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This is the second year in a row that FSU has administered the Campus Quality Survey of Employees. Results this year indicate that relative to 2004 improvements have been made in all eight quality categories representing significant components of a quality management system identified in the Presidential Award for Quality, comparable to the Baldrige Award criteria. In addition, employees are more satisfied and have a more positive overall impression of FSU in 2005. And employee training has accelerated. During this academic year, 72% attended training or professional development activities compared to only 58% in 2004. These are but a few of the highlights in this report.

The purpose of this report is to provide employee derived data from which FSU can use to improve the institution. During April 2005, 401 of all 717 permanent employees completed the Campus Quality Survey (CQS). Last year’s response rate was 67%. The 2005 response rate of 56 percent, while somewhat lower, 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. 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 A9
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 60% of respondents rated their overall impression of quality at FSU as “excellent” (12%) or “good” (48%) on a five-point scale from excellent to inadequate. When asked about their level of job satisfaction, a similar percent (or 60%) said they are “very satisfied” (19%) or “satisfied” (41%). Results in both areas showed nearly a 10% increase in improvement over 2004. 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 401 respondents included 172 support/classified staff, 95 faculty, 11 department chairs, and 110 administrators (13 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=.43]
2. I know what is expected of me (see CQS Question Q38). [Gap=.57]
3. This institution has user friendly computer systems to assist employees and students (see CQS Question Q10). [Gap=.59]
4. I have a good understanding of the goals and objectives within my own department or unit (see Customized FSU Question, Q82). [Gap=.68]
5. Our services to students are “user-friendly” see CQS Question Q39). [Gap=.75].

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

Compared to 2004, these areas are all improving but as shown in 2005 they still least meet expectations.

1. There are effective lines of communication between departments (see CQS Question Q27). [Gap=1.8]
2. Employees are rewarded for outstanding job performance (see CQS Question Q26). [Gap=1.77]
3. There is a spirit of teamwork and cooperation in this organization (see CQS Question 37). [Gap=1.52].
4. This institution analyzes complaints to determine appropriate remedial actions (see CQS Question Q14). [Gap=1.49]
5. Administrators recognize faculty and staff when they do a good job (see CQS Question Q31). [Gap=1.47].
III. Performance Gaps for Eight Quality Categories (see Appendix A-4):

FSU quality ratings in 2004 compared to 2005 demonstrated improvements in all eight components of a quality management system identified in the Presidential Award for Quality criterion.

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

1. Quality Assurance [Gap=1.09]
2. Customer Focus [Gap=1.10]
4. Strategic Quality Planning [Gap=1.18]

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

1. Employee Training and Recognition [Gap=1.36]
2. Top Management Leadership and Support [Gap=1.26]
3. Employee Empowerment and Teamwork [Gap=1.24]
4. Quality and Productivity Improvement Results [Gap=1.18]

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:

FSU average overall ratings in the category “How It Should Be” are lower 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). This means that relative to all institutions in the database, expectations for an effective management system are lower at FSU.

In the category of “How It Is Now,” FSU overall average ratings are higher than the average ratings of all other institutions in the data bank in all quality categories except “Top Management Leadership and Support” (FSU = 3.34 vs. All Colleges = 3.36) (refer to full report, pgs 3-11 and 3-12). This means that relative to all institutions in the database, perceptions of how things are now in terms of a quality management system are higher at FSU in seven of eight areas.

When comparing FSU composite “How It Is Now” average ratings with those of four-year institutions in the data bank, FSU ratings are higher in all eight categories as shown below. This means that relative to all four-year colleges in the data bank, perceptions of how things are now in terms of a quality management system are higher at FSU.
V. Assessment of 30 Programs, Services, and Activities (see App. A-7)

NOTE: Areas marked with an asterisk (*) were among the top/bottom three in 2004 as well.

TOP 3:
Employees responsible for the three service areas receiving the highest ratings are to be commended for their commitment to providing quality customer service to students and employees. These services were, in order:

1. Maintenance and custodial services*
2. Computer information systems and services*
3. Library and learning resources*

BOTTOM 3:

1. Parking for faculty and staff*
2. Communication with other departments*
3. Budget planning and coordination*
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 second time the Campus Quality Survey has been used at FSU (see Appendix A-9 for sample CQS). 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 two years in a row 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. Note, however, that this item showed marked improvement over 2004.

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.

   Publicize widely the fact that relative to all institutions in the database, as well as the specific subset of four-year institutions, FSU rated higher in perceptions of its quality management system.

7. FSU quality ratings in 2004 compared to 2005 demonstrated marked improvement in all eight quality management categories identified in the Presidential Award for Quality criteria.