

**University of Michigan-Flint
Vice Chancellor for Administration
Employee Satisfaction Survey
November, 2008**

Executive Summary

The 2008 Employee Satisfaction Survey was designed based on similar studies conducted in 1998 and 2005 as a critical component of the VCA's assessment program which includes customer surveys, external benchmarking and regular assessments of employee satisfaction. Data from the previous studies were used in comparison to the data collected in the 2008 survey. As they were in the past, the questions used in the 2008 Employee Satisfaction Survey were designed to ascertain the *importance of* and *satisfaction with* an assortment of items specific to the University and even more specifically to the VCA staff participating as the respondents.

The surveys from 1998, 2005, and 2008 all found that campus safety was considered an area of both great importance and increased satisfaction. Additionally, salary, health care, and retirement benefits showed increases in both importance and satisfaction in the 2008 survey.

Areas which demonstrated consistently low satisfaction ratings were typically associated with communication relative to procedures and policies. Included in these items were policies for performance evaluation, grievances, and career advancements. A lack of communication between departments and offices was also ranked low in terms of satisfaction. The ability to provide input in decision-making, opportunities for professional development, and opportunities to communicate with the VCA were also areas where improvement would be welcomed by the VCA staff.

Overall, comparisons between 1998, 2005, 2008 demonstrated a significant improvement in satisfaction in several areas, matched by fairly consistent rankings of importance. Evaluating specific items in the survey should ultimately allow the VCA leadership team to determine which areas require more attention and offer opportunity for improvement.

Methodology

To measure employee satisfaction and to determine the areas upon which employees place the highest premium, a survey was conducted in the Fall of 2008; led by the efforts of the VCA Steering Committee. The 93-question survey instrument (Appendix A) was electronically disseminated to the entire VCA persons; comprised of 126 staff. Fifty-nine surveys were completed and returned; yielding a 47% response rate.

The distribution and rate of returns by department are as followed:

Table 1: Distribution and Response Rates

Department	Surveys Distributed	Surveys returned	Response Rate
Auxiliary and Recreational Services	15	11	73.3%
Environment Health and Safety	2	2	100.0%
Facilities Management	50	11	22.0%
Financial Services	15	13	86.7%
Human Resources	7	7	100.0%
Public Safety	30	5	16.7%
Purchasing	4	1	25.0%
Office of the Vice Chancellor of Administration	3	1	33.3%
No Department Selected	0	8	-
Totals	126	59	46.8%

Survey instrumentation

The questions used in the 2008 survey were predominately similar to those used in the previous studies from 1998 and 2005. It should be noted however, that several categorical items in the 2008 instrument were either semantically amended (i.e. changing the term “unbiased” to “fair and equitable”) or were newly added to reflect changes in the University’s environment (i.e. assessing satisfaction with the University’s dining services). In the case of the newly added items, it is not possible to offer any comparative analysis to the previous studies (as the data from the 2008 study are separately analyzed, these areas will discussed in more detail). Nevertheless, most items in the survey remained fairly consistent over the years.

Also consistent were the response options used the survey. The following Likert scales were used in rating each item:

Importance

- (1) Very Unimportant
- (2) Unimportant
- (3) Neutral
- (4) Important
- (5) Very Important
- (6) Does Not Apply

Satisfaction

- (1) Very Dissatisfied
- (2) Dissatisfied
- (3) Neutral
- (4) Satisfied
- (5) Very Satisfied
- (6) Does Not Apply

As higher ratings translate into greater importance and satisfaction with each item, “Does Not Apply” options were excluded from the final analysis to preclude any erroneous calculations of the data.

Findings

The data collected from the 1998 survey created a reference point from which data collected in other studies can be compared. Data from both 2005 and, most recently, 2008 were used in a series of comparative analyses found in this report.

Importance (by category):

Some key data relative to *Importance* from the 2008 are consistent with those collected in the 1998 and 2005 surveys. “Security and Safety” and “Campus Support Services” remain as the two most important aspects of the VCA division; at 4.89 and 4.63 respectively. “Influences on your decision to work at UM-Flint”, “Effectiveness of Dept./Offices”, and “Institutional Effectiveness” were all consistently ranked at the bottom in terms of importance each year, though each area recorded high levels of importance as well.

Interestingly, only one category “Security and Safety” increased in mean importance from 2005 to 2008; with a minimal increase of 0.04 points. Of course, given how important this category has traditionally been, the data suggest this should remain an area of priority for the VCA unit. This category joins only “Campus Climate” as areas for which importance has increased over a *ten-year* period (“Campus Climate” has a ten-year increase in importance; though even its importance actually saw a decrease from 2005 to 2008).

It is also important to note that “Campus Climate” – once considered one of the *least important* aspects in the 1998 study (ranked fifth out of six categories) – has continued an upward trend toward *greater* importance (ranked third in both 2005 and 2008). Structural and organizational changes at the University were likely contributors to this increase.

Table 2: Comparison between 1998, 2005, and 2008 Importance Ratings (by group)

Category	Mean Importance (1998)	Mean Importance (2005)	Mean Importance (2008)	Difference (2005-2008)	Difference (1998-2008)
Security and Safety	4.87	4.85	4.89	0.04	0.02
Campus support services	4.66	4.66	4.63	-0.03	-0.03
Influences on your decision to work @ UM-Flint	4.58	4.54	4.44	-0.10	-0.14
Effectiveness of Dept./Offices	4.57	4.59	4.30	-0.30	-0.28
Campus Climate	4.38	4.62	4.52	-0.10	0.14
Institutional Effectiveness	4.37	4.41	4.36	-0.05	-0.01

Satisfaction (by category):

As in previous years, the data show employee satisfaction ratings were lower than the employees' perceived importance in each of the categorical areas of assessment. However, there were two critical findings worth discussing: (1) an increase in the levels of satisfaction in *each* category over the years and (2) a significant decrease in the Importance/Satisfaction gap resulting from those much improved satisfaction ratings. Though the importance of each category (and individual items within each category) varied from year to year, satisfaction levels showed consistent improvement each time this study was administered. Particularly, "Institutional Effectiveness" showed a dramatic increase in satisfaction over the years; averaging a satisfaction mean of 3.01 in 1998 and increasing 0.77 points by 2008. Closely mirroring that 1998-2008 increase in satisfaction is "Security and Safety"; increasing by 0.73 points. "Campus Support Services"- which recorded the highest mean satisfaction in the 2008 survey - ranked third over a ten-year period, increasing by 0.68 points.

