For example, as you review the data, you might consider the impact of large-scale initiatives, strategic or fiscal planning, as well as the context provided by other data that may have been gathered within the unit around key initiatives.

In the context of qualitative data, it’s helpful to first gauge your own reactions to the results. Is there anything that surprises or doesn’t surprise you? Is there anything that you feel particularly good or disappointed about? These are good questions to pose to your faculty and staff as well when you share results.

Comment reports can also provide useful contextual data, but are only distributed at college/unit-leader level where 10 comments or more have been submitted. Comments are meant to provide support to themes already identified in the data, rather than for
identifying respondents or drawing attention to outlying situations. It’s important to note that not all employees responded to open-ended comment questions, so consider the absolute data as you review comments.

As we now move into the data slides for this year’s survey report, please know the data shown here was randomly generated by our vendor and does not represent a coherent or consistent portrayal of employee engagement for most units.
This is the Summary of Engagement for the overall report. The results are organized by our two Key Metrics, which together make up engagement. These metrics are:

- **Commitment and Dedication**—Motivating employee commitment and dedication to excellence

- **Effective Environment**—Supporting employees’ success with the tools and resources of an effective work environment.

Under each key metric, you will see its corresponding five drivers. This slide provides a summary of the results for all the engagement drivers, including the overall or cumulative engagement for each key metric of commitment and dedication and effective work environment.

On the following slides, we will show the results for employees responses to each of the survey items for each key metric and all ten drivers.

Again, as we look at the right hand side of the table, you’ll see the benchmarks are always based on the percent favorable and going across the grid they are comparisons to scores in 2013 and in 2014 (where available) as well as comparisons to the total college or unit in which your employees are situated (TC campus only). Finally the last two benchmarks are the comparisons to the total system campus and the total.
University (which includes all campuses).

For example, the key metric of Commitment and Dedication has a 54% favorable score for 2015 which is indicated by the green bar in the first row of data.

In 2013, the percent favorable response was 48 percent for this unit. We know that from the “2013 Same Unit Results” in the first column, which is +6, and this means the 2015 score is 6 points higher than it was in 2013. We subtract the 6 points from the 2015 percent favorable to get the percent favorable response for 2013.

As we continue across the columns for Commitment and Dedication, in 2014 the percent favorable response was 49 percent for this unit. We know that from the “2014 Same Unit Results” in the second column, which is +5, so the 2015 score is 5 points higher than it was in 2014. Again, we subtract 5 from 54% to get the percent favorable response in 2014.

Next are the 2015 benchmark comparisons for “Total College/Unit” (TC campus only) and for “2015 Total Campus”, and for “2015 Total University” which includes all campuses. Each of these are based on the percent favorable for 2015, again the percent in the green bar.

For this hypothetical unit on the Twin Cities campus, their 2015 score is 1 percentage point lower than the 2015 score for their total college or unit (-1), their unit score is 1 percentage point higher than the 2015 score for the Twin Cities campus (+1), and the unit score is exactly the same as the 2015 score for the total University, or zero difference in the last column.

As I stated earlier, the percentages do not always total exactly 100 due to rounding to the nearest whole number. This is not an error, just a function of rounding the numbers and it can result in the total for all three bars adding up to 99% or 101%.

Again, as we look at the responses, we will want to note key metrics and drivers where there is a large percentage “neutral.” That means that faculty or staff neither agree nor disagree with a statement. For example, they may have mixed experiences with the topic the question asks about and are awaiting further information to help them decide whether they agree or disagree. Neutral responses, especially higher than about 20%, should be viewed as an opportunity to gather more information to support the possibility of moving the neutral response in the favorable direction.
The unique part of our engagement framework is that it contains two metrics (individual commitment and dedication and how effective the work environment is in supporting engagement). This four-square displays the Employee Engagement Profile.

The profile is created by the Hay Group by categorizing the overall University results into four quadrants based on General Industry norms. Above average indicates results scoring above the norm and below average indicates scores below this norm. The percent for the Total University in the bottom of a given quadrant box is the percentage of employees at the University that fall into that quadrant. The percent at the top of a given quadrant box is the percent of employees in the specific unit in that quadrant. You can then compare your unit to the overall percent at the University for each quadrant.

- Respondents in the **Engaged** box scored higher on commitment and dedication and higher on effective environment.

- Respondents in the **Disengaged** box scored lower on both of these outcomes.

- Respondents in the **Detached** box score higher on effective environment and lower on commitment and dedication.
• Respondents in the **Frustrated** box score higher on commitment and dedication and lower on effective work environment.

