



The Survey of Organizational Excellence

Texas A&M International University



Executive Summary

2004-2005

Executive Summary

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Organizational Profile	3
Survey Administration	3
Response Rates	4
Survey Framework and Scoring	5
Dimension Analysis	6
Construct Analysis	7
Organizational Typology: Areas of Strength and Areas of Concern	8
Organizational Change: Performance Over Time	14
Analyzing Over Time Data	15
Participant Profile	16
Interpretation and Intervention	A1
Timeline	A2



Introduction

Thank you for your participation in the Survey of Organizational Excellence (SOE). We trust that you will find the information helpful in your leadership and organizational development efforts. Acting as a powerful wave of change, the SOE is important in both the public and private sectors. The number of surveys distributed over the last 10 years has increased three-fold. Both organization and employee response has been tremendous. Such participation indicates the readiness, indeed the eagerness, of employees to engage in meaningful work to improve the organization.

Organizational Leadership must build on this wave of engaged employees and begin initiatives to improve services and benchmark results against outstanding organizations. Above all, the Survey is not about just collecting data or fulfilling some type of compliance, but about promoting excellence through participation and accountability. The Survey reinforces the vital role every employee must play to the fullest at all times. The Survey emphasizes continuous thinking to formulate better, more efficient ways of getting work done. Finally, the Survey calls for candor among all employees towards building a quality organization.

The Survey Framework assesses, at its highest level, five workplace dimensions capturing the total work environment. Each workplace dimension consists of survey constructs. The survey constructs are designed to profile organizational areas of strength and concern so that interventions are targeted appropriately.

Survey Dimensions and Constructs

Dimension I Work Group	Dimension II Accommodations	Dimension III Organizational Features	Dimension IV Information	Dimension V Personal
Supervisor Effectiveness Fairness Team Effectiveness Diversity	Fair Pay Physical Environment Benefits Employment Development	Change Oriented Goal Oriented Holographic Strategic Quality	Internal Availability External	Job Satisfaction Time and Stress Burnout Empowerment

Your Reports Include:

An Executive Summary is provided in this document. The summary contains graphical representations of data from the organization as a whole or in the case of executive summaries for category codes, data specific to that category code. Your organization may or may not have elected to use category codes. In each executive report there is a demographic profile of the organization along with high order analysis of survey data on the construct and dimension level. Both organizational strengths and areas of concern are presented along additional narrative and analysis. Relative benchmark data is also pulled in for comparison purposes.



Introduction (cont.)

A Data Summary accompanies this report. The data summary provides a greater detail than the executive summary. The data summary is largely a quantitative report of the survey responses. Demographic data are presented in percentages and real numbers. Construct means and benchmark comparison numbers are provided on all variables. Item data is broken into mean, frequency counts, standard deviations, and number of respondents and item benchmark data are also displayed.

Electronic Reports are provided in two formats. First, all executive and data summary reports are included in pdf files for ease in distribution and for clear printability. This file format is widely used and a free pdf reader, called Adobe Acrobat reader is available from www.adobe.com. The second types of electronic reports are in Microsoft Excel format. These reports are constructs and item survey data in a flat spreadsheet format. This allows the user to sort highs and lows, search for individual items, or create custom reports from the survey data.

Benchmark Data composed of the organizations participating in the survey are provided in your reports. Benchmarks are used to provide a unit of comparison of organizations of similar mission and size. If you selected to use organizational categories, internal benchmarks between categories as well as over time data illustrates differences and changes along item and construct scores. Our benchmark data are updated every two years and are available from our website at www.orgexcel.net. The most current benchmark data are provided in your report.

Using the Survey as a Catalyst for organizational improvement is essential to the survey process. The survey creates momentum and interest. Towards the end of the executive summary report is a series of suggested next steps to assist in these efforts. Also, we have captured several presentations from other organizations that have used the data in strategic planning, organizational improvement, and employee engagement initiatives. These presentations are provided in streaming video from our website at www.orgexcel.net by clicking on the Best Practices link.

