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Using ClimateQual to legitimize the strategic importance of staff

BRINLEY
Organizational Assessment at the UConn Libraries

• The University of Connecticut Libraries have been practicing multidimensional assessment approaches for more than a decade.

• Influenced by the Balance Scorecard, the Libraries’ first “organizational assessment” was undertaken in 1999.
Figure 1: The balanced scorecard adapted for the University of Connecticut Libraries

Output Measures (Key Measures)

“How should we measure our core process outputs?”

Customer (User Surveys)

“How do users rate our services?”

Internal Business Process (Workflow)

“What business processes must we excel at?”

Learning and Growth (Organizational Assessment)

“To achieve our vision, how will we sustain our ability to change and improve?”

Source: Kaplan and Norton (1996, p. 76)
The Advent of ClimateQUAL®

• Having used its own instrument from 1999-2005, the UConn Libraries were excited about participating in the first group of ARL Libraries in 2007 to pilot the Organizational Climate and Diversity Assessment (OCDA) methodology developed at the University of Maryland that became ClimateQUAL®

• Once the quantitative and qualitative results were received, the Libraries needed help understanding how to interpret the findings and respond so we turned to an organizational development consultant who had worked with us successfully in the past.
Approach

• Clarify organizational systems analysis approach
  • Experience and/or Perceptions of policies, procedures practice determine satisfaction/commitment
  • Root cause analysis

• Analyze and understand ClimateQUAL results—the initial data
  • Time-bound (possibility of reactions to org. events)
  • Survey population diversity—need to drill down
  • Averages are misleading; some factors more of concern than others? (UConn a learning organization)
  • Need to focus on the critical few
Gather more data

• Select the climate factors to research
  • Less than 50% agreement
  • Significant difference in responses by one demographic group
  • Wide variance from peer institutions
• Plan the focus groups; invite the staff
  • 2 all-staff
  • 1 team
  • Underrepresented minorities
  • Area heads
• Involve leadership group
  • Discuss focus group approach
  • Frame the systems analysis approach
  • Invite their perspective
Facilitate Focus Groups

- Agreement on process/ground rules
  - Facilitator summaries
  - Confidentiality of individual remarks

- Apollo Root Cause Analysis
  - Think of an event or a condition which might have contributed to the ratings on the survey which was taken last Spring.

- Analysis of Focus Group information
  - Themes / Possible Causes of Ratings
Leadership and 
Team Decision-Making 
System Project Team 
Recommendations

• Investigate different leadership models
• Hold individual staff responsible for their participation under the Libraries’ new leadership and decision making structure
• Restructure Leadership Council to include some team leaders
• All Leadership Council members attend leadership training together and periodically participate in team building exercises
• Ongoing training for all team leaders on topics such as facilitation, team building, and managerial skills
• Reduce the number of standing cross-functional teams; and
• Modify the Libraries’ current meeting structure.
Performance Management Project Team
Recommendations

- Revise and clarify *Goal Setting* and *Report of Activity and Achievements* forms
- Training on setting **SMART** goals for all employees
- Mandatory performance evaluation training for all Supervisors
- Mandatory contributions by all team leaders to team members’ evaluations
- Quarterly reviews of all staff
- Hiring
  - Search Committees: composition, search process etc.
- Merit
  - Establish a standard framework for University Merit
  - Communicate criteria for University Merit effectively to staff
  - Make a clear case for merit recommendations
- Promotion
  - Educational opportunities
  - New career ladders
ClimateQual @ NU Library

Ongoing Implementation
- Training Committee
- Performance Review Training and Procedure Review
- Library Employee Orientation
- Conflict Resolution Procedures

Action Items:
1) Launch ClimateQual Task Force to explore issues/interventions re: **Structural Facilitation of Teamwork**
2) Facilitate AC (Administrative Committee) Retreat to identify interventions re: **Distributive Justice**—specifically performance review processes

( Presented at ARL meeting, May 2011)
Putting ClimateQual in the focus of the Balanced Scorecard

VIVIAN
Moving HR from Transactions to Strategy
The Typical Current Library Strategic Plan

- Lots of user-centered objectives ✔
- Lots of internal process ✔
- A few key financial objectives ✔
- Very little focus on staff ✖
McMaster (2008)

7 strategic directions, 24 goals, 69 initiatives, very little relating to staff
The Balanced Scorecard

MISSION

Customer Perspective
"To achieve our mission, how must we look to our customers?"

Financial Perspective
"If we succeed, how will we look to our donors or taxpayers?"

Internal Perspective
"To satisfy our customers and financial donors, which business processes must we excel at?"

Learning and Growth Perspective
"To achieve our mission, how must our organization learn and improve?"

2008: Move to Balanced Scorecard

New focus on staff learning and growth
Key Learning & Growth Objective

Nurture a healthy, collaborative and dynamic work environment.
Great but....
The BSC Continuum

Mission

Objectives

Measures & Targets

Initiatives
The Problem

• How do you measure a “healthy work environment”
ClimateQUAL

- Credible (endorsed by ARL)
- Neutral (created by 3rd party)
- Statistically rigorous
- Standardized
- Online (easy to administer)
- Provides analysis within weeks
Bravery Required

- **Management:**
  - Encouraging expressions of discontent?
  - How will this reflect on my organization and on my as a leader?
- **Staff:**
  - Will my privacy be protected?
  - Will my comments be taken seriously?
Some downsides

• Generally speaking
  – High-level: Need to drill down deeper to get at the issues.
  – Easy to take comments personally

• McMaster specifically:
  – Had to blend disparate groups together to protect anonymity.
  – Were the first Canadian site to implement. Demographics didn’t line up well.
The Upsides

