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AGENDA
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Alamo Hall
300 Alamo Plaza
San Antonio, TX 78205
April 28, 2022
2:45 p.m.
(or upon the adjournment of the 1:30 p.m. Historic Sites committee meeting, whichever occurs later)

This meeting of the THC Executive committee has been properly posted with the Secretary of State’s Office according to the provisions of the Texas Open Meetings Act, Chapter 551, Texas Government Code. The members may discuss and/or take action on any of the items listed in the agenda.

NOTES: Alamo Hall is a separate building from the Alamo and can be found by following the path to the right of the Alamo. The Executive Committee may go into executive session (closed meeting to the public) on any agenda item if appropriate and authorized by the Open Meetings Act, TGC, Chapter 551.

1. Call to Order – Chairman John Nau
   A. Committee member introductions
   B. Establish quorum
   C. Recognize and/or excuse absences

2. Consider approval of the February 1, 2022 Executive Committee meeting minutes

3. Consider adoption of new rule to the TAC, Title 13, Part 2, Chapter 11, Subchapter A, Section 11.25 related to the Family Leave Pool, without changes as published in the February 25, 2022, issue of the Texas Register (47 TexReg 845-846) (Item 6.4) – Miller

4. Hurricane Harvey Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund (Item 15.2) – Hart
   A. Consider approval of grant award to alternate project (Item 15.2A)
   B. Consider approval of process to award supplemental funding to previously awarded projects (Item 15.2B)

5. Consider delegation of authority to the Executive Committee to approve the Legislative Appropriations Request for FY 2024-2025 (Item 15.3) – Wolfe

6. Consider delegating authority to the Executive Committee to approve the THC Strategic Plan FY 2023-2027 (Item 15.4) – Wolfe

7. Human Resources Update – Miller
   A. Survey of Employee Engagement Report
   B. Consider approval of the FY 2020 Survey of Employee Engagement Operational action plan (item 6.6)

8. Information technology update – Miller

9. Committee Chairman’s Report
   A. Ongoing Projects; and
   B. Updates and Upcoming Events

10. Adjourn

NOTICE OF ASSISTANCE AT PUBLIC MEETINGS: Persons with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who may need auxiliary aids or services such as interpreters for persons who are deaf or hearing impaired, readers, large print or Braille, are requested to contact esther.brickley@thc.texas.gov at least four (4) business days prior to the meeting so that appropriate arrangements can be made.
1. Call to Order

The meeting of the Texas Historical Commission (THC) Executive Committee was called to order by Vice-Chairman Catherine McKnight at 11:30 a.m. on February 1, 2022. She announced the meeting had been posted to the Texas Register, was being held in conformance with the Texas Open Meetings Act, Texas Government Code, Chapter 551 and that notice had been properly posted with the Secretary of State’s Office as required.

A. Committee member introductions
Vice-Chair McKnight welcomed everyone, and introductions were made around the table.

B. Establish quorum
Vice-Chair McKnight reported a quorum was present and declared the meeting open.

C. Recognize and/or excuse absences
Vice-Chair McKnight noted that Chairman John L. Nau, III, was absent due to an unavoidable scheduling conflict. Commissioner Pete Peterson moved, Commissioner Garrett Donnelly seconded, and the committee voted unanimously to excuse the absence of Chairman Nau.

2. Consider approval of the Executive Committee meeting minutes

A. October 28, 2021 (Austin)
B. January 11, 2022 (Houston)

Commissioner Peterson moved, Commissioner John Crain seconded, and the committee voted unanimously to approve the minutes from the October 28, 2021 and the January 11, 2022 executive committee meetings.

3. Consider dates/locations for 2022 and 2023 quarterly meetings

THC Executive Director Mark Wolfe presented the proposed dates and locations for the next two years. He noted that a few changes had been made since the last time the commission had approved the dates/locations. Commissioner Daisy White moved, Commissioner Peterson seconded, and the committee vote unanimously to send forward to the commission and recommend approval of the dates/locations for the 2022 and 2023 quarterly meetings as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 1-2, Austin</td>
<td>January 31–February 1, Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 28–29, San Antonio</td>
<td>April 27–28, Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25-26, Big Spring</td>
<td>July 20–21, Plano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27–28, College Station</td>
<td>October 26–27, TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Consider approval of filing authorization of proposed new rule to the TAC, Title 13, Part 2, Chapter 11, Subchapter A, Section 11.25 related to the Family Leave Pool, for first publication and public comment in the Texas Register

THC Deputy Executive Director of Administration Alvin Miller reported that the THC was proposing to add a new rule to Chapter 11 of the Texas Administrative Code, Part 2, Section 11.25 related to the state employee family leave pool to comply with Texas Government Code requirements for rulemaking. He stated that the agency had complied with the requirements of the related statute but had not formally adopted rules. Commissioner Peterson moved, Commissioner Donnelly seconded, and the committee voted unanimously to send forward to the commission and recommend approval of the filing authorization of the proposed new rule to TAC, Title 13, Part 2, Chapter 11, section 11.25 related to the State Employee Family Leave Pool, for first publication and public comment in the Texas Register.

5. Consider approval of Hurricane Harvey Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund grant award to alternate project

THC Disaster Assistance Program Coordinator Lisa Hart reported that a funding grant award to the Luther Hotel was withdrawn in November 2021 due to complications resulting from the death of the owner. She reported that the return resulted in $183,509.09 remaining for distribution. Hart explained that the next highest-ranking project remaining on the alternate list, was the Donigan House, also known as the Waller County Museum, owned by Waller County. She noted that the county judge had approved moving forward with the grant-funded repair work. Hart presented the proposed scope of work with photos. Commissioner White moved, Commissioner Peterson seconded, and the committee voted unanimously to send forward to the commission and recommend approval of funding from the Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund Grant program to the Donigan House (Waller County Museum), 906 Cooper Street, Brookshire, Waller County in the amount of $250,000.

6. Consider approval of appointments/reappointments to the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB)

Executive Director Wolfe explained that the commission had the ability to appoint advisory committees pursuant to Texas Administrative Code, Chapter 26, Practice and Procedure, Subchapter A, General Provisions, Section 26.5. He noted that the AAB consisted of archeologists, historians and historic architects who serve two-year terms that expire on February 1, of either odd or even numbered years, as determined by the commission. Executive Director Wolfe stated that seven positions were up for appointment or reappointment (three professional archeologists, two historic architects, and two historians) and referred commissioners to their meeting packets for the list of proposed appointments/reappointments. Commissioner Donnelly moved, Commissioner Crain seconded, and the committee voted unanimously to send forward to the commission and recommend the appointment of Niki Hise, professional archeologist, and Joaquín Rivaya-Martínez, historian; and the reappointments of Doug Boyd, professional archeologist, Todd Ahlman, professional archeologist, and Rick Lewis, historic architect, each to serve a two-year term (effective February 2, 2022 through January 31, 2024); further, to approve the retroactive reappointments of Norman Alston, historic architect, and Bob Ward, historian, each to serve a two-year term (effective February 1, 2021 through January 31, 2023) to the Antiquities Advisory Board.

7. Human Resources Update

Deputy Executive Director of Administration Alvin Miller provided an overview of the FY2022 Survey of Employee Engagement (SEE). Administered by the University of Texas Institute of Organizational Excellence (Institute), he explained that the THC had participated in the biennial SEE since 1994 and noted that the
FY2022 survey was administered between December 2021 through January 20, 2022. Miller explained that the survey provided information about employees’ perceptions of the effectiveness of the agency and their job satisfaction. He stated that the overall survey response rate was 85.6 percent which was an increase from the previous biennium. Miller reported that the Institute would submit an independent report which would be presented at the April 2022 quarterly meeting along with a proposed action plan.

8. Information technology update
Miller offered a summary of the IT activities over the past quarter including the completion of a password change initiative and annual network penetration testing.

9. Committee Chairman’s Report
Vice-Chair McKnight called on Executive Director Wolfe who provided an updated timeline for the anticipated work on the Battleship Texas including onsite repairs in advance of drydocking (February-April 2022); consideration of one last public day (March 2022); dredging of the Battleship berth (April-May 2022); final towing preparations (May 2022); and towing of the Battleship to Galveston for restoration (18-day journey, June 2022).

10. Adjourn
On the motion of the vice-chair, and without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 11:50 a.m.
TAB 6.4
Consider adoption of proposed new rule to the TAC, Title 13, Part 2, Chapter 11, Subchapter A, Section 11.25 related to the Family Leave Pool, without changes as published in the February 25, 2022, issue of the Texas Register (47 TexReg 845-846)

Background:

The Texas Historical Commission proposes adoption of a new rule to Chapter 11 of the Texas Administrative Code, Part 2, Section 11.25 related to the state employee family leave pool to comply with Texas Government Code requirements for rulemaking. The Commission has been in compliance with the requirements of the related statute but has not formally adopted rules. The Human Resources policy has been established in the Personnel Manual.

No comments were received following the posting of the proposed rule. The final publication in the Texas Register will take place after adoption by the Commission.

Recommended motion (Committee):

Move to send forward to the Commission and recommend adoption of the new rule to Texas Administrative Code, Title 13, Part 2, Chapter 11, section 11.25 related to the State Employee Family Leave Pool, without changes as published in the February 25, 2022, issue of the Texas Register (47 TexReg 845-846)

Recommended motion (Commission):

Move to adopt the new rule to the Texas Administrative Code, Title 13, Part 2, Chapter 11, section 11.25 related to the State Employee Family Leave Pool, without changes as published in the February 25, 2022, issue of the Texas Register (47 TexReg 845-846)
Texas Administrative Code
Title 13 Cultural Resources
Part 2 Texas Historical Commission
Chapter 11 Administration Department
Subchapter A Administration
Rule §11.25 State Employee Family Leave Pool

ADOPTION PREAMBLE
The Texas Historical Commission (Commission) adopts new rule Sec. 11.25, related to State Employee Family Leave Pool within Title 13, Part 2, Chapter 11 of the Texas Administrative Code.