Additional Services are available from our group. We conduct 360-Degree leadership and supervisory evaluations, special leadership assessments, customer and client satisfaction surveys along with the ability to create and administer a variety of custom hardcopy and online survey instruments. Consultation time for large presentations, focus groups, or individual meetings is available as well. For additional information, please contact us at anytime.

Your Comments are Important to us. We welcome your comments (positive or negative) regarding the Survey, the level or type of service provided by our office, or suggestions you may have for ways we can improve our products or services. Comments can be sent directly to me or to the Survey's Principal Investigator, Dr. Michael L. Lauderdale at the UT School of Social Work, 1925 San Jacinto Blvd., Austin, TX 78712.



Organization Profile

Texas A&M International University

Organizational Leadership:

ID: 761

- Ray Keck, President
- Lowry Mays, Board Chair



Benchmark Categories:

To get a better idea of how this organization compares to others like it, we provide three types of benchmark data: organizations with a similar size, similar mission, and organizations belonging to a special grouping. Visit www.survey.utexas.edu for a complete list of benchmark groups and scores.

Organization Size: Size category 4 includes organizations with 301 to 1000 employees.

Mission Category: Education (Mission 3)

The Education category includes Universities, Colleges, Institutes and other Agencies involved with students, teachers, administrators and families throughout many areas of learning.

Special Grouping: A&M: Member of the Texas A&M System

Survey Administration Profile:

Collection Period:

11/1/2004 - 11/20/2004

Collection Method:

All employees took the survey online.

Additional Items and Categories:

Organizations can add customization by creating additional items tailored to the organization and categories for employees to identify with.

Refer to the Appendix of the Data Report for a complete list of categories and additional items.

- Area (5 codes)
- Position (3 codes)

Survey Liaison:

Elizabeth Martinez (956) 326-2380
Assoc. VP for Administration
Texas A&M International University
5201 University Blvd.
Laredo, TX 78041


enmartinez@tamiu.edu



Response Rates


Overall Response Rate

High rates mean that employees have an investment in the organization, want to see the organization improve and generally have a sense of responsibility to the organization. Low response rates can mean several things. There simply may not have been enough effort in making certain employees know the importance of completing the Survey. At a more serious level, low rates of response suggest a lack of organization focus or responsiveness. It may suggest critical levels of employee alienation, anger or indifference to organizational responsibilities.




Out of the 502 employees who were invited to take the survey, 294 responded. As a general rule, rates higher than 50 percent suggest soundness. Rates lower than 30 percent may indicate serious problems. At 59%, your response rate is considered high.

Response Rate Over Time



One of the values of participating in multiple iterations of the Survey is the opportunity to measure organizational change over time. In general, response rates should rise from the first to the second and succeeding iterations. If organizational health is sound, rates tend to plateau above the 50 percent level. Sharp declines in participation suggest some form of general organizational problem is developing. Your response rate is higher than it was for the previous survey.

Response Rate Benchmark Comparisons



- Scores for your Organization (Numeric Score to the right in Blue)
- S Size - Benchmark for similar size organizations
- M Mission - Benchmark for organizations with a similar mission
- A All Respondents - Benchmark for all of the survey respondents

Regional Distribution Map and Benchmarks

Regional Distribution Maps are available to organizations with a large number of employees working in several regions throughout the state. Regional Distribution Map (if applicable) and Regional Benchmark Map will be available in the near future.



Survey Framework and Scoring

The Survey assessment is a framework that consists of survey items, constructs, and dimensions. Each level of the framework provides insight into the workings of an organization.

Items

At the most basic level there are survey items, which provide specific feedback. For each item, employees are asked to indicate how strongly they agree or disagree that the item describes the organization. Possible responses include: (1) strongly disagree; (2) disagree; (3) feel neutral; (4) agree; (5) strongly agree; and, (not scored) don't know/not applicable. Any survey item with an average (mean) score above the neutral midpoint of "3.0" suggests that employees perceive the issue more positively than negatively. Scores of "4.0" or higher indicate areas of substantial strength for the organization. Conversely, scores below "3.0" are viewed more negatively by employees. Items that receive below a "2.0" should be a significant source of concern for the organization and should receive immediate attention.

