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The purpose of this report is to provide employee derived baseline data from which FSU can use to improve the institution. On May 10, 2004, over two-thirds of all full-time employees completed the Campus Quality Survey (CQS) during the FSU Year-End Celebration held in the cafeteria of the Rudolph Jones Student Center. This report is based on 403 of 600 employees at FSU. This 67.2 percent response rate is considered a valid representation of most campus employees. Summary information provided here is no substitute for examining the full 50-page report with its accompanying comments and suggestions from nearly 100 employees that is available in the Office of Academic Programs, Planning and Assessment. This is the first time the CQS has been administered at FSU. The full report was produced by the consulting group, Performance Horizons.

Within the CQS, employees were offered up to 95 statements related to current issues and practices at FSU. Fifty of the items are categorized in eight areas following the Malcolm Baldrige Presidential Award Quality Criteria (used in US government agencies). The survey gives three different scores for the 50 items: (1) how it is now, (2) how it should be, and (3) performance gaps (this reflects the difference between how it is now and how it should be). It is recommended that the “performance gap” category be used in determining where to put emphasis in FSU quality efforts and that immediate action be taken to exploit these findings. Faculty and staff were also given 30 statements from which to assess programs, services and activities; two statements regarding overall satisfaction and impression; two demographic statements; and one statement regarding campus-sponsored training received. A section allowing up to 10 additional questions generated by FSU was provided with results shown as the last page of the sample survey included at the end of this report. This report is organized into seven parts:

I. Overall Ratings of Quality and Job Satisfaction
II. Performance Gaps for Survey Items
III. Performance Gaps for the Eight Quality Categories
IV. National Norm Summary Analyses
V. Assessment of Programs, Services and Activities
VI. Recommendations for Usage of Results
VII. Appendices A1 to A8

I. Overall Ratings of Quality and Job Satisfaction:
Impressions of quality service and levels of satisfaction are a clear and present challenge at FSU. Results from the CQS demonstrate that 51% of respondents rated their overall impression of quality at FSU as “excellent” (11%) or “good” (40%) on a five-point scale from excellent to inadequate. When asked about their level of job satisfaction, a similar percent (or 52%) said they are “very satisfied” (41%) or “satisfied” (11%). Employees used a five-point scale (1=low satisfaction to 5=high satisfaction) to indicate “How it is Now” at FSU. The employee groups from among the 403 respondents included 145 support/classified staff, 140 faculty, 13 department chairs, and 93 administrators (12 employees left this blank).
II. Performance Gaps for Survey Items (see Appendices A-1 to A-3):
Five Smallest Performance Gaps (i.e., items listed in order which are best meeting expectations of FSU employees):

1. Admissions standards at this institution are too low and should be raised (see Customized FSU Question, Q89). [Gap=.51]
2. I know what is expected of me (see CQS Question Q38). [Gap=.83]
3. The Chancellor communicates satisfactorily with faculty, administrators, and staff (see Customized FSU Question, Q84). [Gap=.88]
4. This institution has user friendly computer systems to assist employees and students (see CQS Question Q10). [Gap=.89]
5. I have a good understanding of the goals and objectives within my own department or unit (see Customized FSU Question, Q82). [Gap=.96]

Five Largest Performance Gaps (i.e., items listed in order which are least meeting expectations of FSU employees):

1. There are effective lines of communication between departments (see CQS Question Q27). [Gap=2.01]
2. Employees are rewarded for outstanding job performance (see CQS Question Q26). [Gap=1.97]
3. Employees are empowered to resolving problems quickly (see CQS Question Q19). [Gap=1.78]
4. This institution analyzes complaints to determine appropriate remedial actions (see CQS Question Q14). [Gap=1.73]
5. There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation in this organization (see CQS Question Q37). [Gap=1.73]

III. Performance Gaps for Eight Quality Categories (see Appendix A-4):
Four Smallest Performance Gaps (i.e., items listed in order which are best meeting expectations of FSU employees):

1. Quality Assurance [Gap=1.38]
2. Measurement and Analysis [Gap=1.38]
3. Customer Focus [Gap=1.39]
4. Quality and Productivity Improvement Results [1.45]

Four Largest Performance Gaps (i.e., items listed in order which are least meeting expectations of FSU employees):

1. Employee Training and Recognition [Gap=1.67]
2. Top Management Leadership and Support [Gap=1.51]
3. Employee Empowerment and Teamwork [Gap=1.49]
4. Strategic Quality Planning [Gap=1.49]
IV. National Norms Summary Analysis (see Appendices A-5 and A-6):
The summary charts shown in the full report from Performance Horizons reveal the following information regarding how FSU stacked up with other colleges in the data bank:

1. FSU average overall ratings in the category “How It Should Be” are higher in all eight quality categories than the average ratings of all other institutions in the data bank (refer to full report, pgs 3-9 and 3-10).
2. In the category of “How It Is Now,” FSU overall average ratings are lower than the average ratings of all other institutions in the data bank in all eight quality categories (refer to full report, pgs 3-11 and 3-12).
3. When comparing FSU composite “How It Is Now” average ratings with those of four-year institutions in the data bank, FSU ratings are lower in all eight categories as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality Categories</th>
<th>Four-Year College Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measurement and Analysis</td>
<td>-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
<td>-108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Training and Recognition</td>
<td>-156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Quality Planning</td>
<td>-163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Mgt Leadership and Support</td>
<td>-188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality and Productivity Improvement</td>
<td>-193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Focus</td>
<td>-209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Empowerment and Teamwork</td>
<td>-198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. Assessment of 30 Programs, Services, and Activities (see App. A-7)

TOP 5:
Employees responsible for the five service areas receiving the highest ratings are to commended for their commitment to providing quality customer service to students and employees. There services were, in order:

1. Maintenance and custodial services
2. Cafeteria and food services
3. Library and learning resources
4. Affirmative action
5. Computer information systems and services

BOTTOM 5:

1. Parking for faculty and staff
2. Communication with other departments
3. Research and planning services
4. Budget planning and coordination
5. Marketing, advertising, and public relations
VI. Recommendations for Usage of Results

Performance Horizons’ Consulting Group commended the FSU administration, faculty and staff for its desire to use these data for charting the future of the university. This is the first time the Campus Quality Survey has been used at FSU (see Appendix A-8 for sample CQS and FSU customized questions). Both positive and negative factors revealed by the findings provide much opportunity for analysis, reflection, and action. The CQS provides a snapshot of our employee perceptions at a given time. Recommendations found below are based on a comprehensive analysis of the following: performance gaps in survey items as well as in the eight Presidential Award for Quality categories; ratings of programs, services, and activities; employee satisfaction and quality impression ratings; customized question responses; national comparisons; and employee comments and suggestions.

1. Publicly commend the top five programs, services, and activities that received the highest overall ratings.
2. Since Employee Training and Recognition was identified as the Quality category needing the greatest attention, appoint a study team and hold focus group sessions with personnel at all levels to review professional development and recognition programs for faculty, staff, and administration.
3. 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.
4. Since communication (item 27) demonstrated the largest performance gap of any survey item, it should be considered among the highest priority areas of FSUs’ quality improvement process. To remedy this, appoint a cross-functional team to study the processes related to communication between departments.
5. Share survey results with all employees as a means of affirming that their input has been valued. This also allows them to see how FSU as a whole has or will respond to results.
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