Though not having as significant of a *ten-year* increase in satisfaction, "Influences on [VCA employees'] decision to work at UM-Flint" boasted the highest satisfaction increase from 2005 to 2008. Its 0.27 point increase tops the other categories by almost double, with "Institutional Effectiveness" next with a 0.16 increase. However, even when "Influences..." and "Institutional Effectiveness" recorded the highest increases in satisfaction levels since 2005, their mean scores (at 4.01 and 3.78 respectively) are still considerably lower than all the other categories. This suggests that while improvements have been made in these areas over the past three years (evidenced by the very positive ratings), more work is required for satisfaction in these areas to match or exceed the levels in other areas.

Table 3: Comparison between 1998, 2005, and 2008 Satisfaction Ratings (by group)

Category	Mean Satisfaction (1998)	Mean Satisfaction (2005)	Mean Satisfaction (2008)	Difference (2005-2008)	Difference (1998-2008)
Security and Safety	3.82	4.51	4.55	0.04	0.73
Campus support services	3.88	4.44	4.57	0.13	0.68
Influences on your decision to work @ UM-Flint	3.43	3.74	4.01	0.27	0.58
Effectiveness of Dept./Offices	3.58	4.05	4.14	0.09	0.56
Campus Climate	3.50	3.99	4.10	0.11	0.60
Institutional Effectiveness	3.01	3.62	3.78	0.16	0.77

As previously stated, “Campus Support Services” also showed a *significant* increase in satisfaction over the years. But what makes this category especially noteworthy is how in 2008, there was a virtual tie in the level of importance and satisfaction (see **Table 3**). With a -0.06 difference between the aggregate importance and satisfaction means, this ratings in this category stand out from the others. No other areas measure a gap of anything greater than -0.10; where “Effectiveness of Department/Offices” recorded an Importance/Satisfaction gap of -0.16.

Table 4: Comparison of Categories from 1998, 2005, & 2008 (1998 as the point of reference)

Category	1998 Rank	Mean Importance (1998)	Mean Satisfaction (1998)	Gap (1998)	2005 Rank	Mean Importance (2005)	Mean Satisfaction (2005)	Gap (2005)	2008 Rank	Mean Importance (2008)	Mean Satisfaction (2008)	Gap (2008)	Gap difference (2005-2008)	Gap difference (1998-2008)
Security and Safety	1	4.87	3.82	-1.05	1	4.85	4.51	-0.34	1	4.89	4.55	-0.35	0.00	-0.71
Campus support services	2	4.66	3.88	-0.78	2	4.66	4.44	-0.22	2	4.63	4.57	-0.06	-0.16	-0.72
Influences on your decision to work @ UM-Flint	3	4.58	3.43	-1.15	5	4.54	3.74	-0.80	4	4.44	4.01	-0.43	-0.37	-0.72
Effectiveness of Dept./Offices	4	4.57	3.58	-0.99	4	4.59	4.05	-0.54	6	4.30	4.14	-0.16	-0.38	-0.83
Campus Climate	5	4.38	3.50	-0.88	3	4.62	3.99	-0.63	3	4.52	4.10	-0.42	-0.21	-0.46
Institutional Effectiveness	6	4.37	3.01	-1.36	6	4.41	3.62	-0.79	5	4.36	3.78	-0.58	-0.21	-0.78

Importance (by item)

When assessing the most important individual items, the top five items (“Safe Campus”, “Safe Office”, “Quick Response of Security Staff” and “Well-lighted parking lots”) consistently rank the highest in terms of their average means. These data suggest that VCA employees place the highest premium on their safety and well-being. After safety, items of importance shuffle each year in their rankings. The highest *non-safety related* item ranked in the 2008 survey “Good Staff/Administration Relationship” showed an increase in priority from 1998 (then ranked 10) to 2008 (ranked fifth). The items generally considered *least important* by the VCA staff are “Institutional recognition of [their] efforts”, “Healthy food options”, “Flexible work schedule”, “Dining services”, and “Discussion of issues facilitated by the structure of Staff Council.”

In addition to these items, other significant changes in rankings from **1998 to 2008** relative to *Importance* include the following:

- “Helpful orientation services for new staff” *increased* in ranking from 31st in 1998 to 10th in 2008.
- “Clearly stated procedures for performance evaluation” showed an *increase* in ranking from 39th in 1998 to 19th in 2008
- “Appropriateness of workload” showed a significant *decrease* in ranking from 15th in 1998 to only 33rd in 2008.
- The importance of “Racial Harmony” *increased* in ranking from 24th in 1998 to 8th in 2008.
- “Employment opportunities for disabled people” *increased* from being ranked 41st in 1998 to being ranked 26th in 2008
- The importance of a “Manageable workload” *decreased* in ranking; falling from 14th in 1998 to 25th in 2008.
- Both “Salary” and “Health care benefits” *decreased* by fourteen ranking points in ten years (“Salary”: from 13th to 23rd and “Health care...”: from 21st to 35th)
- “Prospect of promotion” *decreased* from 1998-2008; falling from 28th to 41st over ten years.

