TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY
HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER
Office *of* Institutional Planning *and* Assessment

Staff Satisfaction Survey

TTUHSC Institutional Report
2007-2008

General Information

The Higher Education Excellence Survey (HEES) was administered to staff members at Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center (TTUHSC) in Spring 2008. Based on the well-established Survey of Organizational Excellence, the HEES has been tailored specifically to meet the needs of the higher education community. Survey administration is coordinated through the Organizational Excellence Group (OEG) at the University of Texas at Austin.

The Higher Education Excellence Survey (HESS) measures five broad dimensions of the work environment. They include (1) *Work Group*, (2) *Accommodations*, (3) *Organizational Features*, (4) *Information*, and (5) *Personal*. Each dimension is composed of three to five specific constructs. Scores for each dimension and construct range from 100 to 500. Scores above 300 suggest that employees perceive an issue more positively than negatively, and scores of 400 or higher indicate areas of substantial strength. Conversely, below 300 suggest that employees perceive an issue more negatively than positively, and scores below 200 should be a significant source of concern for the institution.

Data Collection

More than four thousand (N=4,032) TTUHSC employees were invited to take the Higher Education Excellence Survey (HEES). Targeted employees included administrators and staff members whose primary responsibility was not as a faculty member.

Data collection began May 26, 2008, and ended June 13, 2008. During that three-week period, 932 TTUHSC employees completed the survey online, and an additional 32 employees completed a paper survey. In total, 964 (n=964) employees completed the HEES, resulting in a response rate of 24%. This is lower than the average response rate of 52% for institutions that participated in the HEES in 2007-08.

Results

Survey results are presented in a series of reports prepared by the Organizational Excellence Group (OEG). The resulting reports are now available. The institution's overall results are described in an executive summary and comprehensive data report. In addition, survey respondents were asked to select a primary affiliation using one of the descriptors listed below. Therefore, individual summary reports are also available for the following sub-groups. (Approximate sample sizes are provided for each sub-group.)

- School of Allied Health Sciences (SOAHS) (*n=57*)
- Correctional Managed Health Care (CMHC) (*n=69*)
- Resident Physicians (*n=63*)
- School of Medicine, excluding CMHC and Resident Physician (SOM) (*n=63*)
- School of Nursing (SON) (*n=238*)
- School of Pharmacy (SOP) (n=34)
- Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences (GSBS) (*n=9*)
- Academic Services (*n=17*)
- Finance and Administration – Business Affairs (*n=37*)
- Finance and Administration – Human Resources (*n=15*)
- Finance and Administration – Physical Plant (*n=18*)
- Finance and Administration – Other (*n=32*)
- Information Technology (IT) (*n=39*)
- Institutes (e.g. Garrison, Rural Health) (*n=13*)
- Institutional Advancement/Communications and Marketing (Adv/ Comm & Mkt) (*n=9*)
- Libraries (*n=14*)
- Research (*n=39*)
- Other (*n=185*)

Respondents were also asked to indicate their location using one of the descriptors listed below. Thus, individual summary reports are available for these sub-groups as well:

- Abilene (*n=10*)
- Amarillo (*n=173*)
- Dallas (*n=0*)
- El Paso (*n=156*)
- Lubbock (*n=499*)
- Permian Basin (*n=61*)
- Hill Country (*n=0*)
- Correctional Facilities (*n=19*)

The reports distributed by the OEG provide an excellent overview of survey results, highlighting key strengths and potential areas of concern by identifying the highest and lowest construct scores. However, it may be necessary to note some additional observations not addressed in those reports. This supplemental report provides construct and dimension scores in relation to various benchmarks. Benchmark scores are available for all organizations who administered the Survey of Organizational Excellence, organizations of a similar size, organizations with an educational mission, and institutions of higher education See Tables 1-5 throughout the text. Individual units and departments are encouraged to run their own analyses of the data as well. Contact the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (OIPE) for a particular data set.