Rule 11.25 creates a process for State Employee Family Leave Pool

PUBLIC COMMENT
No comments pertaining to this new rule were received during the thirty-day period following publication on February 25, 2022, in the Texas Register.

The new rule is adopted under the authority of the Texas Government Code Sec. 442.005(q), which provides the Commission with the authority to promulgate rules to reasonably effect the purposes of the Commission. The Commission hereby certifies that the section as adopted has been reviewed by legal counsel and found to be a valid exercise of the agency’s authority.

The new rule to the Texas Administrative Code, Title 13, Part 2, Chapter 26.3 is adopted as appears below:
A state employee family leave pool is established to provide eligible employees more flexibility in bonding and caring for children during a child's first year following birth, adoption, or foster placement, and caring for a seriously ill family member or the employee, including pandemic-related illnesses or complications caused by a pandemic.

(1) The commission's Executive Director shall designate a pool administrator.

(2) The pool administrator will recommend a policy, operating procedures, and forms for the administration of this section for approval by the Executive Director.

(3) Operation of the pool shall be consistent with Texas Government Code, Chapter 661, Subchapter A-1, State Employee Family Leave Pool.

(4) Adoption of this rule is required of state agencies by Texas Government Code §661.022.
TAB 15.2 A
Consider approval of Hurricane Harvey Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund grant award to alternate project

Background

Congress appropriated $50 million from the Historic Preservation Fund to address the impacts of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, which occurred in 2017. In August 2018, the Texas Historical Commission (THC) applied to the National Park Service to receive an apportionment of these funds to assist affected historic properties in Texas. Staff received official notice on March 8, 2019 of the successful grant award in the amount of $12,318,047. In August of 2019, the NPS awarded THC an additional $200,000 for a mid-century modern survey and elevation study, bringing the grant funding total to $12,518,047.

The THC Commission awarded 39 projects in May and July 2019 for a total of $8,373,401. In addition, eight projects were identified as alternate projects. The Commission reserved $626,599 in grant funding for distribution to alternate project funding, program-required National Register nominations and possibly supplementing already awarded projects. To date, seven alternate projects have been awarded funding by the Commission. In January 2022, an award in the amount of $250,000 to rehabilitate the Schlumberger Well Servicing Corporation Building in Harris County was declined due to devastating damage and theft of the building’s electrical system.

The final project remaining on the alternate list, Texas Freedom Colonies Project, is a trademarked research initiative copyrighted by Andrea R. Roberts, PhD, an associate professor in the Department of Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning in the College of Architecture at Texas A&M University. Dr. Roberts will be transitioning to employment with the University of Virginia this fall necessitating a contract directly through her company, Freedom Colonies Project LLC. The project will cover strategic and technical planning, including support for student research this summer.

Recommended motion (Committee):
Move to send forward to the Commission and recommend approval of funding from the Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund Grant program to Freedom Colonies Project LLC in the amount of $151,211.00

Recommended motion (Commission):
Move to approve funding from the Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund Grant program to Freedom Colonies Project LLC in the amount of $151,211.00
HIM ESHPF Alternate Projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Fire Station #3 FUNDED</td>
<td>Replace roof, 2nd floor restoration</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
<td>Nueces</td>
<td>Ritz Theater FUNDED</td>
<td>Repair roof, condition assessment, restoration plan</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugio</td>
<td>Refugio</td>
<td>Anaqua Home FUNDED</td>
<td>Porch repair to storm standards</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>Galveston</td>
<td>Scottish Rite Temple FUNDED</td>
<td>Repair roof, walls, windows</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Sociedad Mutualista Obrera Mexicana (SMOM) FUNDED</td>
<td>Repair roof, structural damage</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Caroline Gilbert Hinchee House FUNDED</td>
<td>Temporary roof, weatherization, stabilization drainage</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookshire</td>
<td>Waller</td>
<td>Waller County Museum (Donigan House) FUNDED</td>
<td>Flood assessment and mitigation, structural work</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Freedom Colonies strategic &amp; tech plan PROPOSED</td>
<td>Plan and test methodology for integrated engagement and survey</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAB 15.2 B
Consider approval of process to award supplemental funding to previously awarded Hurricane Harvey Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund projects

Background

Congress appropriated $50 million from the Historic Preservation Fund to address the impacts of Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, which occurred in 2017. In August 2018, the Texas Historical Commission (THC) applied to the National Park Service to receive an apportionment of these funds to assist affected historic properties in Texas. Staff received official notice on March 8, 2019 of the successful grant award in the amount of $12,318,047. In August of 2019, the NPS awarded THC an additional $200,000 for a mid-century modern survey and elevation study, bringing the grant funding total to $12,518,047.

The THC Commission awarded 39 projects in May and July 2019 for a total of $8,373,401. In addition, eight projects were identified as alternate projects. The Commission reserved $626,599 in grant funding for distribution to alternate project funding, program-required National Register nominations and possibly supplementing projects which previously received awards. Since the grant awards were made, several projects have declined funding due to a variety of reasons. Now that all eight alternate projects have been funded, a process is proposed to distribute the remaining funding as it becomes available. All projects must be completed by the deadline established by the National Park Service of March 31, 2024. The process below will redistribute funding as efficiently as possible to ensure the state makes full use of grant funding according to terms of the THC’s contract with the National Park Service award contract.

Proposed Policy

To facilitate distributing all funds awarded to the state, the Executive Director will award supplemental funding to those subgrant projects that identified the need for additional funding in their original applications, in the order of the original score ranking and project status. To be eligible for supplemental funding, a project must have an executed subgrant agreement and a filed preservation easement in place and demonstrate progress in project development.

The Executive Director shall defer awarding supplemental funding to projects that do not meet the required criteria or are unready to utilize the additional funding and will then consider the next highest-rank qualified project. As additional funding becomes available, the Executive Director will again consider the highest ranked project for supplemental funding, with no guarantee that funding will become available to projects at a later date. Internal THC projects may also be considered for supplemental funding.

Prior to determining the amount of a supplemental funding award, the applicant may submit a revised budget and scope of work. The Executive Director may use updated cost and budget to determine supplemental funding, if appropriate. The Executive Director may make multiple awards to a single project, depending on the viability of the project, the use of prior funding, and the demonstrated ability to meet the final project closure deadline of March 31, 2024.
Recommended motion (Committee):
Move to send forward to the Commission and recommend directing the Executive Director to award supplemental funding from the Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund Grant program to the highest ranking qualified subgrantee projects as outlined in the motion policy.

Recommended motion (Commission):
Move to direct the Executive Director to award supplemental funding from the Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria Emergency Supplemental Historic Preservation Fund Grant program to the highest ranking qualified subgrantee projects as outlined in the motion policy.
TAB 15.3
Consider delegation of authority to the Executive Committee to approve the Legislative Appropriations Request for the 2024-2025 biennium

Background:

The Legislative Appropriations Request (LAR) for the 2024-25 biennium is the agency’s budget request to the Texas Legislature. The LAR contains the actual expenditures from the previous year (2021), the estimated expenditures from the current year (2022), budgeted expenditures for the coming year (2023), and the requested budget for the coming biennium (FYs 2024-2025). Agencies, including THC, are also able to request additional funding for agency initiatives, known as exceptional items.

The LAR Policy letter and submission schedule is expected to be released in mid-late June with an expected due date to the Legislative Budget Board (LBB) on approximately August 5, 2022. This timeframe falls in between THC quarterly meetings and warrants delegation of authority to the Executive committee for approval of the LAR to facilitate the timely submission.

Suggested Motion:
Move to delegate authority to the Executive Committee to approve the Legislative Appropriations Request (LAR) for the 2024-25 biennium. Any final adjustments necessary before submission of the LAR to the Legislature may be made by the Executive Director with the approval of the Chairman.
TAB 15.4
Consider delegating authority to the Executive Committee to approve the THC Strategic Plan FY 2023-2027

Background:

The THC is required to submit a Strategic Plan to the Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning and Policy and the Legislative Budget Board every biennium (even-numbered years). The Strategic Plan identifies a 5-year vision and direction for the agency and serves as the framework for internal operations, which include objectives, strategies, performance measures and the budget.

The agency has undergone an inclusive strategic planning process. The conceptual direction of the Strategic Plan incorporates decisions made during this process and is in alignment with the Governor’s instructions for strategic planning.

The THC will submit its final plan to the Governor’s Office of Budget, Planning and Policy and the Legislative Budget Board June 1, 2022. As the Strategic Plan must be submitted prior to the next Commission meeting, it is requested that the Commission delegate authority to the Executive Committee to make any final adjustments necessary and approve the THC Strategic Plan for FY 2023-2027 to meet the June 1, 2022 submission deadline.

Suggested Motion:

Move to delegate authority to the Executive Committee to make any final adjustments necessary and approve the THC Strategic Plan for FY 2023-2027 for timely submission.
TAB 6.6
Consider approval of the FY 2022 Survey of Employee Engagement (SEE) Operational Action Plan

Background:

Since 1994, THC has participated in this biennial Survey, which is administered by The University of Texas Institute for Organizational Excellence (UT). UT recommends that an agency focus on improving its three lowest scoring areas.

A proposed SEE Action Plan has been developed that lists several specific strategies to focus on improvement of the three lowest scoring areas of the Survey and to reinforce the very favorable results achieved overall.