When examining the ranking changes of *Importance* from **2005 to 2008**, the following items are most notable:

- “Health care benefits” *decreased* in ranking; from 15th in 2005 to 35th in 2008.
- “Retirement benefits” also saw a sharp *decrease* in Importance rankings; falling from 6th in 2005 to 22nd in 2008.
- “Manageable workload” *decreased* in importance; falling from 11th in 2005 to 25th in 2008.
- Importance for both “Adequate communication regarding campus events” and “Employment opportunities for under-represented groups” both decreased by ten rankings from 2005-2008 (“Adequate...” dropped from 11th in 2005 to 21st in 2008;

“Employment...under-represented groups” dropped from 22nd to 32nd in that same time span.)

- “Clear communication among depts./offices” is on the rise in terms of importance. From 2005 to 2008, importance rankings rose from 21st to 9th.
- “VCA leadership [being] approachable” was less important in 2008 as it was in 2005; *decreasing* from 5th in 2005 to 15th in 2008.
- “Clearly stated procedures for performance evaluations” *increased* in importance rankings; jumping from 35th in 2005 to 19th in 2008.
- The importance of “racial harmony” also increased from 2005 to 2008; from being ranked 23rd to 8th.

The complete list of Importance rankings is found in **Table 5**.

Table 5: 2008 Importance Rankings by item (Compared to both 1998 and 2005)¹

Item	1998	2005	2008
Safe campus	1	2	1
Quick response of security staff	4	1	2
Safe office	3	3	2
Well-lighted parking lots	2	4	2
Good staff/admin relationship	10	10	5
Adequate technical support for computers in my work area	7	7	6
Good staff/faculty relationship	11	18	7
Racial harmony on campus	24	23	8
Clear communication among departments/offices	17	21	9
Helpful orientation services for new staff	31	11	10
Opportunities for long term employment	9	15	11
Well maintained campus	18	9	12
Fair and equitable** personnel policies	20	19	13
Support from my supervisor*	6	13	14
VCA leadership*** is approachable	22	5	15
Motivation to put forth my best effort	8	13	16
Fair and equitable** policies/procedures for advancement	13	21	17
Type of position	n/a	n/a	17
Clearly stated procedures for performance evaluation	39	35	19
Clearly stated work responsibilities	23	19	19
Adequate mail service	19	29	21
Retirement benefits	12	6	22
Clearly stated personnel policies	29	24	23
Freedom of expression	25	26	24
Manageable workload	14	11	25
Adequate communication regarding campus events	26	15	26
Employment opportunities for disabled individuals	41	33	26
Opportunities for staff input in administrative decision making	35	28	26
Responsible allocation of UM-Flint resources	30	36	26
Salary	16	27	30
Clearly stated policies/procedures for advancement	27	31	31
Internal customer service within VCA	n/a	n/a	32
Employment opportunities for women	40	34	33
Appropriateness of workload	15	30	33
Health care benefits	21	15	35
Opportunities for communication with VCA	38	40	36
Clearly stated staff disciplinary procedures	36	37	37
Professional development opportunities	34	37	38
Clearly stated grievance procedures	37	40	39
Employment opportunities for under-represented groups	42	31	40
Prospect of promotion	28	42	41
Institutional recognition of my contribution	33	39	42
Healthy food options	n/a	n/a	43
Flexible work schedule	n/a	n/a	44
Dining services	n/a	n/a	45
Discussion of issues is facilitated by the structure of staff council	43	43	46

¹ In this table, individual *Importance* rankings for the 1998 and 2005 data were taken directly from the 2005 VCA Employee Satisfaction Survey.

Satisfaction (by item)

Similar to *Importance*, analysis of the mean *Satisfaction* scores reveal high rankings for items most germane to security. Consistently ranked in the top five in terms of *Satisfaction* rankings are “Safe campus”, “Safe office”, and “Quick response of security staff².” Non-security issues also included in the top five include “Adequate mail service” (sharing the top spot with “Safe Campus” receiving the highest *Satisfaction* ratings), “Retirement benefits”, and “Well maintained campus”. On average, staff were *least satisfied* with “Institutional recognition of [their] contribution”, “Clearly stated policies/procedures for advancement”, “Discussion of issues facilitated by the structure of staff council”, “Prospect of promotion”, and “Opportunities for staff input in administrative decision making.”

In addition to these items, other significant changes in rankings from **1998 to 2008** relative to *Satisfaction* include the following:

- “Adequate technical support...” showed a *remarkable increase* from 1998 to 2008; with satisfaction rankings improving from 29th to 9th.
- “Salary” for the VCA staff *increased* in ranking from 38th in 1998 to 29th in 2008.
- “Quick response of security staff” rose in satisfaction over the years from being ranked 17th in 1998 to 6th in 2008.
- “Good staff/administration relationship” saw a 10-point *increase* from 1998 to 2008; from being ranked 27th to 17th.
- “Manageable workload” satisfaction *decreased* from being ranked 16th in 1998 to 32nd ten years later. Similarly, satisfaction with the “Appropriateness of workload” also decreased from 15th in 1998 to 30th in 2008.
- Satisfaction with “Professional development opportunities” *decreased* from 1998 to 2008; falling from ranked 21st in 1998 to 38th in 2008.

When examining the changes in *Satisfaction* rankings from **2005 to 2008**, the following items are most notable:

- Satisfaction for both “Manageable workload” and “Professional development opportunities” both decreased by fourteen ranking points from 2005-2008 (“Manageable workload” dropped from 18th in 2005 to 32nd in 2008; “Professional development...” dropped from 24th to 38th in that same time span.)
- “Salary” satisfaction *increased* in ranking; from 43rd in 2005 to 29th in 2008.
- Satisfaction with “Opportunities for staff input in administrative decision making” saw a *decrease* in ranking; falling from 34th in 2005 to the very bottom of the list in 2008 at 46th.