Constructs

The survey constructs are designed to broadly profile organizational strengths and areas of concern so that interventions may be targeted appropriately. Survey constructs are developed from a group of related survey items. The construct score is calculated by averaging the related item scores together and multiplying that result by 100. Scores for the constructs range from a low of 100 to a high of 500. An item may belong to one or several constructs, however, not every item is associated with a construct.

Dimensions

The framework, at its highest level, consists of five workplace dimensions. These five dimensions capture the total work environment. Each dimension consists of several survey constructs. The dimension score also ranges from 100 to 500 and is an average of the construct scores belonging to the dimension.

Survey Dimensions and Constructs

Dimension I Work Group	Dimension II Accommodations	Dimension III Organizational Features	Dimension IV Information	Dimension V Personal
Supervisor Effectiveness Fairness Team Effectiveness Diversity	Fair Pay Physical Environment Benefits Employment Development	Change Oriented Goal Oriented Holographic Strategic Quality	Internal Availability External	Job Satisfaction Time and Stress Burnout Empowerment

Over Time and Benchmark Data


Comparison scores are provided when available. One of the benefits of continuing to participate in the survey is that over time data shows how employees' views have changed as a result of implementing efforts suggested by previous survey results. Additionally, benchmarks help to illustrate how this organization is performing relative to organizations of similar size, organizations with similar missions and to the performance of all organizations that participated in this survey.



Dimension Analysis

In order for organizations to improve, there is a need to compare performance with other organizations. This comparison process is called benchmarking. The Survey provides a number of convenient and useful comparisons. The number of employees in an organization is one important characteristic of any organization. Large organizations with multiple locations in which any employee will know only a few of the members are different from organizations where most interaction is face-to-face and people know each other well. A second kind of benchmark focuses upon organizations that perform similar functions. The nature of an organization's work can have an impact on organizational features and employee experiences. Lastly, a benchmark is provided for a comparison against all other organizations that have taken the Survey in the current time frame.


The data in this table are composed of the organization's scores for this iteration of the Survey and comparison data from the latest benchmark scores. The scores for the organization appear to the right.



Construct Analysis

Constructs have been color coded to highlight the organization's areas of strength and areas of concern. The 5 highest scoring constructs are blue, the 5 lowest scoring constructs are red, and the remaining 10 constructs are yellow.

Each construct is displayed below with its corresponding score. Highest scoring constructs are areas of strength for this organization while the lowest scoring constructs are areas of concern. Scores above 300 suggest that employees perceive the issue more positively than negatively, and scores of 400 or higher indicate areas of substantial strength. Conversely, scores below 300 are viewed more negatively by employees, and scores below 200 should be a significant source of concern for the organization and should receive immediate attention.



Organizational Typology: Areas of Strength

The following Constructs are relative strengths for the organization:

Strategic

Score: 399

General Description: Strategic (Strategic Orientation) reflects employees' thinking about how the organization responds to external influences that should play a role in defining the organization's mission, vision, services, and products. Implied in this construct is the ability of the organization to seek out and work with relevant external entities.

Average scores suggest that employees feel there is room for improvement in how the organization interprets and understands the environment. Likely there is a concern that some programs are less relevant than in the past and that some processes do not seem knit into an overall vision. In general problems with Strategic Orientation stem from these factors: employees having a limited grasp of the goals of the organization, high levels of "silos", organizational components that function in isolation from other organizational processes, and the nature of the specific work being performed. Remedying Strategic Orientation requires careful study to determine the correct causative factors but assessing environmental understandings is the starting point. Conduct and compile customer assessments and review findings with staff at all levels. Benchmark processes with similar and competitive organizations. Use the employee feedback sessions to make a more complete determination for the causes of low Strategic Orientation scores.

Quality

Score: 396

General Description: Focuses upon the degree to which quality principles, such as customer service and continuous improvement are a part of the organizational culture. This Construct also addresses the extent to which employees feel that they have the resources to deliver quality services.

