Cabinet Meeting – Presentation of Executive Summary of 2015 Results

Goals:
1. Provide executive summary of 2015 CUCSA Engagement Survey results
2. Discuss next steps and campus outreach efforts
2015 UC Engagement Survey – Objectives and Methodology

- **Survey Objectives**
  - To understand the current state of engagement of the UC workforce
  - To identify strengths to build on and opportunities to address
  - Create actions to address issues and improve employee engagement

- **Target Population**
  - A random, stratified sample of non-represented UC staff (99s) with at least one year of service from each UC campus were invited to take the survey during the second quarter of 2015.
    
    Total non-represented population ~ 4,000.
  - Response: 1,083 staff responded from the Davis campus, School of Medicine and School of Nursing.
  - UCDHS conducts its own engagement survey using Press Ganey as vendor. 2015 survey just closed on 9/30/15.

- **Survey content**
  - Survey consisted of 37 opinion ITEMS/questions that were organized into 8 different CATEGORIES.
    
    (2012 survey contained 32 opinion ITEMS/questions organized into 8 CATEGORIES)
  - CATEGORIES included: Engagement (8 ITEMS); Career Development (5 ITEMS); Communication (2 ITEMS);
    Image/Brand (2 ITEMS); Organizational Change (3 ITEMS); Performance Management (3 ITEMS); Supervision (12 ITEMS); Working Relationships (2 ITEMS)
  - Responses to an open-ended question have not yet been provided to campuses.

- **Benchmarks**
  - Benchmarks cited in report are 1) UC Davis 2012; 2) UC Overall 2015; 3) 2014 US Universities Staff Norm;
    4) Towers Watson US National Norm
Comparative Data by Survey Category

Communication (2 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score/Norm</th>
<th>UC Davis 2015</th>
<th>UC 2015 Overall</th>
<th>2014 US University Staff Norm</th>
<th>TW US National Norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engagement (8 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score/Norm</th>
<th>UC Davis 2015</th>
<th>UC 2015 Overall</th>
<th>2014 US University Staff Norm</th>
<th>TW US National Norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supervision (12 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score/Norm</th>
<th>UC Davis 2015</th>
<th>UC 2015 Overall</th>
<th>2014 US University Staff Norm</th>
<th>TW US National Norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working Relationships (2 items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score/Norm</th>
<th>UC Davis 2015</th>
<th>UC 2015 Overall</th>
<th>2014 US University Staff Norm</th>
<th>TW US National Norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparative Data by Survey Category

Career Development (5 items)

Organizational Change (3 items)

Image/Brand (2 items)

Performance Management (3 items)

2015 UC Davis Engagement Survey Results
Summary
# 2015 Ten Items with Highest Favorable Scores

## Top 10 Favorable Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Favorable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION: I have a clear understanding of how my job contributes to the departmental objectives.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAGE/BRAND: I am proud to be associated with the UC system.</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGEMENT: My work schedule allows sufficient flexibility to meet my personal/family needs.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION: My supervisor treats me with respect.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGEMENT: I feel motivated to go beyond my formal job responsibilities to get the job done.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGEMENT: I would recommend the UC system as a good place to work.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORKING RELATIONSHIPS: There is good cooperation between staff in my department.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER DEVELOPMENT: I believe I have the opportunity for personal development and growth within the UC system.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION: Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your supervisor. Encourages new ideas and new ways of doing things.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: I think my performance on the job is evaluated fairly.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-point Likert scale:
1, 2 = Unfavorable
3 = Neutral
4, 5 = Favorable
# 2015 Ten Items with the Lowest Favorable Scores

**DAVIS [W] (N=1,083)**

## Bottom 10 Favorable Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Total Favorable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Total Unfavorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: Generally, recent major organizational changes across the UC system have been: Executed well</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: I feel my campus/location does a good job matching pay to performance.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: Generally, recent major organizational changes across the UC system have been: Explained well</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: Generally, recent major organizational changes across the UC system have been: Planned well</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER DEVELOPMENT: My campus/location is doing a good job of planning for management succession.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION: Please indicate the extent to which you agree with the following statements about your supervisor: Effectively deals with poor performers</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGAGEMENT: There is usually sufficient staff in my department to handle the workload.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT: I feel my personal contributions are recognized.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER DEVELOPMENT: My campus/location provides people with the necessary information and resources to manage their own careers effectively.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERVISION: My supervisor develops people’s abilities.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-point Likert scale:
1, 2 = Unfavorable
3 = Neutral
4, 5 = Favorable
Sustainably Engaging UC’s Workforce

- Sustainable Engagement at UC is...
  - The intensity of employees’ connection to UC, marked by a commitment to UC and inspiration to do one’s best work (being engaged) in environments that support productivity (being enabled) and maintain personal well-being (feeling energized)

**Traditionally Engaged**
- I feel motivated to go beyond my formal job responsibilities to get the job done.
- UC inspires me to do my best work.
- I would recommend UC as a good place to work.