² Though *Satisfaction* rankings for “Quick response of security” dropped from 2005 to 2008, there was a significant 11-point increase from 1998-2008. Once ranked 17th in Satisfaction, it is now ranked 6th.

- Satisfaction with “Freedom of expression” *increased* from 28th in 2005 to 17th in 2008.
- Clearly stated work responsibilities *decreased* in satisfaction from 2005 to 2008; falling from being ranked 11th to 23rd.
- Satisfaction with “Health care benefits” *increased* from being ranked 18th in 2005 to being ranked 9th in 2008.

The complete list of *Satisfaction* rankings is found in **Table 6**.

Table 6: 2008 Satisfaction Rankings by item (Compared to data compiled in 1998 and 2005)³

³ In this table, individual *Satisfaction* rankings for the 1998 and 2005 data were taken directly from the 2005 VCA Employee Satisfaction Survey.

Item	1998	2005	2008
Adequate mail service	2	4	1
Safe campus	5	2	1
Retirement benefits	1	6	3
Safe office	6	1	4
Well maintained campus	3	5	5
Quick response of security staff	17	2	6
Opportunities for long term employment	7	14	7
Type of position	n/a	n/a	8
Adequate technical support for computers in my work area	29	6	9
Health care benefits	8	18	9
Well-lighted parking lots	4	5	11
Employment opportunities for women	11	16	12
Adequate communication regarding campus events	12	12	12
Motivation to put forth my best effort	10	10	12
Healthy food options	n/a	n/a	15
Support from my supervisor*	9	9	16
Flexible work schedule	n/a	n/a	17
Freedom of expression	14	28	17
Good staff/admin relationship	27	21	17
Helpful orientation services for new staff	23	14	17
Racial harmony on campus	18	20	17
VCA leadership*** is approachable	25	15	17
Clearly stated work responsibilities	13	11	23
Internal customer service within VCA	n/a	n/a	24
Dining services	n/a	n/a	25
Employment opportunities for under-represented groups	22	21	26
Good staff/faculty relationship	24	26	26
Clearly stated procedures for performance evaluation	36	35	28
Salary	38	43	29
Appropriateness of workload	15	17	30
Employment opportunities for disabled individuals	20	25	31
Manageable workload	16	18	32
Clearly stated personnel policies	30	27	33
Responsible allocation of UM-Flint resources	39	38	34
Clearly stated grievance procedures	31	32	35
Opportunities for communication with VCA	28	29	36
Fair and equitable** personnel policies	37	29	37
Professional development opportunities	21	24	38
Clearly stated staff disciplinary procedures	32	33	39
Clear communication among departments/offices	33	37	40
Fair and equitable** policies/procedures for advancement	42	41	41
Institutional recognition of my contribution	35	35	42
Clearly stated policies/procedures for advancement	43	42	43
Discussion of issues is facilitated by the structure of staff council	34	40	44
Prospect of promotion	41	39	45
Opportunities for staff input in administrative decision making	40	34	46

When comparing the gap analyses from 1998 through 2008, the items with the most significant changes include “Salary”, “Prospect of promotion”, “Fair and equitable polices/procedures for advancement”, “Clearly stated policies/procedures for advancement” “Adequate technical support...” and “Responsible allocation of UM-Flint resources” showed the most significant change in gaps over the years. Most notable about each of these items are the increases in overall satisfaction. Table 7 lists the top 20 gap changes over the ten year period. The entire list can be viewed in Appendix C.

Table 7: Comparison of Top 20 Gap Changes from 1998 and 2008 (by item)

Item	Mean Importance (1998)	Mean Satisfaction (1998)	Gap (1998)	Mean Importance (2008)	Mean Satisfaction (2008)	Gap (2008)	Gap change (1998-2008)
Salary	4.62	2.81	-1.81	4.38	3.95	-0.43	-1.38
Prospect of promotion	4.44	2.59	-1.85	4.06	3.57	-0.49	-1.36
Fair and equitable policies/procedures for advancement	4.66	2.57	-2.09	4.51	3.64	-0.87	-1.22
Clearly stated policies/procedures for advancement	4.48	2.54	-1.94	4.35	3.60	-0.75	-1.19
Adequate technical support for computers in my work area	4.75	3.23	-1.52	4.77	4.39	-0.38	-1.14
Responsible allocation of UM-Flint resources	4.38	2.67	-1.71	4.41	3.84	-0.57	-1.14
Quick response of security staff	4.85	3.55	-1.30	4.88	4.53	-0.35	-0.95
Institutional recognition of my contribution	4.30	3.03	-1.27	4.02	3.63	-0.39	-0.88
Fair and equitable personnel policies	4.57	2.90	-1.67	4.61	3.76	-0.85	-0.82
Health care benefits	4.55	3.86	-0.69	4.27	4.39	0.12	-0.81
Opportunities for staff input in administrative decision making	4.28	2.64	-1.64	4.40	3.54	-0.86	-0.78
Clearly stated grievance procedures	4.26	3.14	-1.12	4.16	3.81	-0.35	-0.77
Good staff/admin relationship	4.74	3.34	-1.40	4.80	4.14	-0.66	-0.74
Safe campus	4.91	4.01	-0.90	4.92	4.73	-0.19	-0.71
Motivation to put forth my best effort	4.75	3.71	-1.04	4.57	4.24	-0.33	-0.71
Clearly stated procedures for performance evaluation	4.22	2.99	-1.23	4.50	3.96	-0.54	-0.69
Appropriateness of workload	4.63	3.60	-1.03	4.29	3.93	-0.36	-0.67
VCA leadership is approachable	4.53	3.38	-1.15	4.58	4.10	-0.48	-0.67
Safe office	4.89	3.94	-0.95	4.88	4.59	-0.29	-0.66
Adequate communciation regarding campus events	4.49	3.67	-0.82	4.41	4.24	-0.17	-0.65
Opportunities for long term employment	4.75	3.90	-0.85	4.69	4.49	-0.20	-0.65