Research shows that leaders have far more success by focusing on two particular areas of the four square—“detached” and “frustrated”—those with one measure of engagement working well for them, however something is missing. These employees are well-placed to move into the engaged camp. Although there may be a tendency to focus on the Disengaged quadrant—this is unlikely to yield positive results, and there will always be some people who are in this space. In fact, the data shows that even in some of the highest performing organizations in the world, about 20-25% of employees are in the disengaged quadrant.

It is often easier to have an impact on work environment issues than it is to address personal commitment and dedication. Therefore, focusing on the Frustrated quadrant can often present the greatest opportunity.

Research shows that those typically in the Frustrated box are high-potential employees who tend to do one of three things with their frustration:

• First, find innovative ways to break through work environment barriers and move into the engaged camp.

• Second, get tired of the frustrations and leave to work elsewhere.

• Third, they get tired of their frustration and lower their level of expectations, moving into the Disengaged sector.

Next, we’ll take a look at strengths and opportunities.
Survey data is organized into strengths and opportunities as another lens to help identify what is working well and what could be improved upon.

Both strengths and opportunities are not simply the top-five and bottom-five rated survey items. There is more complexity to how they are ascertained which involves an algorithm used by Hay Group to include percent favorable and comparison to all benchmark scores.

If an item is a key strength or key opportunity, it doesn’t mean action planning efforts must be focused here. This is another source of information on the whole picture of engagement for your work area.

Again, the “Valid N” column represents the number of people who provided a favorable, neutral, or unfavorable response to a question. Respondents who may have skipped questions or who answered “Don’t Know/Not Applicable” (6 on the scale) are not counted in that question.

It is important to consider the Valid N size in terms of the practical significance of the percentage favorable differences. Each item in the report will have a “valid N column” where you can see the total number of responses to an item, and typically this number will vary by survey item. In smaller units, when the percentages are significant in size it is important to consider the actual number of employees within those ranges.
(Again, the total N is your benefits eligible employees hired by August 24, 2015. If you need the official number your HR staff can provide it for you once you receive your report.)
Here we have a representation of key opportunities as another lens to help identify what could be improved upon.

As with the key strengths, any areas of weakness are not simply the bottom-five rated survey items. Hay Group uses an algorithm which includes percent favorable as well as comparison to all benchmark scores in the calculation.

If an item is a key opportunity, it doesn’t mean action planning efforts must be focused here. Again, this is another source of information on the whole picture of engagement for your work area.
This slide is repeated in today’s presentation to remind you of the University’s engagement model as we begin to look at the data for the key metric of Commitment & Dedication and the drivers that impact this first area of engagement.

The slides that follow include the employee responses to the survey questions for this key metric and for each of the five drivers in the first gold box.
Survey reports break out the key metric of Commitment and Dedication to show which specific survey items contribute to this measure and how they rate against the benchmarks.

You’ll also note that the employee group is flagged at the top right on the data slides to make it clear whether this information is for faculty or staff.

Commitment and dedication refers to an individual’s level of personal motivation and conviction in their job. When employees are committed and dedicated to their work, they care not only about the quality of their own work, but are also invested in the collective work of their group, unit, and the University. This is a defining characteristic of employee engagement, thus it is one of two key components in the University of Minnesota’s model of employee engagement. The other, as mentioned, is effective environment.

In terms of the data shown on this slide, the Valid N column shows how many people responded to each item. Also, the percentage of favorable, neutral and unfavorable responses to each survey item is the bar graph. The bar graph for the overall Commitment and Dedication in the blue highlighted row at the top is the roll-up of these four survey items. This is the same set of scores from the first row of data on the Summary of Engagement slide we walked through in terms of how to interpret and calculate the Same Unit Results for both 2013 and 2014.
If the same unit result is a positive number you will subtract it from the 2015 result (the number in the green bar) and if it is a negative number you will add it to the 2015 result. You do this because the numbers in the first two columns are positive or negative scores as compared to this year’s (2015) percent favorable score.

For example, in the first item measuring Commitment and Dedication, item number 19 – “I feel motivated to go beyond my formal job responsibilities.” In 2013, the score was 76% favorable because it is -2 (or down two) as compared to this year’s (2015) score of 74%.

However, in 2014, the score was 71% favorable because it is +3 (or up three) as compared to this year’s (2015) score of 74%.

Next, you can see how this unit’s score of 74% percent favorable responses to this item compares to each of the three benchmarks in the next columns. As you can see, this score of 74% is the same (0) as the overall college or unit’s 2015 score, and one point lower (-1) for both the total campus and the total University.