• Helped us determine areas of concern (organizational justice, organizational fairness...)
• Helped us compare ourselves with others
• Created a safe place for staff to express concerns (anonymous)
• Came with statistical analysis.
Next Steps:

• Focus groups to get at real issues
• Identification of 3-5 priority areas to focus on for 2012/13
Key Messages from the McMaster Experience

• BSC encouraged us to identify staff learning & growth as areas for strategic change
• ClimateQUAL gave us a safe, reliable way to measure success
Broader Institutional Implications – Employee Engagement at the Institutional Level
JHU Timeline

- March 2009 ClimateQual
- Summer 2009 Focus Groups
- October 2009 Hand Off Recommendations to Management
- 2010 – 2012 Annual Follow Up Survey
- Summer 2012 Institution-wide Gallup Survey
- Fall 2012 Gallup Results, Impact Planning
- Planned 2013 repeat of ClimateQual
Tell me more......

66% = 2/3

66% = D
JHU ClimateQual and Follow Up Surveys

3 Year Comparison: Communication, Follow-through Leadership & Transparent Decision Making

- **Transparent Decision Making**
  - Worse
  - No Change
  - Better

- **Leadership**
  - Worse
  - No Change
  - Better

- **Follow Through**
  - Worse
  - No Change
  - Better

- **Communication**
  - Worse
  - No Change
  - Better

The bar chart shows the percentage comparison over three years (2010, 2011, 2012) for each category.
Better has been trending down in all areas

ClimateQual 3 Year Follow Up - Improvement

- Better Communication
- Better Follow Through
- Better Leadership
- Better Transparent Decision Making
- Better Facilitation of Teamwork
- Better Psychological Safety
- Better Distributive Justice
- Better Procedural Justice
# Syncing Performance to Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. Budget Cycle</td>
<td>Begin budget prep</td>
<td>Pre-budget meetings</td>
<td>Budget meetings</td>
<td>Budget meetings continued and Internal allocations</td>
<td>Pres. &amp; Deans goal prep</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Refresh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modifications based on budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>Begin Refresh Environ Scan, Scenarios, Staff Input</td>
<td>Finalize Strat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC &amp; Strat. Funds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Review 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Call for strat prop.</td>
<td>Review 4</td>
<td>Final new strat prop.</td>
<td>Review 1</td>
<td>Review 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCouncil</td>
<td>MC 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>MC4</td>
<td></td>
<td>MC1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MC2 Strat work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Mid Year Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Annual Performance Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Goals Set</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Notes
- **U. Budget Cycle**
  - Begin budget prep
  - Pre-budget meetings
  - Budget meetings
  - Budget meetings continued and Internal allocations
  - Pres. & Deans goal prep

- **Strategy Refresh**
  - Modifications based on budget
  - Begin Refresh Environ Scan, Scenarios, Staff Input
  - Finalize Strat

- **BSC & Strat. Funds**
  - Call for strat prop.
  - Review 4
  - Final new strat prop.

- **MCouncil**
  - Review 3
  - MC4
  - MC1

- **P3**
  - Mid Year Review
  - Annual Performance Reviews
  - New Goals Set
2012 Gallup Staff Engagement

• JHU-wide survey
• Reports at a manager level with organizational roll ups
• Impact planning required at departmental and division level
• 12 core questions that Gallup finds consistently links employee engagement to outcomes
• 12 institution developed questions
Gallup Pyramid of Needs

Overall Satisfaction

Gallup Q¹²®

Grow
- Q12. Learn & grow
- Q11. Progress

Belong
- Q10. Best friend
- Q09. Employees committed to quality
- Q08. Mission/Purpose
- Q07. Opinions count

Give
- Q06. Development
- Q05. Cares about me
- Q04. Recognition
- Q03. Opportunity to do best

Get
- Q02. Have materials & equipment
- Q01. Know what’s expected
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gallup</th>
<th>ClimateQual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q00. How satisfied are you with JHU as a place to work?</td>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q01. I know what is expected of me at work.</td>
<td>Task Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q02. I have the materials and equipment I need to do my job.</td>
<td>Broadly the justices in ClimateQual cover this area, but not specifically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q03. At work, I have the opportunity to do what I do best everyday.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q04. In the last 7 days, I have received recognition or praise for doing good work.</td>
<td>Leader Member Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q05. My supervisor or someone at work cares about me as a person</td>
<td>Leader Member Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q06. There is someone at work who encourages me development.</td>
<td>Climate for Continual Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gallup ClimateQUAL Compatibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gallup</th>
<th>ClimateQUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q07. At work, my opinions seem to count</td>
<td>Psychological Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q08. The mission or purpose of my organization makes me feel my job is important.</td>
<td>Organizational Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q09. My fellow employees are committed to quality work.</td>
<td>Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. I have a best friend at work.</td>
<td>Psychological Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. In the last six months someone at work talked to me about my progress.</td>
<td>Leader Member Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12. This last year, I had opportunities to learn and grow</td>
<td>Climate for Continual Learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What’s in ClimateQual but Missing From Gallup?

- Distributive/Procedural Justices
- Authentic transformational leadership
- Deep and Demographic Diversity
- Climate for Customer Service
- Organizational Withdrawal
- Work Unit Conflict
Impact Plan Questions

• Do any of the results surprise you?
• What were you thinking about when you answered this question?
• Do the results reflect how you feel now?
• What would a “5” look like in this area?
• What are we doing that makes this a strong or weak result?
• What does our work unit need to do to improve in this area?
Change leads to disappointment if it is not sustained. Transformation is sustained change and it is achieved through practice.

BKS Iyengar