In examining the gap changes from the 2005 and 2008 survey results, nearly all items indicated decrease in gaps. The most significant decreases in gaps include “Salary” (also with the most significant gap difference from 1998-2008), “Health care benefits”, “Retirement benefits”, and “Fair and equitable policies/procedures for advancement.” Only six items in the survey, “Adequate technical support...”, “Opportunities for communication with VCA”, “Quick response of security staff”, “Professional development opportunities”, “Well lighted parking lots”, and “Safe office” measured an increase in the gap from 2005 to 2008. Five items (each denoted by “n/a” were not included in the 2005 study).

Table 8: Comparison of Top 20 Gap Changes from 2005 and 2008 (by item)

Item	Mean Importance (2005)	Mean Satisfaction (2005)	Gap (2005)	Mean Importance (2008)	Mean Satisfaction (2008)	Gap (2008)	Gap change (2005-2008)
Salary	4.55	3.19	-1.36	4.38	3.95	-0.43	-0.93
Health care benefits	4.69	4.04	-0.65	4.27	4.39	0.12	-0.77
Retirement benefits	4.75	4.40	-0.35	4.47	4.63	0.16	-0.51
Fair and equitable policies/procedures for advancement	4.65	3.28	-1.37	4.51	3.64	-0.87	-0.50
Clearly stated policies/procedures for advancement	4.49	3.26	-1.23	4.35	3.60	-0.75	-0.48
Responsible allocation of UM-Flint resources	4.40	3.38	-1.02	4.41	3.84	-0.57	-0.45
Freedom of expression	4.57	3.82	-0.75	4.44	4.14	-0.30	-0.45
Adequate communication regarding campus events	4.69	4.13	-0.56	4.41	4.24	-0.17	-0.39
Opportunities for long term employment	4.69	4.10	-0.59	4.69	4.49	-0.20	-0.39
Discussion of issues is facilitated by the structure of staff council	3.79	3.30	-0.49	3.70	3.58	-0.12	-0.37
Employment opportunities for under-represented groups	4.49	3.98	-0.51	4.12	3.98	-0.14	-0.37
Prospect of promotion	4.15	3.32	-0.83	4.06	3.57	-0.49	-0.34
VCA leadership is approachable	4.68	3.86	-0.82	4.58	4.10	-0.48	-0.34
Employment opportunities for women	4.43	4.07	-0.36	4.29	4.24	-0.05	-0.31
Clearly stated procedures for performance evaluation	4.42	3.58	-0.84	4.50	3.96	-0.54	-0.30
Adequate mail service	4.52	4.48	-0.04	4.49	4.73	0.24	-0.28
Institutional recognition of my contribution	4.21	3.58	-0.63	4.02	3.63	-0.39	-0.24
Well maintained campus	4.72	4.45	-0.27	4.62	4.58	-0.04	-0.23
Motivation to put forth my best effort	4.70	4.19	-0.51	4.57	4.24	-0.33	-0.18
Clearly stated personnel policies	4.60	3.85	-0.75	4.47	3.86	-0.61	-0.14

2008 Survey results

Table 8: Top 20 Importance Items by Rank

*Complete listing found in Appendix B

Item	Rank	Mean Importance (2008)
Safe campus	1	4.92
Quick response of security staff	2	4.88
Safe office	2	4.88
Well-lighted parking lots	2	4.88
Good staff/admin relationship	5	4.80
Adequate technical support for computers in my work area	6	4.77
Good staff/faculty relationship	7	4.76
Racial harmony on campus	8	4.73
Clear communication among departments/offices	9	4.72
Helpful orientation services for new staff	10	4.70
Opportunities for long term employment	11	4.69
Well maintained campus	12	4.62
Fair and equitable personnel policies	13	4.61
Support from my supervisor	14	4.60
VCA leadership is approachable	15	4.58
Motivation to put forth my best effort	16	4.57
Fair and equitable policies/procedures for advancement	17	4.51
Type of position	17	4.51
Clearly stated procedures for performance evaluation	17	4.50
Clearly stated work responsibilities	17	4.50

As previously observed in the data collected in 1998 and 2005, issues of safety are most important with the VCA staff. However, it is also important to note that good relationships between the staff and other University personnel (both administration and faculty), and technical support are also included as some of the most importance aspects of the University.

Table 9: Top 20 Satisfaction Items by Rank

*Complete listing found in Appendix C

Item	Rank	Mean Satisfaction (2008)
Adequate mail service	1	4.73
Safe campus	1	4.73
Retirement benefits	3	4.63
Safe office	4	4.59
Well maintained campus	5	4.58
Quick response of security staff	6	4.53
Opportunities for long term employment	7	4.49
Type of position	8	4.42
Adequate technical support for computers in my work area	9	4.39
Health care benefits	9	4.39
Well-lighted parking lots	11	4.33
Employment opportunities for women	12	4.24
Adequate communication regarding campus events	12	4.24
Motivation to put forth my best effort	12	4.24
Healthy food options	15	4.22
Support from my supervisor*	16	4.16
Freedom of expression	17	4.14
Good staff/admin relationship	17	4.14
Helpful orientation services for new staff	17	4.14
Racial harmony on campus	17	4.14

The data suggest VCA employees are – for the most part – satisfied with the level of safety on campus. Of the top five rated items for which the VCA had high satisfaction, “Safe campus”, “Safe office”, and “Quick response from security staff” were cited. Also included in the items with high levels of satisfaction include “Adequate mail service”, “Retirement benefits”, and “Well-maintained campus.”