Recommended motion (Committee):

Move that the committee send forward to the Commission and recommend approval of the THC FY 2022 Survey of Employee Engagement Operational Action Plan.
Strategy 1: Re-enforce THC as a positive place to work by recognition of staff performance through monetary and non-monetary recognition and awards.

Short term actions (1 year):
A. Conduct a targeted follow-up annual Compensation Review of Archaeologist, Information Technology, Architect, Historian, Project Reviewer, Project Design Specialist and selected Historic Sites job classifications to confirm compensation alignment with current salary market conditions and adjust as needed.
B. Include a review of Division Director compensation structure to ensure appropriate supervisor and employee salary equity and relationships are preserved.
C. Conduct biennial review of State Job Classifications and Salary Group Ranges utilized by THC; submit recommendations to the State Auditor’s Office for needed changes to the State Classification Act for consideration in 88th Legislative Session.
D. Continue Staff Performance Awards Recognition Program and identify needed revisions.
E. Continue a robust telework program that allows employees some flexibility to productively work remote to meet job expectations. Review program annually for needed adjustments or revisions.

Long term actions (2 years):
F. Conduct additional training for Directors on Compensation and Performance Management Best Practices.
G. Complete organizational assessment of the THC division Team Lead structure, job expectations and responsibilities to:
   • Identify leadership training opportunities for Division Program Leads who provide formalized workload management support to Directors, and
   • Increase employee development and career progression opportunities for our program leads and other key professional staff.
H. Identify strategies to improve our new employee orientation to educate newer employees on career advancement and professional development opportunities to reinforce retention.

Strategy 2: Re-enforce an environment where internal communications and feedback is welcomed, valued, and utilized.

Short term actions (1 year):
A. Share current SEE Results, SEE Action Plan, and provide progress updates at the all-agency staff meeting and in individual division staff meetings.
B. Continue monthly division staff meetings and bi-monthly all-agency state-wide meetings to encourage maximum participation and feedback.
C. Continue monthly employee newsletter that highlights THC staff and their accomplishments, published in both digital and print versions to encourage on-line access and employee sharing with family members.
D. Conduct informal division staff meetings with Executive Director to solicit and promote open and informal staff feedback.
E. Provide feedback to each Director using the results of the SEE and the feedback provided by their employees in individual Division Teambuilding Training Sessions.
F. Continue formal customer service training for all agency staff including establishment of expectations for responding to questions or requests for assistance in a reasonable timeframe.
G. Review/Update current THC intranet employee resources to improve employee ease of access to agency communications, operating policies, procedures, and frequently asked questions.
**Strategy 3: Continue improvements to information systems infrastructure, data accessibility and productivity tools for staff.**

**Short term actions (1 year):**

A. Continue 4-year refresh cycle for all employee Personal Computers and software to keep hardware and software technology current.

B. Conduct post – implementation review of Comptroller’s CAPPS Financial and Human Resources system and provide feedback to CPA for suggested improvements.

C. Continue Implementation of improved Historic Sites Public/Guest Wifi Technology Plan based on Historic Sites Management priority and funding available, including any newly acquired historic sites approved by the commission.

D. Continue Point-of-Sale System Assessment/Enhancements and Staff Training at Historic Sites to improve Site business operations and support Retail Development Plan Expansion.

E. Evaluate new systems technology improvements needed to the eTrac 106 project review system.

F. Develop a proposal for a digital storage and information retrieval system solution to improve data, document, and photographic image access for THC applications and program staff.

G. Determine best strategy to fund needed technology improvements. If appropriate, include funding request for needed technology improvements in the Legislative Appropriations Request for FY 2024 – 2025.

**Long term actions (2 years):**

H. Implement enhancements to on-call Help Desk Support model to improve technical support response time for Central Austin and Historic Sites employees.

I. Implement In-tune technology to allow software updates and patches to be automatically pushed out to all employee computer workstations to ensure current versions of software installed and improved security.

**Strategy 4: Re-enforce and Support Strategic Leadership and Supervisory Development.**

**Short term actions (1 year):**

A. Continue formal training for all supervisors and employees on managing a remote workforce and being a successful teleworker. This training will ensure employee expectations of telework are clearly communicated and understood by the employee and will prepare the supervisor for effectively managing a remote worker. This training will include an opportunity for employee feedback after supervisor training is complete.

B. Provide regular opportunities for managerial staff to meet with each other to discuss ongoing supervisory efforts and issues.

**Long term actions (2 years):**

C. Provide THC directors the opportunity to complete strategic leadership training in the planned Texas Leadership Experience Academy under development at Washington on the Brazos State Historic Site in partnership with Blinn College and Texas A & M University.
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Texas Historical Commission
FY 2022 Survey of Employee Engagement Results Overview Report
April 2022

Introduction
Since 1994, the Texas Historical Commission (THC) has participated in the biennial Survey of Employee Engagement (SEE) conducted by the Institute of Organizational Excellence at The University of Texas at Austin. The data provides information not only about employees’ perceptions of the effectiveness of their own organization, but also about employees’ satisfaction with their employer. The survey is a catalyst to promote excellence through participation and accountability.

During December 2021 to mid-January 2022, the staff of the THC completed this anonymous survey, and the results were released to the agency in February 2022. The Survey consisted of 48 questions posed to employees that measure 12 different areas or categories called Constructs plus a Climate Category. These Constructs are used to assess overall how the agency functions. Each Construct category is rated on a 5-point scale of 1 – 5, from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. There is an overall agency score, and each Construct receives a score.

A score above 350 is the desirable target. A score below 300 indicates a cause for concern.

So how did THC fare on the survey?
Overall, the 2022 THC results are very favorable and improved from 2019:

- THC achieved an overall agency score of 397, an improvement from 2019’s score of 394. According to UT, scores for state agencies typically range from 325 to 375. So, THC’s trend is positive.
- The employee response rate of 85.6 percent was slightly up from 2019. A desirable target is > 50% so our response rate is considered high compared to other agencies.
- Out of 12 constructs, 11 constructs scored over 375, with 9 constructs scoring 400 or higher – these scores indicate areas of substantial strength.
- Categories deserving special mention are:
  - Strategic with a Score of 406.
  - Job Satisfaction with a score of 408.
  - Employee Engagement with a score of 411.
  - Supervision with a score of 421.
  - Information Systems with a score of 401.
- Lowest scoring categories include:
  - Pay with a score of 299, a slight improvement from 2019 and 5.6% higher compared to similar agencies.
  - Employee Development with a score of 389.
  - Internal Communications with a score of 387, an increase from 2019’s score of 377.

All 3 of the lowest scoring areas (Employee Development, Internal Communications and Pay) either improved or remained stable compared to 2019. Two of these three exceeded the desirable goal of 350 or better, and all three scores surpassed the average benchmark scores for similar-sized agencies.

UT recommends that an agency focus its efforts on improvement of its 3 lowest scoring areas. THC has developed a proposed action plan that outlines additional strategies to further improve the areas of Pay, Employee Development, and Internal Communications, and that will reinforce the overall positive results from the 2021 Survey.
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Institute for Organizational Excellence
The University of Texas at Austin
1925 San Jacinto Blvd., D3500
Austin, Texas 78712

www.survey.utexas.edu
orgexcel@utexas.edu
Phone (512) 471-9831
Fax (512) 471-9600
THANK YOU for your participation in the Survey of Employee Engagement (SEE). We trust that you will find this information helpful in your leadership planning and organizational development efforts. The SEE is specifically focused on the key drivers relative to the ability to engage employees towards successfully fulfilling the vision and mission of the organization.

Inside this report, you will find many tools to assist you in understanding the engagement of your employees. Your first indication of engagement will be the response rate of your employees. From there, we share with you the overall score for your organization, averaging all survey items. You will also find a breakdown of the levels of engagement found among your employees. We have provided demographic information about the employees surveyed as well as what percent are leaving or retiring in the near future. Then, this report contains a breakdown of the scoring for each construct we surveyed, highlighting areas of strength and areas of concern. Finally, we have provided Focus Forward action items throughout the report and a timeline suggesting how to move forward with what you have learned from the survey results.

Your report represents aggregate data, but some organizations will want further information. For example, the SEE makes it possible to see results broken down by demographic groupings. We would enjoy hearing how you've used the data, and what you liked and disliked about the SEE experience. We are here to help you engage your employees in achieving your vision and mission.

Noel Landuyt
Associate Director
Institute for Organizational Excellence
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The Survey

**Primary Items**
The Survey of Employee Engagement (SEE) consists of a series of 48 primary items used to assess essential and fundamental aspects of how the organization functions. The items are on a 5-point scale from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5).

**Demographic Items**
Also included on the SEE instrument are a series of items to ascertain the demography of the respondents.

**Constructs**
Similar items are grouped together, and their scores are averaged to produce twelve construct measures. These constructs capture the concepts most utilized by leadership and drive organizational performance and engagement.

**Overall Score**
The Overall Score is an average of all survey items and represents the overall score for the organization. It is a broad indicator for comparison purposes with other entities.

**Levels of Employee Engagement**
Twelve items crossing several survey constructs have been selected to assess the level of engagement (high, moderate, or low) among individual employees.

**Breakout Categories**
Organizations can use breakout categories to get a cross-sectional look at specific functional or geographic areas. Your organization had a total of 9 breakout categories.