**Enabled**
- I am satisfied with my involvement in decisions that affect my work.
- I have the equipment /tools /resources I need to do my job effectively.

**Energized**
- There is usually sufficient staff in my department to handle the workload.
- My work schedule allows sufficient flexibility to meet my personal/family needs.

The truly engaged UC employee wants to stay with the organization, so a retention item is also included in the index: *At the present time, are you seriously considering leaving UC?*
### UC Davis Progress on Items Related to Engagement
Comparison between 2015 and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainable Engagement Sub-Indices</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>2015 Total Favorable</th>
<th>2012 Total Favorable</th>
<th>Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Engaged</td>
<td>3. I feel motivated to go beyond my formal job responsibilities to get the job done.</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Engaged</td>
<td>11. UC inspires me to do my best work.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>+ 10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabled</td>
<td>15. I am satisfied with my involvement in decisions that affect my work.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enabled</td>
<td>19. I have the equipment/tools/resources I need to do my job effectively.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energized</td>
<td>21. There is usually sufficient staff in my department to handle the workload.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+ 8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energized</td>
<td>23. My work schedule allows sufficient flexibility to meet my personal/family needs.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditionally Engaged</td>
<td>25. I would recommend UC as a good place to work.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>+ 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>29. At the present time, are you seriously considering leaving UC?</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates a statistically significant difference
Items that Reflect the *Key Drivers of Engagement* as identified by Towers Watson
Comparison between 2015 and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total Favorable 2015</th>
<th>Total Favorable 2012</th>
<th>Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>14. I am confident I can achieve my personal career objectives within the UC system.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>+ 5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>18. My campus/location is doing a good job of planning for management succession.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+ 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>6. I feel my personal contributions are recognized.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>- 8*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Management</td>
<td>16. I feel my campus/location does a good job matching pay to performance.**</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+ 5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>10. I feel able to openly and honestly communicate my views to my supervisor and other leaders.***</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>+ 13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>23. My campus/location does an excellent job of keeping employees informed about matters affecting us.****</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates a statistically significant difference

**Slightly different statement in 2012, “I feel UC does a good job matching pay to performance.”

***Slightly different statement in 2012, “I feel able to openly and honestly communicate my views upwards.”

****Slightly different statement in 2012, “UC does an excellent job keeping employees informed about matters affecting us.”
### Items that Reflect the *Key Drivers of Retention* as identified by Towers Watson Comparison between 2015 and 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Total Favorable 2015</th>
<th>Total Favorable 2012</th>
<th>Differential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>14. I am confident I can achieve my personal career objectives within the UC system.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>+ 5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Development</td>
<td>18. My campus/location is doing a good job of planning for management succession.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>+ 4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>27. Regarding suggestions for change from employees, my supervisor is usually responsive.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>- 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>26. I have a clear understanding of how my job contributes to the departmental objectives.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>+ 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indicates a statistically significant difference
2015 UC Davis Strengths

2015 Strengths on which to build with favorable scores above 70%:

• Supervisor relationships
  • 83% of employees feel respected by their supervisors, though the 2015 score for this item is 4% lower than 2012 (pg. 47 full report)
  • Over 70% of supervisors are open to suggestions and new ways of doing things (pg. 48, 49 full report)
  • Over 70% of supervisors listen to different points of view; communicate effectively and are responsive (pg. 48, 49 full report)

• Alignment
  • 88% of participants understand how their work aligns with departmental objectives (pg. 49 full report)

• Motivation
  • 83% of participants are motivated to go above and beyond job responsibilities to ensure work is done (pg. 29 full report)
  • 85% of participants are proud to be associated with the UC System (pg. 36 full report)

• Work-Life Balance
  • 84% of participants are allowed flexibility in their work schedule to meet personal/family needs (pg. 30 full report)
2015 UC Davis Opportunities for Improvement