Table 10: Ranking of 2008 Satisfaction/Importance Gaps

Item	Mean Importance (2008)	Mean Satisfaction (2008)	Gap (2008)	Rank
Clear communication among departments/offices	4.72	3.68	-1.04	1
Fair and equitable policies/procedures for advancement	4.51	3.64	-0.87	2
Opportunities for staff input in administrative decision making	4.40	3.54	-0.86	3
Fair and equitable personnel policies	4.61	3.76	-0.85	4
Good staff/faculty relationship	4.76	3.98	-0.78	5
Clearly stated policies/procedures for advancement	4.35	3.60	-0.75	6
Good staff/admin relationship	4.80	4.14	-0.66	7
Clearly stated personnel policies	4.47	3.86	-0.61	8
Racial harmony on campus	4.73	4.14	-0.59	9
Responsible allocation of UM-Flint resources	4.41	3.84	-0.57	10
Helpful orientation services for new staff	4.70	4.14	-0.56	11
Clearly stated staff disciplinary procedures	4.25	3.69	-0.56	11
Well-lighted parking lots	4.88	4.33	-0.55	13
Clearly stated procedures for performance evaluation	4.50	3.96	-0.54	14
Manageable workload	4.43	3.89	-0.54	14
Professional development opportunities	4.24	3.75	-0.49	16
Prospect of promotion	4.06	3.57	-0.49	16
Employment opportunities for disabled individuals	4.40	3.92	-0.48	18
VCA leadership is approachable	4.58	4.10	-0.48	18
Opportunities for communication with VCA	4.26	3.80	-0.46	20
Support from my supervisor	4.60	4.16	-0.44	21
Salary	4.38	3.95	-0.43	22
Clearly stated work responsibilities	4.50	4.09	-0.41	23
Institutional recognition of my contribution	4.02	3.63	-0.39	24
Adequate technical support for computers in my work area	4.77	4.39	-0.38	25
Appropriateness of workload	4.29	3.93	-0.36	26
Clearly stated grievance procedures	4.16	3.81	-0.35	27
Quick response of security staff	4.88	4.53	-0.35	27
Motivation to put forth my best effort	4.57	4.24	-0.33	29
Freedom of expression	4.44	4.14	-0.30	30
Internal customer service within VCA	4.32	4.02	-0.30	30
Safe office	4.88	4.59	-0.29	32
Opportunities for long term employment	4.69	4.49	-0.20	33
Safe campus	4.92	4.73	-0.19	34
Adequate communciation regarding campus events	4.41	4.24	-0.17	35
Employment opportunities for under-represented groups	4.12	3.98	-0.14	36
Discussion of issues is facilitated by the structure of staff council	3.70	3.58	-0.12	37
Type of postion	4.51	4.42	-0.09	38
Employment opportunities for women	4.29	4.24	-0.05	39
Well maintained campus	4.62	4.58	-0.04	40
Health care benefits	4.27	4.39	0.12	41
Retirement benefits	4.47	4.63	0.16	42
Flexible work schedule	3.87	4.10	0.23	43
Dining services	3.78	4.02	0.24	44
Adequate mail service	4.49	4.73	0.24	45
Healthy food options	3.90	4.22	0.32	46

Summary

The data from the 2008 survey are relatively consistent with those collected in the 1998 and 2005 survey. Of all the areas of interest, safety-related issues were both considered highly important by VCA staff and were highly regarded in terms of satisfaction. Equally as important however is the notion that several additional areas outside of safety were also considered highly importance *and* also had high levels of satisfaction. Namely, technical support, long term employment opportunities, types of positions available and adequate mail services all rank high in both importance and satisfaction.

VCA staff feel as if they have little input in the decision-making process; which could be problematic given the high level of importance placed on this. Other potential areas of improvement could conceivably focus on areas surrounding communication. Effective communication between departments, clearly stated *and* communicated policies for advancement, clearly stated personnel policies, and clearly stated work responsibilities were all cited as important items for the staff, even as satisfaction in those areas was lower on average.

Relationship building is another area where greater attention can be focused. Staff relationships with both administration and faculty are not as satisfactory as they are considered important. In addition, racial harmony – though far more satisfactory now than in previous years – can be improved given the importance/satisfaction gap.

Even considering the areas which need improvement, it can be stated that the VCA staff are becoming increasingly satisfied with the areas of focus in the survey. However, this does not suggest that improvements cannot be made. There are several areas in this survey that have specifically *increased in importance* and *decreased in satisfaction*. As possible actions are taken in the future, it is important to consider those findings.

Appendix A: 2008 Survey Instrument

See attached PDF file.