Quality comes from attention to detail, customers and overall effort. Average scores mean that there is important room for improvement. In general quality is a result of understanding the needs of customers or clients coupled with a continuous and zealous examination of products and processes for improvement. Achieving quality requires the full and thoughtful attention of all members of the organization. Essential to maintaining high levels is clear articulation of goals, careful attention to changes in the environment that might affect resources or heightened competition and vigorous participation by all members. Leadership must maintain a clear articulation of the importance of quality and the role of everyone in achieving quality. Improvement is best addressed by developing clear standards of quality at all levels, urging employee assessment and feedback, and creating measures of quality for all work.



Organizational Typology: Areas of Strength

Relative Strengths Continued:

Physical Environment

Score: 390

General Description: This Construct captures employees' perceptions of the total work atmosphere and the degree to which employees believe that it is a "safe" working environment. This construct addresses the "feel" of the workplace as perceived by the employee.

Average scores suggest that room for improvement exists and lack of attention can lead to dropping scores. Attention may be needed to quality and amount of office space, equipment, parking and the location of facilities.

Benefits

Score: 386

General Description: This Construct provides a good indication of the role the benefit package plays in attracting and retaining employees in the organization. It reflects comparable benefits that employees feel exist with other organizations in the area.

Average scores suggest that room for improvement exists and lack of attention can lead to dropping scores. Benefits are often not viewed as motivators for employees but more as hygiene factors. This means employees will become restless, upset and dissatisfied when benefits are perceived as less than needed or fair. Part of the follow up to the Survey when data are returned is to discuss the results with employees and secure more elaborate explanations of important issues. In general concerns about benefits stem from these factors: level and type of benefits available, the cost and employees being able to understand and use the benefits package. Remedying concerns about benefits requires data collection from employees and competitive organizations to determine the correct causative factors. Use the employee feedback sessions to make a more complete determination for the causes of low Benefits scores.



Organizational Typology: Areas of Strength

Relative Strengths Continued:

External

Score: 384

General Description: This Construct looks at how information flows into the organization from external sources, and conversely, how information flows from inside the organization to external constituents. It addresses the ability of organizational members to synthesize and apply external information to work performed by the organization.

Average scores suggest that immediate consideration needs to be made to improve tools and process for external communication. In general External Communication is a function of these factors: nature of the organization's services or products and those who use the products, types of technology deployed for communication and knowledge of the organization of the needs of those who use its services. Remedying External Communication requires careful study to determine the correct causative factors. Carefully examine the customer base, operating hours of the organization, location of offices and knowledge of contact personnel with customer needs.



Organizational Typology: Areas of Concern

The following Constructs are relative areas of concern for the organization:

Fair Pay

Score: 274

Source of Concern

General Description: This Construct addresses perceptions of the overall compensation package offered by the organization. It describes how well the compensation package "holds up" when employees compare it to similar jobs in other organizations.

Low scores can come from many causes and may suggest a number of remedies. Part of the follow up to the Survey when data are returned is to discuss the results with employees and secure more elaborate explanations of important issues. Failure to successfully remedy Fair Pay problems is one of the more serious mistakes that leadership can make. These scores suggest that pay is a central concern or reason for satisfaction or discontent. Problems with pay can come from two or three causes and may suggest a number of remedies. In some situations pay does not meet comparables in similar organizations. In other cases individuals may perceive that pay levels are not appropriately set to work demands, experience and ability. At some times cost of living increases may cause sharp drops in purchasing power and employees will view pay levels as unfair. Remedying Fair Pay problems requires a determination of which of the above factors are serving to create the concerns. Triangulate low scores in Fair Pay by reviewing comparable positions in other organizations and cost of living information. Use the employee feedback sessions to make a more complete determination for the causes of low Fair Pay scores.

Internal

Score: 345

General Description: This Construct captures the flow of communication within the organization from the top-down, bottom-up, and across divisions or departments. It addresses the extent to which communication exchanges are open and candid and move the organization toward goal achievement.