2015 Opportunities for Improvement with favorable scores generally below 50%*:

- **Succession Planning & Workload**
  - Although succession planning scores improved in 2015, only one third of participants believe that we are effectively planning for management succession (pg. 20 full report)
  - While workload scores improved by 8%, less than half of participants believe there is sufficient staff to handle workload (pg. 30 full report)

- **Rewards and Recognition**
  - Only 56% of participants believe their personal contributions are recognized - 8% lower than 2012 (pg. 43 full report).
  - Over half of participants do not believe that campus does a good job matching pay to performance though this score improved by 6% in 2015 (pg. 43 full report)

- **Managing Change**
  - Less than one third of participants view change management efforts favorably (pg. 41 full report)
  - Davis scores are considerably below national norms in organizational change and there is a statistically significant difference in favorable and unfavorable scores between UC Davis and UC Overall (pg. 14 full report)
  - Unfavorable attitudes toward managing organizational change cross all demographics

- **Communication**
  - 68% of participants viewed overall communication favorably, however campus leadership sees opportunities for significant improvement in this area
Recommended Actions to Address 2015 Opportunities for Improvement
(additional actions to be determined in collaboration with UC Davis Staff Assembly and campus leadership)

• Supervisory Training
  • Increase accountability for all UC Davis supervisors to complete required supervisory training

• Rewards and Recognition
  • Improve performance management processes (Task Force preparing recommendations by 12/31/15)
  • Conduct quarterly performance reviews to ensure a culture of proactive performance management
  • Educate campus managers, supervisors and employees on Total Compensation, including pay-for-performance, equity programs and employee recognition programs

• Managing Change
  • Consider change impact for system and campus change initiatives
  • Utilize structured approaches to manage change that includes communication, training and coaching, tools to mitigate resistance to change.

• Communication
  • Utilize Staff Assembly communications focus group data to identify common gaps and develop recommended solutions for implementation
  • Diversity communication tools and strategies

• Succession Planning & Workload
  • Analyze current workforce to determine greatest risk populations
  • Develop a robust succession planning tool and metrics (pilot in VC-CFO division)
RECAP: 2012 Post-survey Follow-up

• Upon receipt of the survey results:
  • Human Resources presented findings to CoDVC with support from project vendor Towers Watson
  • HR, Chancellor’s Office, and Towers Watson conducted employee town hall meetings
  • Articles appeared in Dateline
  • Action plans were created in a collaboration between Human Resources and Staff Assembly

• QUESTION: What steps should we take with respect to 2015 survey results?
  • Scheduled for CODVC discussion 10/27/15
  • HR will lead but need campus leaders and managers to lead change
RECAP: Actions Taken to Address 2012 Opportunities for Improvement

• HR collaborated with three Staff Assembly committees to analyze the highest priorities identified by Staff Assembly leadership. Key actions as follows.

  • Committee #1 - Career Development (category score improved by 3%)
    • Launched a Career Development Resources Showcase: March 31, 2015. Discussions are underway for a similar event with Staff Assembly at the Health System.
    • HR Communications is supporting production of an event promotional video using staff testimonials touting the success of staff development resources already available.
    • Career Development News: Since June 2014, the Talent Management Director has been authoring a monthly column “Career Development Corner” in the Staff Assembly newsletter.
    • Supervisory Development: “Developing as a Supervisor” series is required for new-to-role supervisors and offered at Health System and Davis campus locations
    • Mentoring Activities: focus groups, survey, articles, upcoming presentation at ADMAN conference on “Mentoring Matters,” Developed Mentoring Toolkit; launching group program in fall 2015
    • Competed second successful year of the Administrative Officers for the Future Program
    • Deployed Career Catalyst Series
    • Deployed Career Management Toolkit
    • Improved Career Counseling
    • Deployed updated Individual Development Plan (IDP) tool
RECAP: Actions Taken to Address 2012 Opportunities for Improvement

• Committee #2 - Workload/Retention (workload item score improved by 8%; retention item score improved by 1%)
  • Reclassification and equity adjustment procedures were made available on the HR compensation webpage
  • HR and IET working in partnership to address technology gaps and potential solutions
  • Organizational Excellence conducting business process reviews in context of current projects; providing education and assistance in LEAN business process improvement methodologies; providing education and assistance in change management strategies and methodologies

• Committee #3 – Communication (category score improved by 7%)
  • HR identified and contracted with external consultants skilled in focus group facilitation
  • Staff Assembly, with the support of the Chancellor, worked with consultants to conduct focus groups to identify common gaps in campus communications and recommended solutions – project completion expected by September 2015