Limitations

A word of caution is necessary before proceeding to the following sections. As with any survey administration, there are certain limitations of which to be aware. A key consideration for this survey is that respondents self-selected the sub-groups for primary affiliation and location. Therefore, it is possible that respondents either mistakenly or intentionally marked sub-groups to which they did not belong. This may be attributed to confusion in selecting the most appropriate sub-group and/or fear of one's identity being determined based on his/her responses. (There were approximately 185 respondents who marked *Other* as their primary affiliation.) In addition, some respondents did not select any sub-groups. Another consideration relates to the significance of the results. The information presented below is descriptive only. No efforts have been made to calculate whether differences are statistically significant. Third, small sample sizes impact survey results, and resulting samples may not be representative of the population. With

these considerations in mind, the potential strengths and areas of concern presented below should be considered carefully. Individual unit and/or department leaders are encouraged to explore issues in more depth as necessary in order to determine the most appropriate courses of action.

Dimension I: Work Group

The *Work Group* dimension relates to employees' activities within their immediate work environment. They include factors that concern how employees interact with peers, supervisors, and those involved in everyday work activities. This dimension is composed four constructs. Brief descriptions of those constructs are provided below. Additional descriptions are available in the OEG reports.

(1) *Supervisor Effectiveness*: Provides insight into the nature of supervisory relationships in the organization;

(2) *Fairness*: Measures the extent to which employees believe that equal and fair opportunity exists for all members of the organization;

(3) *Team Effectiveness*: Captures employees' perceptions of the effectiveness of their work group and the extent to which the organizational environment supports teamwork among employees; and

(4) *Diversity*: Addresses the extent to which employees feel that individual differences may result in alienation and/or missed opportunities for learning or advancement.

On the *Work Group* dimension, no specific strengths emerged for TTUHSC when compared to the benchmarks (see Table 1-A). One construct for which TTUHSC scored lower than all the other benchmarks was *Fairness*.

Table 1-A. *Work Group* Dimension Comparisons for the Institution

Dimension	Construct Name	BENCHMARKS				TTUHSC
		Total	*Size*	*Mission*	*Higher Ed.*	n=964
Work Group	Supervisor Effectiveness	*344*	*318*	*336*	*354*	333
	Fairness	*363*	*339*	*353*	*352*	330
	Team Effectiveness	*344*	*317*	*337*	*336*	320
	Diversity	*359*	*337*	*355*	*361*	344
WORK GROUP SCORE		**352**	**327**	**345**	***350***	**331**

Additional insights related to the *Work Group* dimension are evident in the dimension and construct scores for the sub-groups organized by primary affiliation and location. These scores were compared against all available benchmark scores, which include scores for all organizations who have administered the Survey of Organizational Excellence, organizations of a similar size, organizations with an educational mission, institutions of higher education, and the TTUHSC. Tables 1-B and 1-C list the specific areas that had scores above (+) all the benchmark scores, as well as those areas whose scores were below (-) all the benchmark comparisons. The latter may indicate the need for further exploration and/or improvement. Affiliations and locations not

listed fell within the range of the comparative scores. A spreadsheet comparing the actual scores across affiliation and location is available through the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (OIPE) upon request.

Table 1-B. *Work Group* Dimension by Affiliation

Construct Name	(-)	(+)
Supervisor Effectiveness	Other	Academic Services F&A - Bus. Affairs Institutes Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.
Fairness	Residents SOM GSBS F&A – Human Res. Other	None
Team Effectiveness	CMHC SOM Other	Academic Services F&A – Bus. Affairs Institutes Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.
Diversity	CMHC Other	GSBS Academic Services Institutes Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.**
WORK GROUP DIMENSION	**CMHC Other**	**Academic Services F&A – Bus. Affairs Institutes Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.**

** Scored above 400

Table 1-C. *Work Group* Dimension by Location

Construct Name	(-)	(+)
Supervisor Effectiveness	Correctional Facilities*	None
Fairness	El Paso Correctional Facilities	None
Team Effectiveness	Amarillo Correctional Facilities*	None
Diversity	Correctional Facilities*	None
WORK GROUP DIMENSION	**Correctional Facilities***	**None**

* Scored below 300

Dimension II: Accommodations

The *Accommodations* dimension considers the physical work setting and the factors associated with compensation, work technology, and tools. In the words of the OEG, this dimension relates to the "total benefit package" provided to employees by the organization. This dimension is composed four constructs. Brief descriptions of those constructs are provided below. Additional descriptions are available in the OEG reports.