Average scores suggest that room for improvement exists and lack of attention can lead to dropping scores. Employees feel that information does not arrive in a timely fashion and often it is difficult to find needed facts. In general Internal Information problems stem from these factors: an organization that has outgrown an older verbal culture based upon a few people knowing "how to work the system", lack of investment and training in modern communication technology and, perhaps, vested interests that seek to control needed information. Remedying Internal Communication requires careful study to determine the correct causative factors. Triangulate low scores in Internal Communication by reviewing existing policy and procedural manuals to determine their availability. Assess how well telephone systems are articulated and if e mail, faxing and Internet modalities are developed and in full use. Use the employee feedback sessions to make a more complete determination for the causes of low Internal Communication scores.



Organizational Typology: Areas of Concern

Relative Areas of Concern Continued:

Supervisor Effectiveness

Score: 353

General Description: This Construct provides insight into the nature of supervisory relationships in the organization, including the quality of communication, leadership, thoroughness and fairness that employees perceive exists between supervisors and them. This Construct helps organizational leaders determine the extent to which supervisory relationships are a positive element of the organization.

Average scores suggest that room for improvement exists and lack of attention can lead to dropping scores. No area in an organization is more important and often more resistant to change than the middle areas of the organization. Problems with supervision can come from many causes and may suggest a number of remedies. Part of the follow up to the Survey when data are returned is to discuss the results with employees and secure more elaborate explanations of important issues. In general supervisory effectiveness stems from these factors: the selection, support and training of supervisors, the maturity and experience of employees and the nature of the specific work being performed. A frequent problem with supervisors is that those tasks a person may be successful with are not the same tasks that are required when one is promoted to supervision. Remedying Supervisory Effectiveness requires careful study to determine the correct causative factors. Triangulate low scores in Supervisory Effectiveness by reviewing how supervisors are selected and their training. Use the employee feedback sessions to make a more complete determination for the causes of low Supervisory Effectiveness scores.

Team Effectiveness

Score: 355

General Description: This Construct captures employees' perceptions of the people within the organization that they work with on a daily basis to accomplish their jobs (the work group or team). This construct gathers data about how effective employees think their work group is as well as the extent to which the organizational environment supports cooperation among employees.

Average scores suggest that room for improvement exists and lack of attention can lead to dropping scores. Much and often most work in organizations require regular collaboration with others, the work team. Problems with Team Effectiveness can come from many causes and may suggest a number of remedies. In general team effectiveness stems from these factors: team membership, the selection, support and training of supervisors, the maturity and experience of employees and the nature of the specific work being performed. Remedying Team Effectiveness requires careful study to determine the correct causative factors. Triangulate low scores in Team Effectiveness with Supervisory Effectiveness by reviewing how supervisors are selected and their training. Use the employee feedback sessions to make a more complete determination for the causes of low Team Effectiveness scores.



Organizational Typology: Areas of Concern

Relative Areas of Concern Continued:

Change Oriented

Score: 356


General Description: This Construct secures employees' perceptions of the organization's capability and readiness to change based on new information and ideas. It addresses the organization's aptitude to process information timely and act upon it effectively. This Construct also examines the organization's capacity to draw upon, develop, and utilize the strengths of all in the organization for improvement.

Average scores suggest that room for improvement exists and lack of attention can lead to organizational stasis. Problems with low change orientation can come from many causes and may suggest a number of remedies. Typically the organization is isolated or maintains a culture that feels that the organization and its activities are unique. This vitiates needed comparison or benchmarking processes. Remedying Change Orientation requires opportunity for study and comparisons with other organizations. Visits to other organizations, participation in accreditation processes and developing external advisory boards can help open the organization and increase readiness to change.



Organizational Change: Performance Over Time

One of the benefits of continuing to participate in the survey is that over time data shows how employees' views have changed as a result of implementing efforts suggested by previous survey results. Positive changes indicate that employees perceive the issue as adequately improved since the previous survey. Negative changes indicate that the employees perceive that the issue has worsened since the previous survey. Negative changes of greater than 50 points and having 10 or more negative construct changes should be a source of concern for the organization and should receive immediate attention.



Analyzing Over Time Data

Over Time Data adds another dimension to an organization's scores. By viewing data from multiple iterations of the survey - static data suddenly is capable of tracking effectiveness of previous action plans and catching declining trends before they become critical. Identifying areas for future action plans becomes more obvious and employees can visually confirm the benefits of being proactive in their organization.