**Additional Items**
Organizations can customize their survey with up to 20 additional items. These items can target issues specific to the organization. Your organization did not use additional items.
Employee Engagement

Response Rate

85.6%

Response Rate

The response rate to the survey is your first indication of the level of employee engagement in your organization. Of the 257 employees invited to take the survey, 220 responded for a response rate of 85.6%. As a general rule, rates higher than 50% suggest soundness, while rates lower than 30% may indicate problems. At 85.6%, your response rate is considered high. High rates mean that employees have an investment in the organization and are willing to contribute towards making improvements within the workplace. With this level of engagement, employees have high expectations from leadership to act upon the survey results.

Overall Score

The overall score is a broad indicator for comparison purposes with other entities. Scores above 350 are desirable, and when scores dip below 300, there should be cause for concern. Scores above 400 are the product of a highly engaged workforce. Your Overall Score from last time was 394.

Levels of Employee Engagement

Twelve items crossing several survey constructs have been selected to assess the level of engagement among individual employees. For this organization, 35% of employees are Highly Engaged, 30% are Engaged, 27% are Moderately Engaged, and 8% are Disengaged.

Highly Engaged employees are willing to go above and beyond in their employment. Engaged employees are more present in the workplace and show an effort to help out. Moderately Engaged employees are physically present, but put minimal effort towards accomplishing the job. Disengaged employees are disinterested in their jobs and may be actively working against their coworkers.

For comparison purposes, according to nationwide polling data, about 30% of employees are Highly Engaged or Engaged, 50% are Moderately Engaged, and 20% are Disengaged. While these numbers may seem intimidating, they offer a starting point for discussions on how to further engage employees. Focus on building trust, encouraging the expression of ideas, and providing employees with the resources, guidance, and training they need to do their best work.
Examining demographic data is an important aspect of determining the level of consensus and shared viewpoints across the organization. A diverse workforce helps ensure that different ideas are understood, and that those served see the organization as representative of the community. Gender, race/ethnicity, and age are just a few ways to measure diversity. While percentages can vary among different organizations, extreme imbalances should be a cause for concern.

**Race/Ethnicity**

- African Am/Black: 1.4%
- White: 83.6%
- Asian: 0.5%
- Native Am, Pac Isl: 1.4%
- Prefer not to answer: 10.9%
- Prefer to self-describe: 2.3%

**Age (in years)**

- 16-29: 4.5%
- 30-39: 25.9%
- 40-49: 20.0%
- 50-59: 21.8%
- 60+: 18.6%
- Prefer not to answer: 9.1%

**Gender**

- Female: 52.7%
- Male: 39.5%
- Prefer not to answer: 6.4%
- Prefer to self-describe: 1.4%

**YEARS OF SERVICE With this Organization**

- 24% New Hires (0-2 years)
- 42% Experienced (3-10 years)
- 29% Very Experienced (11+ years)
- 5% Prefer not to answer

*Each figure represents about 2.4 employees.*

**FOCUS FORWARD >>>

5% **INTEND TO LEAVE**

Understand why people are leaving your organization by examining retention factors such as working conditions, market competitiveness, or upcoming retirement.

19% **CAN RETIRE**

This percentage of respondents indicated that they are or will be eligible for retirement within two years.
Constructs

Similar items are grouped together and their scores are averaged and multiplied by 100 to produce 12 construct measures. These constructs capture the concepts most utilized by leadership and drive organizational performance and engagement.

Each construct is displayed below with its corresponding score. Constructs have been coded below to highlight the organization’s areas of strength and concern. The three highest are green, the three lowest are red, and all others are yellow. Scores typically range from 300 to 400, and 350 is a tipping point between positive and negative perceptions. The lowest score for a construct is 100, while the highest is 500.

Focus Forward

Every organization faces different challenges depending on working conditions, resources, and job characteristics. On the next page, we highlight the constructs that are relative strengths and concerns for your organization. While it is important to examine areas of concern, this is also an opportunity to recognize and celebrate areas that employees have judged to be strengths. All organizations start in a different place, and there is always room for improvement within each area.
Constructs 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 having 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 40 points and having 8 or more negative construct changes should be a source of concern for the organization and should be discussed with employees and organizational leadership.

Has Change Occurred?

Variation in scores from year to year is normal, even when nothing has changed. Analyzing trend data requires bringing patterns into focus, digging deeper into data, and asking questions about issues surrounding the workplace.

Pay close attention to changes of more than 15 points in either direction. Were there any new policies or organizational changes that might have affected the scores? Were these areas a point of focus for your change initiatives?
## Areas of Strength

### Supervision
- **Score: 421**
- The supervision construct captures employees’ perceptions of the nature of supervisory relationships within the organization. Higher scores suggest that employees view their supervisors as fair, helpful and critical to the flow of work.

### Employee Engagement
- **Score: 411**
- The employee engagement construct captures the degree to which employees are willing to go above and beyond, feel committed to the organization and are present while working. Higher scores suggest that employees feel their ideas count, their work impacts the organization and their well-being and development are valued.

### Benefits
- **Score: 411**
- The benefits construct captures employees’ perceptions about how the benefits package compares to packages at similar organizations and how flexible it is. Higher scores suggest that employees think health insurance and retirement benefits are competitive with similar jobs in the community.

## Areas of Concern

### Pay
- **Score: 299**
- The pay construct captures employees’ perceptions about how well the compensation package offered by the organization holds up when compared to similar jobs in other organizations. Lower scores suggest that pay is a central concern or reason for discontent and is not comparable to similar organizations.

### Internal Communication
- **Score: 387**
- The internal communication construct captures employees’ perceptions of whether communication in the organization is reasonable, candid and helpful. Lower scores suggest that employees feel information does not arrive in a timely fashion and is difficult to find.

### Employee Development
- **Score: 389**
- The employee development construct captures employees’ perceptions about the priority given to their personal and job growth needs. Lower scores suggest that employees feel stymied in their education and growth in job competence.
The climate in which employees work does, to a large extent, determine the efficiency and effectiveness of an organization. The appropriate climate is a combination of a safe, non-harassing environment with ethical abiding employees who treat each other with fairness and respect. Moreover, it is an organization with proactive management that communicates and has the capability to make thoughtful decisions. Below are the percentages of employees who marked disagree or strongly disagree for each of the 6 climate items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Issue Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>Upper management should communicate better. Upper management should make efforts to be visible and accessible, as well as utilize intranet/internet sites, email, and social media as appropriate to keep employees informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>Information from this survey will go unused. Conducting the survey creates momentum and interest in organizational improvement, so it’s critical that leadership acts upon the data and keeps employees informed of changes as they occur.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>There aren’t enough opportunities to give supervisor feedback. Leadership skills should be evaluated and sharpened on a regular basis. Consider implementing 360 Degree Leadership Evaluations so supervisors can get feedback from their boss, peers, and direct reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>Are not treated fairly in the workplace. Favoritism can negatively affect morale and cause resentment among employees. When possible, ensure responsibilities and opportunities are being shared evenly and appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>Workplace harassment is not adequately addressed. While no amount of harassment is desirable within an organization, percentages above 5% would benefit from a serious look at workplace culture and the policies for dealing with harassment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>Issues with ethics in the workplace. An ethical climate is the foundation of building trust within an organization. Reinforce the importance of ethical behavior to employees, and ensure there are appropriate channels to handle ethical violations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOCUS FORWARD

After the survey data has been compiled, the results are returned approximately one to two months after data collection stops. 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.

Survey Results Received
Executive Summaries, Data Reports, and Excel data are provided for the organization as a whole and for breakout categories. Any of these formats can be used alone or in combination to create rich information on which employees can base their ideas for change.

Share with All Employees
Share results by creating reports, newsletters, or PowerPoint presentations providing data along with illustrations pertinent to the organization. Have employees participate in small work unit groups to review reports as they are distributed.

Move Forward with Change
Have the Change Team compile the priority change topics and action points, and present them to the executive staff. Discuss the administrative protocols for implementing the changes. Determine the plan of action, set a reasonable timeline, and keep employees informed of changes.

Resurvey
Administer the Survey of Employee Engagement again to document the effectiveness of your change efforts.

Review Survey Data
Review the data and summaries with the executive staff, and develop a plan for circulating the data to all employees. Several types of benchmark scores provide relevant external comparisons, and breakdown categories can be used to make internal comparisons.

Engage Employees in Change
Designate the Change Team composed of a diagonal slice across the organization that will guide the effort. Review the organization’s strengths and brainstorm on how to best address weaknesses. Provide employees with comment cards to express their ideas.

Sharpen Your Focus
Further data breakouts and custom reports are available. We also offer leadership assessments, employee pulse and exit surveys, and customer satisfaction surveys. Consultation time for presentations and focus groups is available as well. Please contact us at any time: www.survey.utexas.edu
Demographic Items

Survey respondent information reports the response rate and frequency information for all demographic variables that were asked of participants. Response Rate is a good indicator of employees' willingness to engage in efforts to improve the organization. Scope of Participation is a gauge to see whether or not employees by demographic characteristics participated in the survey.

Response Rate

Your response rate is the percentage of surveys distributed divided by the number of valid surveys received. For category reports, we only report the response rate for the organization as a whole.

What is a good response rate?

If your organization sampled employees, the answer must take into consideration size, sampling strategy, variance, and error tolerance. When all employees are surveyed (census), a general rule for organizations of at least 500, is that a 30% rate is a low, but an acceptable level of response. In general, response rates of greater than 50% (regardless of number of employees) indicate a strong level of participation.

What about non-respondents?

First, you should review the scope of participation discussed in the following paragraph. Second, you need to ascertain whether or not a more focused effort is needed to determine why some groups did not respond.