The responses for question 46 at the bottom, “Given your choice, how long would you plan to continue working at your campus?,” are represented in the report as follows: favorable is more than five years or until retirement, neutral is three to five years, and unfavorable is two years or less.

Next we will look at the responses to the survey items associated with the five key drivers of Commitment & Dedication.
With the “Clear and Promising Direction” driver of engagement, employees look for opportunities to contribute to something larger than themselves and to make a difference. Supporting faculty and staff in connecting their work to the goals of the department, college, and university is critical to creating a high level of engagement. The University of Minnesota’s mission to research, teaching and outreach should be tied to the work of every University employee. College and unit goals should directly influence and connect to the work of its faculty and staff.
The “Commitment to Excellence” driver fits with engagement in that delivering high-quality education and research is critical to the University’s success. Ensuring that employees are working together toward these common goals requires an environment that encourages and supports teamwork as well as promotes innovation and continuous improvement. Engaged faculty and staff want to contribute to the success of something greater than themselves through their work.
The “Confidence in Leaders” driver fits with engagement because the success of your work group depends largely on the quality of its leaders throughout all levels of the organization. Leaders influence how faculty and staff perceive the unit or department as a whole and play a critical role in reinforcing strategies and goals. Effective leaders deliver key messages and share important information with employees in their group in a concise, relevant, and timely manner. Employees will have high levels of engagement when they understand the work group’s strategies and goals, and are confident that leaders are capable of achieving these objectives.
The “Development Opportunities” driver fits with engagement because development is often cited in the research as one of the top drivers of engagement. Employee development includes the ongoing learning and development of skills and knowledge, including job mastery and professional development, coupled with career planning activities.

To remain motivated and productive, employees need to grow in their jobs—and eventually perhaps even grow beyond them. Given the changing nature of work, employees may need encouragement and support in reviewing and assessing their goals and the activities that support those goals. Leaders are in a position to provide valuable career coaching and feedback to help employees reach their career objectives.

Here are five things that managers should know about development opportunities and engagement:

- First, career planning and development clarifies the match between organizational and employee goals.
- Second, attention to career development helps attract and retain top talent.
- Third, development should be an integral part of the performance management process by identifying current and future development goals.
and making a plan to accomplish these.

• Fourth, development paths help align for the future of the organization.

• Finally, opportunities for promotion and lateral moves contribute to an employee’s career satisfaction, motivation, and productivity.

In summary, employees just want to be able to have the conversation with their supervisor, and don’t expect them to have all the answers. That being said, it is also the employees responsibility to seek out development opportunities and initiate these conversations with their supervisor. In fact, research shows that the most engaged, happiest, and most productive employees are proactive in owning and driving their own development.
The “Respect and Recognition” driver fits with engagement in that faculty and staff who feel respected in their workplace will show respect for their work and for the organization. When the University invests in creating the conditions that make work meaningful and rewarding for employees, and employees, in return, respect their work environment, colleagues, and the reputation of the University. Organizations that make a reciprocal commitment of respect will have faculty and staff who take a personal interest in organizational objectives.
This slide is repeated in today’s presentation to again remind you of the University’s engagement model as we begin to look at the data for the key metric of Effective Environment and the drivers that impact this second area of engagement.

The slides that follow include the employee responses to the survey questions for this key metric and each of the five drivers in the second gold box.
Effective work environment as the second of the two key metrics of employee engagement is present when employees who are exerting their best efforts in their job will thrive and continue to give their best in a work environment that supports these efforts. Without an effective work environment, there is a risk of employees becoming frustrated.

Research shows that frustrated employees typically do one of three things: 1) find innovative ways around environmental barriers and become engaged; 2) get tired of challenging environmental barriers and leave the organization; or, 3) lower their expectations and become disengaged. Paying attention to environmental factors is something that usually lies within a unit’s span of control and can pay big dividends in engaging employees.

Survey reports break out the key metric of Effective Environment to show which specific survey items contribute to this measure and how they rate against the benchmarks.

Next we will look at the responses to the survey items associated with the five key drivers of Effective Environment.
The “Authority and Empowerment” driver fits with engagement because employees with appropriate autonomy and discretion to complete their work are better able to be more productive and effective. By managing how they work, employees are also more likely to find ways to fully use their skills and abilities leading to more ideas, innovation, and increased job satisfaction.
The “Clear Expectations and Feedback” driver fits with engagement because communicating expectations and giving feedback are two of the most important parts of a leader’s job.