Changes

Organizational change occurs whether or not leadership plans for it. Planning for change puts the control in the hands of the organization. By using the results of the survey and employee feedback, organizations can encourage positive growth trends in their survey scores. A lack of planning can lead to haphazard fluctuations in scores over time.

This organization experienced positive growth in 13 out of the 20 constructs in comparison to the last iteration of the survey. The constructs with the most positive growth are: *Employment Development, Diversity, Goal Oriented, Fairness, and Benefits*. Together, these constructs were identified by employees as having the most significant improvement compared to the previous iteration of the survey. The constructs that showed the least amount of improvement or a decrease in score are: *Fair Pay, Time and Stress, Burnout, Empowerment, and Job Satisfaction*. These constructs may or may not be the lowest scoring constructs, but definite attention should be given to these constructs when considering which areas to focus efforts upon improving.

Determining Causes

This is a turbulent time for many organizations, however this year will prove as an important benchmark year as the economy starts to recover. Any number of events both within and outside of leadership control can affect scores. While score changes cannot be attributed directly to one particular event, it is worthwhile to consider all possibilities and use the most likely culprits as a starting point for developing action plans and encouraging positive trends. Consider any recent events that might have affected the scores for a particular construct. Have there been changes in leadership, policy, or procedure? Has there been any restructuring or layoffs? Were any action plans put into place based on the results of the last survey?

The *Data Report* provides detailed data on each of the survey items and constructs including descriptions and item-construct relationships. Examine the over time data for the individual items that make up a construct to try to isolate contributing factors. Once you have a list of factors, hold a focus group consisting of a diverse group of employees and try to get a better feel for why the employees responded the way they did. You may find that there are many other complex factors at work, but having a pre-compiled set of possible factors will provide a sound starting point.

Continuing Trends

No matter how high a score, there is always room for improvement. Get the entire organization involved in deciding on which constructs to concentrate efforts for improvement. Brainstorm ideas on how improvements can be made and how every employee can have a chance to contribute suggestions. A questionnaire, customized online survey, or departmental meeting may prove effective for collecting ideas. Each organization is unique and has a great amount of untapped resources in its employees. Using employees to solve problems and make organizational improvements is a natural solution - who else knows the organization better?




Participant Profile

Demography data help one to see if the Survey response rate matches the general features of all employees in the organization. It is also an important factor in being able to determine the level of consensus and shared viewpoints across the organization. It may also help to indicate the extent to which the membership of the organization is representative of the local community and those persons that use the services and products of the organization.


Race/Ethnic Identification

Diversity within the workplace provides resources for innovation. A diverse workforce helps insure that different ideas are understood, and that the community sees the organization as representative of the community. * There were 3 employees who chose not to respond to this item.




Age

Age Diversity contributes to having a well-balanced workplace. Different age groups bring different experiences and perspectives to the organization. Large percentages of older individuals may be a cause of concern if a number of key employees are nearing retirement age. Seek ways to preserve the culture and experiences these individuals have brought to the organization. Be mindful that people have different challenges and resources at various age levels and should see that leadership incorporates these understandings. * There were 2 employees who chose not to respond to this item.



Gender


The ratio of males to females within an organization can vary among different organizations. However, extreme imbalances in the gender ratio should be a source of concern for the organization and may require immediate attention. Give consideration to the types of work being performed and be open to unintentional bias in job and employee selection as well as promotion consideration.



Participant Profile


Employee Retention

The percent of employees that see themselves working for this organization in two years is a good indicator of how well the organization is doing at retaining its employees. Very low retention should be a source of concern and may require immediate attention. You have a higher than average number of employees who expect to be working for your organization in two years. * There were 5 employees who chose not to respond to this item.




Promotion

The percentage of employees that receive a promotion can vary among organizations. While organizational growth may increase the likelihood of promotional opportunities, organizations should not simply wait for growth. Low percentages may indicate that current employees do not compete well for promotional opportunities. This would urge study of the Employee Development Construct to gauge the level of employee interest. * There were 3 employees who chose not to respond to this item.