Scope of Participation

Respondent information is used as a gauge of the scope of participation. For example, the percentages of male and female respondents should roughly mirror your organization's gender composition. This should be true for the other demographic categories. If not, consider whether or not additional efforts need to be made to engage those low participating categories. It is important to note the following:

- If less than five respondents selected a demographic variable, "Less Than Five" and "Not Available" is reported to protect the respondents' anonymity.
- Participants have the option to skip items or select prefer not to answer. Both of these non-responses are combined to give a total "Prefer not to answer" count.
**Demographic Items**

Total Respondents: 220  
Surveys Distributed: 257  
Response Rate: 85.6%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My highest education level</th>
<th>Number of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not earn high school diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school diploma or equivalent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's Degree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>41.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to self-describe</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My annual salary (before taxes)</th>
<th>Number of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $20,001 :</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,001 to 30,000 :</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,001 to 40,000 :</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,001 to 50,000 :</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 to 60,000 :</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001 to 70,000 :</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,001 to 80,000 :</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001 to 90,000 :</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $90,000 :</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer:</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I work</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time :</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time :</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer:</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographic Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Respondents: 220</th>
<th>Number of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Distributed: 257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate: 85.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### My age (in years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Years of service with this organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Number of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>24.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Are you of Hispanic, Latino/a/x, or of Spanish origin?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic Status</th>
<th>Number of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>75.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### My race/ethnic identification (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnic Identification</th>
<th>Number of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American or Black</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>83.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Less than 5</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to self-describe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I am currently in a supervisory role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervisory Role Status</th>
<th>Number of Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>30.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>64.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Demographic Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents:</strong> 220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveys Distributed:</strong> 257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rate:</strong> 85.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### I received a promotion during the past two years.

| Yes | 53 | 24.09% |
| No  | 153 | 69.55% |
| Prefer not to answer | 14 | 6.36% |

#### I received a merit increase during the past two years.

| Yes | 166 | 75.45% |
| No  | 41  | 18.64% |
| Prefer not to answer | 13 | 5.91% |

#### I plan to be working for this organization in one year.

| Yes | 186 | 84.55% |
| No  | 12  | 5.45% |
| Prefer not to answer | 22 | 10.00% |

#### I am eligible for retirement within the next two years.

| Yes | 42 | 19.09% |
| No  | 160 | 72.73% |
| Prefer not to answer | 18 | 8.18% |

#### I currently remote work

| None of the time | 96 | 43.64% |
| Some of the time | 90 | 40.91% |
| Most of the time | 28 | 12.73% |
| All the time | Less than 5 | Not Available |
| Prefer not to answer | 6 | 2.73% |
Primary Items

For the primary items (numbered 1-48), participants were asked to indicate how they agreed with each positively phrased statement. If participants did not have information or the item did not apply, they were to select don’t know/not applicable.

Each primary item is returned with the item text and two types of reported numerical data, response data and benchmark data. The following definitions correspond to survey items:

Response Data

- **Score** is calculated by averaging all item responses on a five point scale ranging from 5=Strongly Agree to 1=Strongly Disagree. If the participant selected Don’t Know/Not Applicable, their response is considered a valid response, but it is not used in the calculation of the score.
- **Standard Deviation** calculates the level of agreement. Large deviations indicate greater levels of disagreement. For this report, you can expect standard deviations to be between .7 and 1.10.
- **Total Respondents** is the number of valid responses including Don’t Know/Not Applicable. If everyone did not answer every item, the number of respondents for an item is less than the number of respondents reported in your response rate.
- **Respondents** is the number of participants who selected each item (strongly agree, agree, etc.).
- **Percentage** is the number of participants who selected each item (strongly agree, agree, etc.) divided by the total number of valid responses.
- **Percent Agreement** is the number of participants who agreed with the item (strongly agree or agree) divided by the total number of valid responses.

Benchmark Data

- **Past Score** is your organization's score reported from the previous iteration, if available.
- **Similar Mission** is the average score from organizations that share a similar mission to your organization.
- **Similar Size** is the average score from organizations that are a similar size to your organization.
- **All Organizations** is the average score from all organizations.
- **Organizational Categories** are benchmarked against the organization as a whole.

Interpreting Data

Any interpretation of data must be done in context of the organizational setting and environmental factors impacting the organization. Regardless of the averages, scores range from areas of strength to areas of concern. In general, most scores are between 3.00 and 4.00. Scores below a 3.25 are of concern because they indicate general dissatisfaction. Scores above 3.75 indicate positive perceptions. When available, over time data provides previous scores from and benchmark data comparative scores. In general (because various factors and statistical test would be needed to confirm), scores that have changed or differ by .2 may be significant.
### Primary Items

#### 1. My work group cooperates to get the job done.

*87% Agreement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>53.18%</td>
<td>34.09%</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*87% Agreement Score:* 4.33  
*Std. Dev.:* 0.92  
*Total Respondents:* 220  

**BENCHMARKS**
- Past Score: 4.26  
- Similar Mission: 4.38  
- Similar Size: 4.34  
- All Orgs: 4.32

#### 2. In my work group, my opinions and ideas count.

*86% Agreement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>41.82%</td>
<td>44.55%</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*86% Agreement Score:* 4.20  
*Std. Dev.:* 0.91  
*Total Respondents:* 220  

**BENCHMARKS**
- Past Score: 4.19  
- Similar Mission: 4.15  
- Similar Size: 4.10  
- All Orgs: 4.09

#### 3. My work group regularly uses performance data to improve the quality of our work.

*61% Agreement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>19.27%</td>
<td>41.28%</td>
<td>21.56%</td>
<td>9.17%</td>
<td>4.13%</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*61% Agreement Score:* 3.65  
*Std. Dev.:* 1.04  
*Total Respondents:* 218  

**BENCHMARKS**
- Past Score: 3.57  
- Similar Mission: 3.71  
- Similar Size: 3.65  
- All Orgs: 3.70

#### 4. In my work group, there is a real feeling of teamwork.

*77% Agreement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>37.44%</td>
<td>39.27%</td>
<td>13.24%</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*77% Agreement Score:* 4.02  
*Std. Dev.:* 1.02  
*Total Respondents:* 219  

**BENCHMARKS**
- Past Score: 3.97  
- Similar Mission: 4.12  
- Similar Size: 3.97  
- All Orgs: 3.99
5. Our organization is known for the quality of work we provide.

83% Agreement

SCORE: 4.17
Std. Dev.: 0.89
Total Respondents: 219

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.30
Similar Mission: 4.30
Similar Size: 4.15
All Orgs: 4.10

6. I know how my work impacts others in the organization.

82% Agreement

SCORE: 4.16
Std. Dev.: 0.94
Total Respondents: 220

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.23
Similar Mission: 4.41
Similar Size: 4.35
All Orgs: 4.33

7. My organization develops services to match the needs of our customers/clients.

77% Agreement

SCORE: 4.00
Std. Dev.: 0.93
Total Respondents: 220

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.04
Similar Mission: 4.25
Similar Size: 4.09
All Orgs: 4.08

8. Our organization communicates effectively with the public.

75% Agreement

SCORE: 3.90
Std. Dev.: 0.92
Total Respondents: 219

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 3.86
Similar Mission: 4.08
Similar Size: 3.96
All Orgs: 3.95
Primary Items

9. I have a good understanding of our mission, vision, and strategic plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>36.07%</td>
<td>46.58%</td>
<td>10.05%</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83% Agreement

SCORE: 4.08
Std. Dev.: 0.95
Total Respondents: 219
BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.14
Similar Mission: 4.30
Similar Size: 4.28
All Orgs: 4.28

10. My supervisor provides me with a clear understanding of my work responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>44.55%</td>
<td>39.09%</td>
<td>10.45%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84% Agreement

SCORE: 4.20
Std. Dev.: 0.92
Total Respondents: 220
BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.09
Similar Mission: 4.17
Similar Size: 4.21
All Orgs: 4.19

11. My supervisor recognizes outstanding work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>51.60%</td>
<td>34.25%</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

86% Agreement

SCORE: 4.30
Std. Dev.: 0.93
Total Respondents: 219
BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.15
Similar Mission: 4.16
Similar Size: 4.10
All Orgs: 4.11

12. I am given the opportunity to do my best work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>48.18%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

83% Agreement

SCORE: 4.19
Std. Dev.: 1.02
Total Respondents: 220
BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.13
Similar Mission: 4.15
Similar Size: 4.13
All Orgs: 4.14
### Primary Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
<th>BENCHMARKS Past Score</th>
<th>BENCHMARKS Similar Mission</th>
<th>BENCHMARKS Similar Size</th>
<th>BENCHMARKS All Orgs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. My supervisor is consistent when administering policies concerning employees.</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My supervisor evaluates my performance fairly.</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Given the type of work I do, my physical workplace meets my needs.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My workplace is well maintained.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Agreement Percentage</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>Benchmark Past Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. There are sufficient procedures to ensure the safety of employees in the workplace.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I have adequate resources and equipment to do my job.</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The people I work with treat each other with respect.</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The people I work with come from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Primary Items

### 21. The people I work with care about my personal well-being.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>36.53%</td>
<td>47.49%</td>
<td>11.42%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**84% Agreement**

**SCORE:** 4.13  
**Std. Dev.:** 0.89  
**Total Respondents:** 219  

**BENCHMARKS**

- Past Score: 4.19  
- Similar Mission: 4.18  
- Similar Size: 4.06  
- All Orgs: 4.03

---

### 22. I trust the people in my workplace.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>37.27%</td>
<td>44.55%</td>
<td>12.73%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**82% Agreement**

**SCORE:** 4.12  
**Std. Dev.:** 0.91  
**Total Respondents:** 220  

**BENCHMARKS**

- Past Score: 4.10  
- Similar Mission: 3.95  
- Similar Size: 3.85  
- All Orgs: 3.84

---

### 23. My work group uses the latest technologies to communicate and interact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>24.66%</td>
<td>50.23%</td>
<td>13.24%</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**75% Agreement**

**SCORE:** 3.86  
**Std. Dev.:** 1.00  
**Total Respondents:** 219  

**BENCHMARKS**

- Past Score: 3.46  
- Similar Mission: 3.73  
- Similar Size: 3.67  
- All Orgs: 3.68

---

### 24. We receive regular and useful updates on how to keep our computer and sensitive information secure from cyber-attack.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>41.36%</td>
<td>47.73%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**89% Agreement**

**SCORE:** 4.25  
**Std. Dev.:** 0.80  
**Total Respondents:** 220  

**BENCHMARKS**

- Past Score: 3.78  
- Similar Mission: 4.16  
- Similar Size: 4.10  
- All Orgs: 4.15
25. Support is available for the technologies we use.

80% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>34.09%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>13.18%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80% Agreement

Score: 4.05
Std. Dev.: 0.94
Total Respondents: 220

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 3.85
Similar Mission: 4.02
Similar Size: 4.05
All Orgs: 3.97

26. Our computer systems enable me to quickly find the information I need.

72% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>42.27%</td>
<td>16.82%</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

72% Agreement

Score: 3.89
Std. Dev.: 1.03
Total Respondents: 220

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 3.71
Similar Mission: 3.85
Similar Size: 3.85
All Orgs: 3.80

27. The communication channels I must go through at work are reasonable.

73% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>29.09%</td>
<td>43.64%</td>
<td>17.27%</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73% Agreement

Score: 3.88
Std. Dev.: 1.02
Total Respondents: 220

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 3.69
Similar Mission: 3.93
Similar Size: 3.87
All Orgs: 3.87

28. My work atmosphere encourages open and honest communication.

76% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>32.73%</td>
<td>43.18%</td>
<td>13.18%</td>
<td>6.36%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76% Agreement

Score: 3.95
Std. Dev.: 1.04
Total Respondents: 220

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 3.85
Similar Mission: 3.83
Similar Size: 3.74
All Orgs: 3.74
## Primary Items

### 29. The communications I receive at work are timely and informative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>70% Agreement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents:</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage:</strong></td>
<td>26.03%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 3.79  
**Std. Dev.:** 1.07  
**Total Respondents:** 219

**Benchmarks:**  
- Past Score: 3.78  
- Similar Mission: 3.87  
- Similar Size: 3.82  
- All Orgs: 3.79

### 30. My pay keeps pace with the cost of living.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>29% Agreement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents:</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage:</strong></td>
<td>3.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 2.70  
**Std. Dev.:** 1.16  
**Total Respondents:** 220

**Benchmarks:**  
- Past Score: 2.76  
- Similar Mission: 2.80  
- Similar Size: 2.68  
- All Orgs: 2.71

### 31. Salaries are competitive with similar jobs in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>33% Agreement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents:</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage:</strong></td>
<td>9.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 2.98  
**Std. Dev.:** 1.15  
**Total Respondents:** 219

**Benchmarks:**  
- Past Score: 2.88  
- Similar Mission: 2.80  
- Similar Size: 2.78  
- All Orgs: 2.80

### 32. I feel I am paid fairly for the work I do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46% Agreement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Strongly Agree</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents:</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage:</strong></td>
<td>10.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 3.29  
**Std. Dev.:** 1.06  
**Total Respondents:** 220

**Benchmarks:**  
- Past Score: 3.25  
- Similar Mission: 3.10  
- Similar Size: 3.03  
- All Orgs: 3.03
Primary Items

33. Retirement benefits are competitive with similar jobs in the community.

80% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>36.53%</td>
<td>43.84%</td>
<td>11.42%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80% Agreement

SCORE: 4.14
Std. Dev.: 0.88
Total Respondents: 219
BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.08
Similar Mission: 4.02
Similar Size: 3.91
All Orgs: 3.91

34. Health insurance benefits are competitive with similar jobs in the community.

84% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>37.90%</td>
<td>45.66%</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

84% Agreement

SCORE: 4.19
Std. Dev.: 0.86
Total Respondents: 219
BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.21
Similar Mission: 4.13
Similar Size: 4.01
All Orgs: 4.03

35. Benefits can be selected to meet individual needs.

79% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>23.74%</td>
<td>54.79%</td>
<td>15.98%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

79% Agreement

SCORE: 3.99
Std. Dev.: 0.79
Total Respondents: 219
BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 3.94
Similar Mission: 4.04
Similar Size: 3.93
All Orgs: 3.96

36. I believe I have a career with this organization.

81% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>39.09%</td>
<td>41.82%</td>
<td>13.18%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81% Agreement

SCORE: 4.12
Std. Dev.: 0.93
Total Respondents: 220
BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.06
Similar Mission: 3.95
Similar Size: 3.92
All Orgs: 3.92
37. Training is made available to me so that I can do my job better.

73% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>25.45%</td>
<td>47.27%</td>
<td>14.09%</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73% Agreement

SCORE: 3.82
Std. Dev.: 1.04
Total Respondents: 220

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.00
Similar Mission: 3.99
Similar Size: 3.85
All Orgs: 3.88

38. Training is made available to me for personal growth and development.

68% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>23.18%</td>
<td>44.55%</td>
<td>17.27%</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68% Agreement

SCORE: 3.72
Std. Dev.: 1.09
Total Respondents: 220

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 3.88
Similar Mission: 3.87
Similar Size: 3.71
All Orgs: 3.76

39. My work environment supports a balance between work and personal life.

77% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>33.64%</td>
<td>43.64%</td>
<td>14.55%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

77% Agreement

SCORE: 4.01
Std. Dev.: 0.97
Total Respondents: 220

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.02
Similar Mission: 4.04
Similar Size: 4.01
All Orgs: 3.95

40. I feel free to be myself at work.

82% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>34.09%</td>
<td>47.73%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82% Agreement

SCORE: 4.06
Std. Dev.: 0.93
Total Respondents: 220

BENCHMARKS
Past Score: 4.06
Similar Mission: 3.97
Similar Size: 3.87
All Orgs: 3.86
Primary Items

41. The amount of work I am asked to do is reasonable.

77% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>20.55%</td>
<td>56.16%</td>
<td>12.79%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>4.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90% Agreement

42. I am proud to tell people that I work for this organization.

90% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>53.18%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>8.18%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87% Agreement

43. Harassment is not tolerated at my workplace.

87% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>47.73%</td>
<td>39.09%</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

90% Agreement

44. Employees are generally ethical in my workplace.

90% Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>44.09%</td>
<td>45.91%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
45. I believe we will use the information from this survey to improve our workplace.

**63% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>24.20%</td>
<td>39.27%</td>
<td>21.46%</td>
<td>8.68%</td>
<td>6.39%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BENCHMARKS**

Past Score: 3.74
Similar Mission: 3.76
Similar Size: 3.65
All Orgs: 3.61

Score: 3.66
Std. Dev.: 1.13
Total Respondents: 219

---

46. I am satisfied with the opportunities I have to give feedback on my supervisor's performance.

**70% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>31.96%</td>
<td>37.90%</td>
<td>16.44%</td>
<td>8.22%</td>
<td>4.57%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BENCHMARKS**

Past Score: 3.58
Similar Mission: 3.78
Similar Size: 3.67
All Orgs: 3.68

Score: 3.85
Std. Dev.: 1.10
Total Respondents: 219

---

47. Upper management (i.e. Executive and/or Senior Leadership) effectively communicates important information.

**65% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>26.82%</td>
<td>37.73%</td>
<td>17.27%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>7.73%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BENCHMARKS**

Past Score: 3.69
Similar Mission: 3.81
Similar Size: 3.81
All Orgs: 3.75

Score: 3.66
Std. Dev.: 1.20
Total Respondents: 220

---

48. I am treated fairly in my workplace.

**85% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>43.38%</td>
<td>42.01%</td>
<td>8.22%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BENCHMARKS**

Past Score: 4.13
Similar Mission: 4.11
Similar Size: 4.04
All Orgs: 4.04

Score: 4.22
Std. Dev.: 0.92
Total Respondents: 219
Additional Items

Organizations participating in the Survey are invited to submit up to 20 additional items for inclusion in the Survey. These items are included at the end of the online survey or are printed on an insert and included in each employee's survey packet. Please refer to the survey customization sheet that has been included later in this report for more information on additional items submitted by this organization.

*Additional Items are not included if none were submitted.

Each additional item is returned with the item text and two types of reported numerical data, response data and benchmark data. The following definitions correspond to additional items:

**Response Data**

- **Score** is calculated by averaging all item responses on a five point scale ranging from 5=Strongly Agree to 1=Strongly Disagree. If the participant selected Don't Know/Not Applicable, their response is considered a valid response, but it is not used in the calculation of the score.
- **Standard Deviation** calculates the level of agreement. Large deviations indicate greater levels of disagreement. For this report, you can expect standard deviations to be between .7 and 1.10.
- **Total Respondents** is the number of valid responses including Don't Know/Not Applicable. If everyone did not answer every item, the number of respondents for an item is less than the number of respondents reported in your response rate.
- **Respondents** is the number of participants who selected each item (strongly agree, agree, etc.).
- **Percentage** is the number of participants who selected each item (strongly agree, agree, etc.) divided by the total number of valid responses.
- **Percent Agreement** is the number of participants who agreed with the item (strongly agree or agree) divided by the total number of valid responses.

**Benchmark Data**

Benchmark and over time data are not available for Additional Items.