All employees need ongoing feedback on expectations and performance in order to continuously deliver high-quality services. Leaders who do this successfully improve the chances of high productivity and quality work for individuals, work groups, departments, colleges or units, and the University overall.

Clarity regarding goals and priorities enables excellent performance by allowing employees to focus their efforts on essential tasks. Likewise, ongoing monitoring and feedback regarding performance helps ensure that faculty and staff capabilities are optimally developed and used. It is also employees’ responsibility to ask for feedback and to integrate supervisor responses to modify performance as well as seek out training and development where and when needed in order to meet performance expectations.
The “Collaboration” driver fits with engagement in that good cooperation and teamwork help units develop better ways to get work done and react faster to changing needs. Collaborative behavior is an important skill for leaders and work groups. One way successful organizations meet and exceed their goals is by optimizing cooperation across work groups that rely on each other, which in turn leads to a number of important benefits:

- Heightened levels of morale and pride among faculty and staff, resulting from greater involvement.
- Increased efficiency by streamlining process steps and eliminating redundancies.
- More efficient and effective communication, both horizontally across work groups, and vertically up-and-down the organization.
- Better decision making through the sharing of internal best practices and experiences.
- Higher levels of service satisfaction with stakeholders (i.e., student, staff, faculty, external contacts, the public, industry leaders, etc.).
The “Support and Resources” driver fits with engagement because engaged employees who have the needed knowledge and resources are likely to meet performance expectations and perform optimally. Commitment and discretionary effort offered by engaged employees can easily be squandered if leaders are not careful to provide them with the workplace support they need to be successful in their responsibilities.

Employees can only perform at optimal levels if they have the necessary information, training, and resources (e.g., tools, technology, equipment, and supplies) required to do their jobs effectively. Employees require on-going training and development to effectively handle the changing nature of job expectations and work environments.

Well-trained employees are more likely to have and use higher levels of skill in their jobs. They are also more likely to demonstrate enthusiasm and positive attitudes towards their work, and exhibit higher levels of commitment to the organization. In assessing the training and development needs within your area, take into consideration the skills employees need to help the organization achieve its objectives.
The “Work, Structure and Process” driver fits with engagement because we continue to be challenged to do more work with fewer resources.

Universities are increasingly competing for resources as well as faculty and staff talent, and cannot afford to lose talent due to poorly designed roles, ineffective team structure, or inefficient processes.

Clear expectations, well differentiated and articulated roles, and effective processes tend to increase productivity and motivation as well as decrease frustration.

Employees closest to the work being performed often have the best ideas on how to improve work performance, and thus tapping into employee feedback will have a positive impact on operating efficiencies, service, and employee satisfaction.
Finally, three survey follow-up items were added to the survey in 2014 to provide an indication for leaders about staff perceptions on whether they had participated in a feedback session around the survey results, whether they had seen action taken on survey results, and whether they felt the results would be used constructively.

In the 2013 “Same Unit Results” column there are dashes because there is no data for that year given that the questions started in 2014. It is important to note where ever you see dashes in a report, that will indicate the data was not available, which is most often the case when trend data is not available or when the number of responses falls below the required N size of 10 or more responses.

With regards to the 2014 “Same Unit Results” because the employee engagement survey and process of sharing results and taking action was new in 2014, scores along each of these items were moderate to low for most leaders and thus were typically one to three items identified as a key opportunity.

This year, higher scores on each of these three items are likely for most leaders given that many more leaders shared results, asked for feedback and took action on the 2014 survey results.

The reason these questions are important is the tendency for engagement to decline when employees perceive their input has been ignored or discounted. Knowledge of
employees’ perceptions gives the unit another place to start in their action planning.

It is important to provide ongoing communications of progress around the steps taken to share results and take action. Often employees do not realize or forget that actions taken to improve the work environment were a direct result of the feedback provided in the survey. For this reason, it is also important to provide a summary of all actions taken to support employee engagement prior to the next survey administration.
As you work to align your survey data with your strategy, goals and objectives, the following action planning principles can guide your next steps.

Survey results are an important diagnostic tool, but are only one input necessary to fully understand faculty and staff opinions. To maximize survey effectiveness, feedback and action planning must be conducted.

Having a conversation about the survey data will help you to understand why faculty and staff feel the way they do. Through conversations around sharing results other questions or topics of importance can be raised and addressed. The real value in engagement actions comes in the discussion with employees. Thus, sharing results with faculty and staff is an important first step.

Next work with your employees to understand results and underlying issues before moving on to action. It is important to consider organizational changes over the last year as well as what events and context were surrounding the time of survey administration. Inviting your employees to understand and provide feedback on the data can help clarify and create deeper meaning to the results.