Merit Increase

The percentage of employees that receive a merit increase can vary between organizations. Low percentages may indicate that employees need to review expectations of current employees and those efforts that seek to increase performance. * There was 1 employee who chose not to respond to this item.



*Charts and percentages are based on valid responses. Slight variations from the Data Aggregation Report are due to respondents who chose not to answer particular demographic items. The number of people who chose not to respond is noted for each demographic item.



Interpretation and Intervention

After the survey data has been compiled, the results are returned to the survey liaison, executive director, and board or commission chair approximately one month after data collection stops. These individuals are strongly encouraged to share results with all survey participants in the organization. Survey results are provided in several formats to provide maximum flexibility in interpreting the data and sharing the data with the entire organization. The quick turnaround in reporting allows for immediate action upon the results while they are still current.

The Executive Summary provides a graphical depiction of the data. Graphical data can easily be reproduced in a company newsletter or website. For additional detailed data, the Data Report is useful for examining survey data on the individual item level. Response counts, averages, standard deviations, and response distributions are provided for each item. Excel files provide electronic access to scores. Scores can be sorted in various ways to help determine strengths and areas of concern. The electronic data can also be used by Excel or other software to create additional graphs or charts. Any of these formats can be used alone or in combination to create rich information on which employees can base their ideas for change.

Benchmark data provide an opportunity to get a true feel of the organization's performance. Comparing the organization's score to scores outside of the organization can unearth unique strengths and areas of concern. Several groups of benchmarks are provided to allow the freedom to choose which comparisons are most relevant. If organizational categories were used, then internal comparisons can be made between different functional areas of the organization. By using these comparisons, functional areas can be identified for star performance in a particular construct, and a set of "best practices" can be created to replicate their success throughout the organization.

These Survey Data provide a unique perspective of the average view of all that took the Survey. It is important to examine these findings and take them back to the employees for interpretation and to select priority areas for improvement. This also provides an opportunity for the organization to recognize and celebrate areas that members have judged to be areas of relative strength. By seeking participation and engaging people on how the organization functions, you have taken a specific step in increasing organizational capital. High organizational capital means high trust among employees and a greater likelihood of improved efforts and good working relationships with clients and customers.

Ideas for getting employees involved in the change process:

- Hold small focus groups to find out how the employees would interpret the results
- Conduct small customized follow-up surveys to collect additional information including comments
- Provide employees with questionnaires/comment cards to express their ideas

Ideas for sharing data with the organization:

- Publish results in an organizational newsletter or intranet site
- Discuss results in departmental meetings
- Create a PowerPoint presentation of the results and display them on kiosks



Timeline

December and January: Interpreting the Data

- Data is returned to survey liaisons, executive directors and board members
- Review Survey data including the Executive Summary with executive staff
- Develop plans for circulating all the data sequentially and providing interpretations for all staff

February: Distributing Results to the Entire Organization

- Implement the plans for circulating the data to all staff
- Create 3 to 4 weekly or monthly reports or organization newsletters
- Report a portion of the Constructs and Questions, providing the data along with illustrations pertinent to the organization
- Select a time to have every employee participate in a work unit group to review the reports as they are distributed to all staff, with one group leader assigned to every group. The size of the groups should be limited to about a dozen people at a time. A time limit should be set not to exceed two hours.

March: Planning for Change

- Designate the Change Team composed of a diagonal slice across the organization that will guide the effort
- Identify Work Unit Groups around actual organizational work units and start each meeting by reviewing strengths as indicated in the data report. Brainstorm on how to best address weaknesses
- Establish Procedures for recording the deliberations of the Work Unit Group and returning those data to the Change Team
- Decide upon the Top Priority Change Topic and Methods necessary for making the change. Web-based Discussion Groups and Mini-Surveys are convenient technologies
- First change effort begins
- Repeat for the next change topic

April and Beyond: Implementation and Interventions

- Have the Change Team compile the Priority Change Topics and Methods necessary for making the change and present them to the executive staff
- Discuss the administrative protocols necessary for implementing the changes
- Determine the plan of action and set up a reasonable timeline for implementation
- Keep employees informed about changes as they occur through meetings, newsletters, or intranet publications
- Resurvey to document the effectiveness of the change