**Interpreting Data**

Any interpretation of data must be done in context of the organizational setting and environmental factors impacting the organization. Regardless of the averages, scores range from areas of strength to areas of concern. In general, most scores are between 3.00 and 4.00. Scores below a 3.25 are of concern because they indicate general dissatisfaction. Scores above 3.75 indicate positive perceptions. When available, over time data provides previous scores from and benchmark data comparative scores. In general (because various factors and statistical test would be needed to confirm), scores that have changed or differ by .2 may be significant.
Engagement Items

Employee Engagement items span several constructs, and capture the degree to which employees are willing to go above and beyond, feel committed to the organization and are present while working. This construct measures the degree to which employees feel that their ideas count, their work impacts the organization and their well being and development is valued.

Each engagement item is returned with the item text and two types of reported numerical data, response data and benchmark data. The following definitions correspond to survey items:

Response Data

- **Score** is calculated by averaging all item responses on a five point scale ranging from 5=Strongly Agree to 1=Strongly Disagree. If the participant selected Don't Know/Not Applicable, their response is considered a valid response, but it is not used in the calculation of the score.
- **Standard Deviation** calculates the level of agreement. Large deviations indicate greater levels of disagreement. For this report, you can expect standard deviations to be between .7 and 1.10.
- **Total Respondents** is the number of valid responses including Don't Know/Not Applicable. If everyone did not answer every item, the number of respondents for an item is less than the number of respondents reported in your response rate.
- **Respondents** is the number of participants who selected each item (strongly agree, agree, etc.).
- **Percentage** is the number of participants who selected each item (strongly agree, agree, etc.) divided by the total number of valid responses.
- **Percent Agreement** is the number of participants who agreed with the item (strongly agree or agree) divided by the total number of valid responses.

Benchmark Data

- **Past Score** is your organization's score reported from the previous iteration, if available.
- **Similar Mission** is the average score from organizations that share a similar mission to your organization.
- **Similar Size** is the average score from organizations that are a similar size to your organization.
- **All Organizations** is the average score from all organizations.

Interpreting Data

Any interpretation of data must be done in context of the organizational setting and environmental factors impacting the organization. Regardless of the averages, scores range from areas of strength to areas of concern. In general, most scores are between 3.00 and 4.00. Scores below a 3.25 are of concern because they indicate general dissatisfaction. Scores above 3.75 indicate positive perceptions. When available, over time data provides previous scores from and benchmark data comparative scores. In general (because various factors and statistical test would be needed to confirm), scores that have changed or differ by .2 may be significant.
### Engagement Items

#### 2. In my work group, my opinions and ideas count.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>41.82%</td>
<td>44.55%</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**86% Agreement**

- **Score:** 4.20
- **Std. Dev.:** 0.91
- **Total Respondents:** 220

**BENCHMARKS**
- **Past Score:** 4.19
- **Similar Mission:** 4.15
- **Similar Size:** 4.10
- **All Orgs:** 4.09

#### 5. Our organization is known for the quality of work we provide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>41.10%</td>
<td>41.55%</td>
<td>11.87%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**83% Agreement**

- **Score:** 4.17
- **Std. Dev.:** 0.89
- **Total Respondents:** 219

**BENCHMARKS**
- **Past Score:** 4.30
- **Similar Mission:** 4.30
- **Similar Size:** 4.15
- **All Orgs:** 4.10

#### 6. I know how my work impacts others in the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>41.82%</td>
<td>40.45%</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**82% Agreement**

- **Score:** 4.16
- **Std. Dev.:** 0.94
- **Total Respondents:** 220

**BENCHMARKS**
- **Past Score:** 4.23
- **Similar Mission:** 4.41
- **Similar Size:** 4.35
- **All Orgs:** 4.33

#### 10. My supervisor provides me with a clear understanding of my work responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>44.55%</td>
<td>39.09%</td>
<td>10.45%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**84% Agreement**

- **Score:** 4.20
- **Std. Dev.:** 0.92
- **Total Respondents:** 220

**BENCHMARKS**
- **Past Score:** 4.09
- **Similar Mission:** 4.17
- **Similar Size:** 4.21
- **All Orgs:** 4.19
## Engagement Items

### 11. My supervisor recognizes outstanding work.

**86% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>51.60%</td>
<td>34.25%</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 4.30  
**Std. Dev.:** 0.93  
**Total Respondents:** 219  
**BENCHMARKS**  
- Past Score: 4.15  
- Similar Mission: 4.16  
- Similar Size: 4.10  
- All Orgs: 4.11

### 12. I am given the opportunity to do my best work.

**83% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>48.18%</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>7.27%</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 4.19  
**Std. Dev.:** 1.02  
**Total Respondents:** 220  
**BENCHMARKS**  
- Past Score: 4.13  
- Similar Mission: 4.15  
- Similar Size: 4.13  
- All Orgs: 4.14

### 14. My supervisor evaluates my performance fairly.

**88% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>50.45%</td>
<td>37.73%</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>1.82%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 4.35  
**Std. Dev.:** 0.84  
**Total Respondents:** 220  
**BENCHMARKS**  
- Past Score: 4.22  
- Similar Mission: 4.12  
- Similar Size: 4.16  
- All Orgs: 4.13

### 18. I have adequate resources and equipment to do my job.

**79% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents:</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage:</td>
<td>31.96%</td>
<td>47.49%</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td>5.02%</td>
<td>5.02%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score:** 3.96  
**Std. Dev.:** 1.04  
**Total Respondents:** 219  
**BENCHMARKS**  
- Past Score: 3.91  
- Similar Mission: 4.12  
- Similar Size: 4.04  
- All Orgs: 4.04
21. The people I work with care about my personal well-being.

**84% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>36.53%</td>
<td>47.49%</td>
<td>11.42%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE:** 4.13  
**Std. Dev.:** 0.89  
**Total Respondents:** 219  

**BENCHMARKS**  
Past Score: 4.19  
Similar Mission: 4.18  
Similar Size: 4.06  
All Orgs: 4.03

22. I trust the people in my workplace.

**82% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>37.27%</td>
<td>44.55%</td>
<td>12.73%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td>2.73%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE:** 4.12  
**Std. Dev.:** 0.91  
**Total Respondents:** 220  

**BENCHMARKS**  
Past Score: 4.10  
Similar Mission: 3.95  
Similar Size: 3.85  
All Orgs: 3.84

37. Training is made available to me so that I can do my job better.

**73% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>25.45%</td>
<td>47.27%</td>
<td>14.09%</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>0.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE:** 3.82  
**Std. Dev.:** 1.04  
**Total Respondents:** 220  

**BENCHMARKS**  
Past Score: 4.00  
Similar Mission: 3.99  
Similar Size: 3.85  
All Orgs: 3.88

38. Training is made available to me for personal growth and development.

**68% Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know/NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>23.18%</td>
<td>44.55%</td>
<td>17.27%</td>
<td>8.64%</td>
<td>5.45%</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE:** 3.72  
**Std. Dev.:** 1.09  
**Total Respondents:** 220  

**BENCHMARKS**  
Past Score: 3.88  
Similar Mission: 3.87  
Similar Size: 3.71  
All Orgs: 3.76
Constructs and Related Items

The Survey of Employee Engagement framework is composed of twelve Survey Constructs designed to broadly profile areas of strength and concern so that interventions may be targeted appropriately. Survey Constructs are developed from the Primary Items (numbered 1-48). This Appendix contains a summary of the Survey Constructs and the related Primary Items. Constructs are scored differently from items to denote them as a separate measure. Using this scoring convention, construct scores can range from a low of 100 to a high of 500.

Your Data

Current Score is calculated by averaging the mean score of the related primary items and then multiplying by 100. For example if the construct score is 389, then the average of the related primary items is 3.89.

Benchmark Data

- **Past Score** is your organization's score reported from the previous iteration. "None" is reported if there is no past score, if the construct is new or consists of new items, or if no comparative data is available.
- **All Respondents** is the average score from all participants from all organizations.
- **Size Category** is the average score from organizations that are similar size to your organization.
- **Mission** is the average score from organizations of similar mission to your organization.
- **Organizational Categories** are benchmarked against the organization as a whole.

What is a good score?

Any interpretation of data must be done in context of the organizational setting and environmental factors impacting the organization. In general, most scores are between 300 and 400. Scores below a 325 are of concern because they indicate general dissatisfaction. Scores above 375 indicate positive perceptions.
### Workgroup

**Construct Score:** 405

The workgroup construct captures employees’ perceptions of the people they work with on a daily basis and how effective they are. This construct measures the degree to which employees view their workgroup as effective, cohesive and open to the opinions of all members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My work group cooperates to get the job done.</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In my work group, my opinions and ideas count.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My work group regularly uses performance data to improve the quality of our work.</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In my work group, there is a real feeling of teamwork.</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic

**Construct Score:** 406

The strategic construct captures employees’ perceptions of their role in the organization and the organization’s mission, vision, and strategic plan. This construct measures the degree to which employees understand their role in the organization and consider the organization’s reputation to be positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Our organization is known for the quality of work we provide.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I know how my work impacts others in the organization.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My organization develops services to match the needs of our customers/clients.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Our organization communicates effectively with the public.</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have a good understanding of our mission, vision, and strategic plan.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Supervision

**Construct Score:** 421

The supervision construct captures employees’ perceptions of the nature of supervisory relationships within the organization. This construct measures the degree to which employees view their supervisors as fair, helpful and critical to the workflow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. My supervisor provides me with a clear understanding of my work responsibilities.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My supervisor recognizes outstanding work.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am given the opportunity to do my best work.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My supervisor is consistent when administering policies concerning employees.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My supervisor evaluates my performance fairly.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Workplace