(1) *Fair Pay*: Feedback from the viewpoint of employees about the competitiveness of the toal compensation package compared to similar jobs in their own communities;

(2) *Physical Environment*: Captures employee perceptions of the work setting and the degree to which employees believe that it is a safe and pleasant working environment;

(3) *Benefits*: Provides an indication of the role that the employment benefit package plays in attracting and retaining employees; and

(4) *Employment Development*: Captures perceptions of the priority given to career and personal development by the organization.

On the *Accommodations* dimension, data indicate that TTUHSC construct scores are in line with those of the comparative groups (see Table 2-A). Note that construct score for *Fair Pay* falls below 300, which typically indicates a source of concern for participating organizations. However, it is important to note that all comparative scores fall below the desired level on this particular construct.

Table 2-A. *Accommodations* Dimension Comparisons for the Institution

Dimension	Construct Name	BENCHMARKS				TTUHSC
		Total	***Size***	***Mission***	***Higher Ed.***	**n=964**
Accommodations	Fair Pay	*260*	*229*	*267*	*272*	244
	Physical Environment	*380*	*356*	*380*	*385*	382
	Benefits	*361*	*345*	*372*	*383*	379
	Employment Development	*357*	*341*	*355*	*373*	355
ACCOMMODATIONS SCORE		***339***	***317***	***343***	***353***	***340***

Additional insights related to the *Accommodations* dimension are evident in the dimension and construct scores for the sub-groups organized by primary affiliation and location. Tables 2-B and 2-C list the specific areas that had scores above (+) all the benchmark scores, as well as those areas whose scores were below (-) all the benchmark comparisons. The latter may indicate the need for further exploration and/or improvement. Affiliations and locations not listed fell within the range of the comparative scores. A spreadsheet comparing the actual scores across affiliation and location is available through the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (OIPE) upon request.

Table 2-B. *Accommodations* Dimension by Affiliation

Construct Name	(-)	(+)
Fair Pay	SOM* SOP* F&A – Physical Plant*	Residents Academic Services Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.
Physical Environment	None	SOAHS GSBS** Academic Services** F&A – Business Affairs** F&A – Other Institutes** Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.**
Benefits	None	CMHC SOP Academic Services** F&A – Business Affairs F&A – Human Res. F&A – Physical Plant F&A – Other IT Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.
Employment Development	SOP GSBS Other	F&A – Physical Plant Institutes** Adv./ Comm. & Mkt. Libraries
ACCOMMODATIONS DIMENSION	**None**	**Residents** **Academic Services** **Institutes** **Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.**

* Scored below 300 AND outside the range of comparative scores
** Scored above 400

Table 2-C. *Accommodations* Dimension by Location

Construct Name	(-)	(+)
Fair Pay	Abilene*	None
Physical Environment	Correctional Facilities	Abilene Lubbock Permian Basin
Benefits	None	Amarillo
Employment Development	Abilene Correctional Facilities	None
ACCOMMODATIONS DIMENSION	**None**	**None**

* Scored below 300 AND outside the range of comparative scores

Dimension III: Organizational Features

The *Organizational Features* dimension addresses the organization's interface with external influences. It is an internal evaluation of the organization's ability to assess changes in the environment and make needed adjustments. This dimension is composed of five constructs. Brief descriptions of those constructs are provided below. Additional descriptions are available in the OEG reports.

(1) *Change-Oriented*: Gathers employees perceptions of the organization's capability and readiness to change based on new information and ideas;

(2) *Goal-Oriented*: Addresses the organization's ability to include all its members in focusing resources towards goal accomplishment;

(3) *Holographic:* Refers to the degree to which all actions of the organization are cohesive and understood by all, including the consistency of decision-making and activities within the organization;

(4) *Strategic*: Captures employees' thinking about how the organization responds to external influences, including those which play a role in defining the mission, services, and products provided by the organization; and

(5) *Quality*: Focuses on the degree to which quality principles, such as customer service and continuous improvement, are integral to the organizational culture.

On the *Organizational Features* dimension, no specific strengths emerged for TTUHSC when compared to the benchmarks (see Table III-A). One construct for which TTUHSC scored lower than all the other benchmarks was *Quality*.