Appendix B: Complete Listing of Importance Items by Rank from 2008 Survey

Item	Rank	Mean Importance (2008)
Safe campus	1	4.92
Quick response of security staff	2	4.88
Safe office	2	4.88
Well-lighted parking lots	2	4.88
Good staff/admin relationship	5	4.80
Adequate technical support for computers in my work area	6	4.77
Good staff/faculty relationship	7	4.76
Racial harmony on campus	8	4.73
Clear communication among departments/offices	9	4.72
Helpful orientation services for new staff	10	4.70
Opportunities for long term employment	11	4.69
Well maintained campus	12	4.62
Fair and equitable personnel policies	13	4.61
Support from my supervisor	14	4.60
VCA leadership is approachable	15	4.58
Motivation to put forth my best effort	16	4.57
Fair and equitable policies/procedures for advancement	17	4.51
Type of position	17	4.51
Clearly stated procedures for performance evaluation	17	4.50
Clearly stated work responsibilities	17	4.50
Adequate mail service	21	4.49
Clearly stated personnel policies	22	4.47
Retirement benefits	22	4.47
Freedom of expression	24	4.44
Manageable workload	25	4.43
Responsible allocation of UM-Flint resources	26	4.41
Adequate communication regarding campus events	26	4.41
Opportunities for staff input in administrative decision making	26	4.40
Employment opportunities for disabled individuals	26	4.40
Salary	30	4.38
Clearly stated policies/procedures for advancement	31	4.35
Internal customer service within VCA	32	4.32
Appropriateness of workload	33	4.29
Employment opportunities for women	33	4.29
Health care benefits	35	4.27
Opportunities for communication with VCA	36	4.26
Clearly stated staff disciplinary procedures	37	4.25
Professional development opportunities	38	4.24
Clearly stated grievance procedures	39	4.16
Employment opportunities for under-represented groups	40	4.12
Prospect of promotion	41	4.06
Institutional recognition of my contribution	42	4.02
Healthy food options	43	3.90
Flexible work schedule	44	3.87
Dining services	45	3.78
Discussion of issues is facilitated by the structure of staff council	46	3.70

Appendix C: Complete Listing of Satisfaction Items by Rank from 2008 Survey

Item	Rank	Mean Satisfaction (2008)
Adequate mail service	1	4.73
Safe campus	1	4.73
Retirement benefits	3	4.63
Safe office	4	4.59
Well maintained campus	5	4.58
Quick response of security staff	6	4.53
Opportunities for long term employment	7	4.49
Type of position	8	4.42
Adequate technical support for computers in my work area	9	4.39
Health care benefits	9	4.39
Well-lighted parking lots	11	4.33
Employment opportunities for women	12	4.24
Adequate communication regarding campus events	12	4.24
Motivation to put forth my best effort	12	4.24
Healthy food options	15	4.22
Support from my supervisor*	16	4.16
Freedom of expression	17	4.14
Good staff/admin relationship	17	4.14
Helpful orientation services for new staff	17	4.14
Racial harmony on campus	17	4.14
Flexible work schedule	21	4.10
VCA leadership*** is approachable	21	4.10
Clearly stated work responsibilities	23	4.09
Dining services	24	4.02
Internal customer service within VCA	24	4.02
Employment opportunities for under-represented groups	26	3.98
Good staff/faculty relationship	26	3.98
Clearly stated procedures for performance evaluation	28	3.96
Salary	29	3.95
Appropriateness of workload	30	3.93
Employment opportunities for disabled individuals	31	3.92
Manageable workload	32	3.89
Clearly stated personnel policies	33	3.86
Responsible allocation of UM-Flint resources	34	3.84
Clearly stated grievance procedures	35	3.81
Opportunities for communication with VCA	36	3.80
Fair and equitable** personnel policies	37	3.76
Professional development opportunities	38	3.75
Clearly stated staff disciplinary procedures	39	3.69
Clear communication among departments/offices	40	3.68
Fair and equitable** policies/procedures for advancement	41	3.64
Institutional recognition of my contribution	42	3.63
Clearly stated policies/procedures for advancement	43	3.60
Discussion of issues is facilitated by the structure of staff council	44	3.58
Prospect of promotion	45	3.57
Opportunities for staff input in administrative decision making	46	3.54

Appendix D: Comparison of Gaps from 1998, 2005, and 2008 (ordered by Gap change from 2005-2008)