The Communications Tooklit on UM E² Employee Engagement website (z.umn.edu/engagedu) which contains sample templates for communications around sharing data and holding a feedback session with faculty and staff. Also on the website
are sample questions for individual leader reflection as well as questions to use in discussions with faculty and staff.

You can also involve faculty and staff in offering areas of priority for action that are integral to achieving the unit’s highest priorities. Faculty and staff can help you understand the context for engagement scores as well as provide ideas for appropriate solutions. Involve faculty and staff in creating and implementing solution(s) where appropriate.

Keep it simple by concentrating on one to three issues that can be executed exceptionally well and are tied to strategic priorities. Focus on issues within your control and spend time on those areas where you can have the most impact.

The most effective action plans are clear and specific, linked to business objectives, limited to a manageable number of action priorities, focused on action areas where those accountable can have an impact, and are clear in assigning accountability and follow-up.

Provide regular updates on progress. When important work is done as a result of the survey, faculty and staff may not realize these actions were based on survey feedback, and may not perceive leaders as having taken action.

As described on this slide, the goal is to collect faculty and staff feedback and determine ways that supervisors, managers, and leaders can take concrete steps to create great work environments and effective cultures. Three key questions on the slide are integral to using staff and faculty feedback and impacting engagement to achieve your greatest priorities.

1. Have you identified and celebrated strengths?
2. What are the patterns of opportunity for increased engagement?
3. Where can increased employee engagement advance your highest priorities?

As we end the presentation in talking about helpful tools and resources available to leaders, it is helpful to recognize that many leaders have concerns about communicating unfavorable results.

It is important to keep in mind that typically the best approach is to be honest and straightforward. All managers have strengths and opportunities in their areas and it is important not to get defensive or “explain away” unfavorable results. You should present a balanced picture and then ask any questions that will help clarify the reasons for the ratings. You could also probe on potential solutions to improve scores moving forward.
For most of us, feedback is not always easily received, and the idea for needed change can also be difficult, even for experienced leaders.

Leaders can unintentionally derail engagement by letting their own reactions to the data lead them to avoid taking action or to act negatively. Therefore, leaders should be aware of their own reaction to the data before sharing results with the direct reports and refining their action plan. It’s very normal for leaders to experience a range of reactions to the data, including shock, anger, resistance and acceptance.

It is most beneficial when leaders are at the point of seeking help when sharing the data with their direct reports. This can prevent the data being presented in a way that may appear defensive and ensure the leader is open to hearing possible ideas for action and potential solutions.
We hope this webinar has been helpful to you. Since survey reports will be shared over the next few months, we want to share a range of resources that are designed to support all leaders throughout the University of Minnesota system as you begin the process of reviewing data and determining next steps.

All managers who receive a report will have access to the Hay Group’s online tool called Insights to Action, or I2A. This website is where you will download your report and access to the site will be emailed to you following your unit or college’s executive presentation. The online tool has an action planning library where you can get ideas for action planning, as well as a place where you can record your action planning steps.

Also, the employee engagement website at z.umn.edu/EngagedU will have a customizable PowerPoint, which is the “Guide to Employee Engagement Survey Data and Action Planning,” that includes sample survey report slides that you can replace with your own data, as well as additional slides to guide sharing and interpreting survey data and taking action on the results.

As mentioned, today’s webinar will also be recorded and available on the website.

The HR leads and staff across all units, colleges and on each system campus are available to assist with data interpretation and action planning. There is also a network of Employee Engagement Leads who have been trained to help support and deepen the
capacity of their colleagues in their workplace to better understand and take action on survey results. The names of the Employee Engagement Lead(s) in your work area can be obtained from your HR staff and/or by emailing ee2@umn.edu

In addition, the consultants in Leadership and Talent Development are also available to answer questions, assist with action planning and be an external resource to individual units, colleges and campuses. Work with your HR staff, employee engagement lead or email ee2@umn.edu for more information on working with Leadership and Talent Development consultants.

Finally, there are a number of related development opportunities available through Leadership and Talent Development for both you, as a leader, and your direct reports. While these opportunities are not focused on engagement exclusively, they do connect strongly with the common challenges and leadership competencies which support leaders overall and in developing engagement and provide professional development for individuals across the University.

Thank you Jennifer.

Now we would like to move into the Question and Answer portion of the webinar. We will not have time to get to all of the questions but we do plan to provide written response to all questions submitted and we will post these on the Employee Engagement website at z.umn.edu/engagedU.

Let’s begin with this question...