Table 3-A. *Organizational Features* Dimension Comparisons for the Institution

Dimension	Construct Name	BENCHMARKS				TTUHSC
		Total	***Size***	***Mission***	***Higher Ed.***	**n=964**
Organizational Features	Change Oriented	*346*	*322*	*339*	*349*	331
	Goal Oriented	*362*	*337*	*353*	*357*	344
	Holographic	*355*	*329*	*351*	*356*	339
	Strategic	*394*	*368*	*390*	*375*	368
	Quality	*391*	*367*	*387*	*380*	364
ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES SCORE		***369***	***344***	***364***	***363***	***349***

Additional insights related to the *Organizational Features* dimension are evident in the dimension and construct scores for the sub-groups organized by primary affiliation and location. Tables 3-B and 3-C list the specific areas that had scores above (+) all the benchmark scores, as well as those areas whose scores were below (-) all the benchmark comparisons. The latter may indicate the need for further exploration and/or improvement. Affiliations and locations not listed fell within the range of the comparative scores. A spreadsheet comparing the actual scores across affiliation and location is available through the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (OIPE) upon request.

Table 3-B. *Organizational Features* Dimension by Affiliation

Construct Name	(-)	(+)
Change-Oriented	CMHC Other	GSBS F&A – Business Affairs Institutes Adv. / Comm. & Mkt.
Goal-Oriented	CMHC SOM SOP F&A – Physical Plant	GSBS Academic Services F&A – Business Affairs Institutes** Adv. / Comm. & Mkt.
Holographic	CMHC Other	Academic Services F&A – Business Affairs F&A – Physical Plant Institutes Adv. / Comm. & Mkt.
Strategic	CMHC SOM SOP GSBS F&A – Other Other	None
Quality	CMHC SOP F&A – Human Res. Other	GSBS Academic Services F&A – Business Affairs Institutes** Adv. / Comm. & Mkt.**
ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES DIMENSION	**CMHC** **SOM** **SOP** **Other**	**Academic Services** **F&A – Business Affairs** **Institutes** **Adv. / Comm. & Mkt.**

** Scored above 400

Table 3-C. *Organizational Features* Dimension by Location

Construct Name	(-)	(+)
Change-Oriented	Correctional Facilities*	None
Goal-Oriented	Correctional Facilities*	None
Holographic	Correctional Facilities*	None
Strategic	Abilene El Paso Correctional Facilities	None
Quality	Amarillo El Paso Correctional Facilities*	None
ORGANIZATIONAL FEATURES DIMENSION	**Correctional Facilities***	**None**

* Scored below 300

Dimension IV: Information

The *Information* dimension refers to the consistency and structure of communication flow within the organization and to external groups. It examines the degree to which communication is directed towards work-related concerns, how focused and effective it is, and how accessible it is to employees. This dimension is composed of three constructs. Brief descriptions of those constructs are provided below. Additional descriptions are available in the OEG reports.

(1) *Internal*: Captures the nature of communication exchanges within the organization and addresses the extent to which employees view information exchanges as open and productive;

(2) *Availability*: Provides insight into whether employees know where to get needed information and whether they have the ability to access it in a timely manner;

(3) *External*: Looks at how information flows in and out of the organization and focuses on the ability of the organization to synthesize and apply external information to work performed by the organization.

On the *Information* dimension, data indicate that TTUHSC construct scores are in line with those of the comparative groups (see Table 4-A). No specific strengths or areas of concern emerged for the institution as a whole.

Table 4-A. *Information* Dimension Comparisons for the Institution

Dimension	Construct Name	BENCHMARKS				TTUHSC
		Total	*Size*	*Mission*	*Higher Ed.*	n=964
Information	Internal	*335*	*307*	*326*	*324*	317
	Availability	*373*	*347*	*363*	*359*	355
	External	*378*	*353*	*374*	*369*	360
INFORMATION SCORE		***362***	***335***	***354***	***350***	***344***

Additional insights related to the *Information* dimension are evident in the dimension and construct scores for the sub-groups organized by primary affiliation and location. Tables 4-B and 4-C list the specific areas that had scores above (+) all the benchmark scores, as well as those areas whose scores were below (-) all the benchmark comparisons. The latter may indicate the need for further exploration and/or improvement. Affiliations and locations not listed fell within the range of the comparative scores. A spreadsheet comparing the actual scores across affiliation and location is available through the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (OIPE) upon request.