Item	Mean Importance (1998)	Mean Satisfaction (1998)	Gap (1998)	Mean Importance (2005)	Mean Satisfaction (2005)	Gap (2005)	Mean Importance (2008)	Mean Satisfaction (2008)	Gap (2008)	Gap change (1998-2008)	Gap change (2005-2008)
Salary	4.62	2.81	1.81	4.55	3.19	1.36	4.38	3.95	0.43	-1.38	-0.93
Health care benefits	4.55	3.86	0.69	4.69	4.04	0.65	4.27	4.39	-0.12	-0.81	-0.77
Retirement benefits	4.69	4.47	0.22	4.75	4.40	0.35	4.47	4.63	-0.16	-0.38	-0.51
Fair and equitable** policies/procedures for advancement	4.66	2.57	2.09	4.65	3.28	1.37	4.51	3.64	0.87	-1.22	-0.50
Clearly stated policies/procedures for advancement	4.48	2.54	1.94	4.49	3.26	1.23	4.35	3.60	0.75	-1.19	-0.48
Responsible allocation of UM-Flint resources	4.38	2.67	1.71	4.40	3.38	1.02	4.41	3.84	0.57	-1.14	-0.45
Freedom of expression	4.50	3.65	0.85	4.57	3.82	0.75	4.44	4.14	0.30	-0.55	-0.45
Adequate communication regarding campus events	4.49	3.67	0.82	4.69	4.13	0.56	4.41	4.24	0.17	-0.65	-0.39
Opportunities for long term employment	4.75	3.90	0.85	4.69	4.10	0.59	4.69	4.49	0.20	-0.65	-0.39
Discussion of issues is facilitated by the structure of staff council	3.70	3.05	0.65	3.79	3.30	0.49	3.70	3.58	0.12	-0.53	-0.37
Employment opportunities for under-represented groups	3.82	3.44	0.38	4.49	3.98	0.51	4.12	3.98	0.14	-0.24	-0.37
Prospect of promotion	4.44	2.59	1.85	4.15	3.32	0.83	4.06	3.57	0.49	-1.36	-0.34
VCA leadership*** is approachable	4.53	3.38	1.15	4.68	3.86	0.82	4.58	4.10	0.48	-0.67	-0.34
Employment opportunities for women	4.11	3.70	0.41	4.43	4.07	0.36	4.29	4.24	0.05	-0.36	-0.31
Clearly stated procedures for performance evaluation	4.22	2.99	1.23	4.42	3.58	0.84	4.50	3.96	0.54	-0.69	-0.30
Adequate mail service	4.61	4.25	0.36	4.52	4.48	0.04	4.49	4.73	-0.24	-0.60	-0.28
Institutional recognition of my contribution	4.30	3.03	1.27	4.21	3.58	0.63	4.02	3.63	0.39	-0.88	-0.24
Well maintained campus	4.62	4.17	0.45	4.72	4.45	0.27	4.62	4.58	0.04	-0.41	-0.23
Motivation to put forth my best effort	4.75	3.71	1.04	4.70	4.19	0.51	4.57	4.24	0.33	-0.71	-0.18
Clearly stated personnel policies	4.39	3.21	1.18	4.60	3.85	0.75	4.47	3.86	0.61	-0.57	-0.14
Manageable workload	4.63	3.58	1.05	4.71	4.04	0.67	4.43	3.89	0.54	-0.51	-0.13
Clearly stated work responsibilities	4.53	3.66	0.87	4.67	4.15	0.52	4.50	4.09	0.41	-0.46	-0.11
Employment opportunities for disabled individuals	3.99	3.49	0.50	4.47	3.88	0.59	4.40	3.92	0.48	-0.02	-0.11
Appropriateness of workload	4.63	3.60	1.03	4.50	4.06	0.44	4.29	3.93	0.36	-0.67	-0.08
Good staff/admin relationship	4.74	3.34	1.40	4.72	3.98	0.74	4.80	4.14	0.66	-0.74	-0.08
Clear communication among departments/offices	4.62	3.06	1.56	4.65	3.54	1.11	4.72	3.68	1.04	-0.52	-0.07
Clearly stated grievance procedures	4.26	3.14	1.12	4.19	3.77	0.42	4.16	3.81	0.35	-0.77	-0.07
Support from my supervisor*	4.78	3.71	1.07	4.70	4.21	0.49	4.60	4.16	0.44	-0.63	-0.05
Helpful orientation services for new staff	4.37	3.40	0.97	4.71	4.10	0.61	4.70	4.14	0.56	-0.41	-0.05
Clearly stated staff disciplinary procedures	4.28	3.13	1.15	4.29	3.69	0.60	4.25	3.69	0.56	-0.59	-0.04
Good staff/faculty relationship	4.72	3.38	1.34	4.68	3.86	0.82	4.76	3.98	0.78	-0.56	-0.04
Racial harmony on campus	4.51	3.55	0.96	4.62	4.00	0.62	4.73	4.14	0.59	-0.37	-0.03
Safe campus	4.91	4.01	0.90	4.91	4.70	0.21	4.92	4.73	0.19	-0.71	-0.02
Opportunities for staff input in administrative decision making	4.28	2.64	1.64	4.54	3.67	0.87	4.40	3.54	0.86	-0.78	-0.01
Fair and equitable** personnel policies	4.57	2.90	1.67	4.67	3.81	0.86	4.61	3.76	0.85	-0.82	-0.01
Adequate technical support for computers in my work area	4.75	3.23	1.52	4.74	4.40	0.34	4.77	4.39	0.38	-1.14	0.04
Opportunities for communication with VCA	4.26	3.29	0.97	4.19	3.81	0.38	4.26	3.80	0.46	-0.51	0.08
Quick response of security staff	4.85	3.55	1.30	4.93	4.70	0.23	4.88	4.53	0.35	-0.95	0.12
Professional development opportunities	4.29	3.46	0.83	4.29	3.94	0.35	4.24	3.75	0.49	-0.34	0.14
Well-lighted parking lots	4.90	4.11	0.79	4.80	4.40	0.40	4.88	4.33	0.55	-0.24	0.15
Safe office	4.89	3.94	0.95	4.87	4.78	0.09	4.88	4.59	0.29	-0.66	0.20
Dining services	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.78	4.02	-0.24	n/a	n/a
Flexible work schedule	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.87	4.10	-0.23	n/a	n/a
Healthy food options	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.90	4.22	-0.32	n/a	n/a
Internal customer service within VCA	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.32	4.02	0.30	n/a	n/a
Type of position	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	4.51	4.42	0.09	n/a	n/a

Appendix E: Open ended responses from the 2008 VCA Employee Satisfaction Survey

Influences on your decision to work at UM-Flint

1. I love working for the university! I have not been disappointed in my supervisor, department, or university leadership. Thank you.
2. The prospect of promotion within the custodial services department is non-existent. At this time, there seems to be no resolution to the situation. However, we are also in need of additional custodial services employees in order that we could continue to meet the needs of the customer to the customer's satisfaction.
3. I'm just a temporary work study.
4. A very reasonable place to work.
5. Retirement will never be an option for our plan.
6. Feel very strongly that there should be open parking Mon-Fri. I don't feel safe where I am required to park and walk to.
7. I see some change, we need more.

Effectiveness of Departments and Offices

1. Not enough help with work load.

Institutional Effectiveness

No comments left

Campus Support Services

1. Service in grill area of Dining Services in need of improvement. Lines are too long (at busy periods) and supplies aren't restocked often enough. Buffet area is better maintained, however.
2. Prices seem high at UCEN. Not enough fresh fruit in vending, or on campus in general.
3. Dining services' hours need to be extended for students living in the dorm. Healthy food also needs to be available late in the afternoon, not just mid-day.

Safety and Security

1. Safety personnel respond quickly and efficiently to incidents on campus.
2. Public Safety does an awesome job. I have always felt safe when attending classes and while working for the university.

Campus Climate

1. We have sufficient tools for communication of campus events, but not enough departments or groups use them (i.e., campus calendar).
2. It seems to me that there are not adequate job opportunities for the disabled on campus.
3. There needs to be much more communication regarding campus events, to the students.