Table 4-B. *Information* Dimension by Affiliation

Construct Name	(-)	(+)
Internal	CMHC* SOP*	Residents GSBS Academic Services F&A – Business Affairs Institutes Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.
Availability	CMHC SOP GSBS	F&A – Business Affairs
External	CMHC	Institutes Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.
INFORMATION DIMENSION	**CMHC** **SOP**	F&A – Business Affairs Institutes

* Scored below 300

Table 4-C. *Information* Dimension by Location

Construct Name	(-)	(+)
Internal	Abilene* Correctional Facilities*	Permian Basin
Availability	Abilene Correctional Facilities	None
External	Abilene Correctional Facilities	None
INFORMATION DIMENSION	**Abilene** **Correctional Facilities***	**None**

* Scored below 300

Dimension V: Personal

The *Personal* dimension measures the internalization of stress and the extent to which debilitating social and psychological conditions appear to factors in the lives of an organization's employees. This dimension addresses the important interface between work and home lives, including how that relationship may impact job performance and organizational efficiency. This dimension is composed of four constructs. Brief descriptions of those constructs are provided below. Additional descriptions are available in the OEG reports.

(1) *Job Satisfaction*: Addresses employees' satisfaction with their overall work situation, including issues concerning employees' evaluation of the availability of time and resources needed to perform jobs effectively;

(2) *Time and Stress*: Looks at how realistic job demands are given time and resource constraints and captures employees' feelings about their ability to balance home and work demands (*Note: The higher the score, the lower the level of stress.*);

(3) *Burnout*: Reflects feelings of extreme mental exhaustion than can negatively impact employees' physical health and job performance, leading to lost resources and opportunities in the organization (Note*: The higher the score, the lower the level of burnout.*); and

(4) *Empowerment*: Measures the degree to which employees feel that they have some control over their jobs and the outcomes of their efforts.

Again, no specific strengths or areas of concern emerged from the data for the *Personal* dimension (see Table 5.A). The TTUHSC construct scores are in line with those of the comparative groups.

Table 5.A. *Personal* Dimension Comparisons for the Institution

Dimension	Construct Name	BENCHMARKS				TTUHSC
		Total	***Size***	***Mission***	***Higher Ed.***	**n=964**
Personal	Job Satisfaction	*369*	*338*	*365*	*373*	363
	Time and Stress	*366*	*338*	*360*	*366*	362
	Burnout	*371*	*347*	*369*	*374*	357
	Empowerment	*363*	*339*	*361*	*359*	347
PERSONAL SCORE		**367**	**340**	**363**	**368**	**357**

Additional insights related to the *Personal* dimension are evident in the dimension and construct scores for the sub-groups organized by primary affiliation and location. Tables 5-B and 5-C list the specific areas that had scores above (+) all the benchmark scores, as well as those areas whose scores were below (-) all the benchmark comparisons. The latter may indicate the need for further exploration and/or improvement. Affiliations and locations not listed fell within the range of the comparative scores. A spreadsheet comparing the actual scores across affiliation and location is available through the Office of Institutional Planning and Effectiveness (OIPE) upon request.

Table 5-B. *Personal* Dimension by Affiliation

Construct Name	(-)	(+)
Job Satisfaction	None	SOAHS SOP Academic Services F&A – Business Affairs F&A – Other Institutes** Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.** Libraries Research
Time and Stress	None	SOAHS Academic Services F&A – Business Affairs F&A – Physical Plant F&A – Other Institutes** Adv./ Comm. & Mkt. Research
Burnout	CMHC Other	GSBS F&A – Business Affairs F&A – Physical Plant Institutes Adv./ Comm. & Mkt. Libraries
Empowerment	CMHC	SOAHS F&A – Business Affairs Institutes Adv./ Comm. & Mkt. Libraries
PERSONAL DIMENSION	**None**	**SOAHS** **Academic Services** **F&A – Business Affairs** **F&A – Physical Plant** **Institutes** **Adv./ Comm. & Mkt.** **Libraries**

** Scored above 400

Table 5-C. *Personal* Dimension by Location

Construct Name	(-)	(+)
Job Satisfaction	Correctional Facilities	None
Time and Stress	Correctional Facilities	Permian Basin
Burnout	Correctional Facilities	None
Empowerment	Correctional Facilities*	None
PERSONAL DIMENSION	**Correctional Facilities**	**None**

* Scored below 300