**Construct Score:** 404

The workplace construct captures employees’ perceptions of the total work atmosphere, workplace safety, and the overall feel. This construct measures the degree to which employees see the setting as satisfactory, safe and that adequate tools and resources are available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Given the type of work I do, my physical workplace meets my needs.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My workplace is well maintained.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. There are sufficient procedures to ensure the safety of employees in the workplace.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I have adequate resources and equipment to do my job.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Community

The community construct captures employees’ perceptions of the relationships between employees in the workplace, including trust, respect, care, and diversity among colleagues. This construct measures the degree to which employees feel respected, cared for, and have established trust with their colleagues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. The people I work with treat each other with respect.</td>
<td>19.</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The people I work with come from diverse backgrounds.</td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The people I work with care about my personal well-being.</td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I trust the people in my workplace.</td>
<td>22.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information Systems

The information systems construct captures employees’ perceptions of whether computer and communication systems prove accessible, accurate, and clear information. This construct measures the degree to which employees view the availability and utility of information positively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. My work group uses the latest technologies to communicate and interact.</td>
<td>23.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. We receive regular and useful updates on how to keep our computer and sensitive information secure from cyber-attack.</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Support is available for the technologies we use.</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Our computer systems enable me to quickly find the information I need.</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Internal Communication

The internal communication construct captures employees’ perceptions of whether communication in the organization is reasonable, candid and helpful. This construct measures the degree to which employees view communication with peers, supervisors and other parts of the organization as functional and effective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. The communication channels I must go through at work are reasonable.</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My work atmosphere encourages open and honest communication.</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The communications I receive at work are timely and informative.</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pay

The pay construct captures employees’ perceptions of how well the compensation package offered by the organization holds up when compared to similar jobs in other organizations. This construct measures the degree to which employees view pay as well valued relative to the type of work, work demands and comparable positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. My pay keeps pace with the cost of living.</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Salaries are competitive with similar jobs in the community.</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I feel I am paid fairly for the work I do.</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Benefits

The benefits construct captures employees’ perceptions of how the benefits package compares to packages at similar organizations and how flexible it is. This construct measures the degree to which employees see health insurance and retirement benefits as competitive with similar jobs in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. Retirement benefits are competitive with similar jobs in the community.</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Health insurance benefits are competitive with similar jobs in the community.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Benefits can be selected to meet individual needs.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Employee Development

The employee development construct captures employees’ perceptions about the priority given to their personal and job growth needs. This construct measures the degree to which employees feel the organization provides opportunities for growth in organizational responsibilities and personal needs in their careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. I believe I have a career with this organization.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Training is made available to me so that I can do my job better.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Training is made available to me for personal growth and development.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Job Satisfaction

The job satisfaction construct captures employees’ perceptions about the overall work situation and ability to maintain work-life balance. This construct measures the degree to which employees are pleased with working conditions and their workload.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. My work environment supports a balance between work and personal life.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I feel free to be myself at work.</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. The amount of work I am asked to do is reasonable.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I am proud to tell people that I work for this organization.</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Climate

While not scored as a construct, the following six items assess the climate in which employees work. The appropriate climate is a combination of a safe, non-harassing environment with ethical abiding employees who treat each other with fairness and respect. Moreover, it is an organization with proactive management that communicates and has the capability to make thoughtful decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. Harassment is not tolerated at my workplace.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Employees are generally ethical in my workplace.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I believe we will use the information from this survey to improve our workplace.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I am satisfied with the opportunities I have to give feedback on my supervisor's performance.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Upper management (i.e. Executive and/or Senior Leadership) effectively communicates important information.</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I am treated fairly in my workplace.</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Twelve items spanning several constructs were selected to get a more focused look at Employee Engagement. The Employee Engagement construct captures the degree to which employees are willing to go above and beyond, feel committed to the organization and are present while working. This construct measures the degree to which employees feel that their ideas count, their work impacts the organization and their well being and development is valued at the organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. In my work group, my opinions and ideas count.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Our organization is known for the quality of work we provide.</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I know how my work impacts others in the organization.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My supervisor provides me with a clear understanding of my work responsibilities.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My supervisor recognizes outstanding work.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am given the opportunity to do my best work.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My supervisor evaluates my performance fairly.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I have adequate resources and equipment to do my job.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The people I work with care about my personal well-being.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I trust the people in my workplace.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Training is made available to me so that I can do my job better.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Training is made available to me for personal growth and development.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey Customization Sheet

Organizational Category Codes: Category 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Archeology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Community Heritage Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>History Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Staff Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Historic Sites (Central Austin Staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Historic Sites (Outside Austin)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Items

None.
Strategy 1: Re-enforce THC as a positive place to work by recognition of staff performance through monetary and non-monetary recognition and awards.

Short term actions (1 year):
A. Conduct a targeted follow-up annual Compensation Review of Archaeologist, Information Technology, Architect, Historian, Project Reviewer, Project Design Specialist and selected Historic Sites job classifications to confirm compensation alignment with current salary market conditions and adjust as needed.
B. Include a review of Division Director compensation structure to ensure appropriate supervisor and employee salary equity and relationships are preserved.
C. Conduct biennial review of State Job Classifications and Salary Group Ranges utilized by THC; submit recommendations to the State Auditor’s Office for needed changes to the State Classification Act for consideration in 88th Legislative Session.
D. Continue Staff Performance Awards Recognition Program and identify needed revisions.
E. Continue a robust telework program that allows employees some flexibility to productively work remote to meet job expectations. Review program annually for needed adjustments or revisions.

Long term actions (2 years):
F. Conduct additional training for Directors on Compensation and Performance Management Best Practices.
G. Complete organizational assessment of the THC division Team Lead structure, job expectations and responsibilities to:
   • Identify leadership training opportunities for Division Program Leads who provide formalized workload management support to Directors, and
   • Increase employee development and career progression opportunities for our program leads and other key professional staff.
H. Identify strategies to improve our new employee orientation to educate newer employees on career advancement and professional development opportunities to reinforce retention.

Strategy 2: Re-enforce an environment where internal communications and feedback is welcomed, valued, and utilized.

Short term actions (1 year):
A. Share current SEE Results, SEE Action Plan, and provide progress updates at the all-agency staff meeting and in individual division staff meetings.
B. Continue monthly division staff meetings and bi-monthly all-agency state-wide meetings to encourage maximum participation and feedback.
C. Continue monthly employee newsletter that highlights THC staff and their accomplishments, published in both digital and print versions to encourage on-line access and employee sharing with family members.
D. Conduct informal division staff meetings with Executive Director to solicit and promote open and informal staff feedback.
E. Provide feedback to each Director using the results of the SEE and the feedback provided by their employees in individual Division Teambuilding Training Sessions.
F. Continue formal customer service training for all agency staff including establishment of expectations for responding to questions or requests for assistance in a reasonable timeframe.

G. Review/Update current THC intranet employee resources to improve employee ease of access to agency communications, operating policies, procedures, and frequently asked questions.

Long term actions (2 years):
H. Conduct additional performance management training for all Directors/Team Leads on performance management, goal setting and soliciting/providing meaningful employee feedback.

**Strategy 3: Continue improvements to information systems infrastructure, data accessibility and productivity tools for staff.**

**Short term actions (1 year):**
A. Continue 4-year refresh cycle for all employee Personal Computers and software to keep hardware and software technology current.

B. Conduct post – implementation review of Comptroller's CAPPS Financial and Human Resources system and provide feedback to CPA for suggested improvements.

C. Continue Implementation of improved Historic Sites Public/Guest Wifi Technology Plan based on Historic Sites Management priority and funding available, including any newly acquired historic sites approved by the commission.

D. Continue Point-of-Sale System Assessment/Enhancements and Staff Training at Historic Sites to improve Site business operations and support Retail Development Plan Expansion.

E. Evaluate new systems technology improvements needed to the eTrac 106 project review system.

F. Develop a proposal for a digital storage and information retrieval system solution to improve data, document, and photographic image access for THC applications and program staff.

G. Determine best strategy to fund needed technology improvements. If appropriate, include funding request for needed technology improvements in the Legislative Appropriations Request for FY 2024 – 2025.

Long term actions (2 years):

H. Implement enhancements to on-call Help Desk Support model to improve technical support response time for Central Austin and Historic Sites employees.

I. Implement In-tune technology to allow software updates and patches to be automatically pushed out to all employee computer workstations to ensure current versions of software installed and improved security.

**Strategy 4: Re-enforce and Support Strategic Leadership and Supervisory Development.**

**Short term actions (1 year):**
A. Continue formal training for all supervisors and employees on managing a remote workforce and being a successful teleworker. This training will ensure employee expectations of telework are clearly communicated and understood by the employee and will prepare the supervisor for effectively managing a remote worker. This training will include an opportunity for employee feedback after supervisor training is complete.

B. Provide regular opportunities for managerial staff to meet with each other to discuss ongoing supervisory efforts and issues.

Long term actions (2 years):

C. Provide THC directors the opportunity to complete strategic leadership training in the planned Texas Leadership Experience Academy under development at Washington on the Brazos State Historic Site in partnership with Blinn College and Texas A & M University.
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Survey of Employee Engagement
Agency Overall Score
Biennial 5-Year History

GOAL > 350

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey of Employee Engagement
Overall SEE Score by Division 2021

Chart 2

GOAL > 350

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHD</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST SITES</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey of Employee Engagement
Overall SEE Score by Division
2021 – 2019 Comparison
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Survey of Employee Engagement
Agency Overall Score by Construct
2021 - 2019
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Survey of Employee Engagement
Agency Overall Score - 2021
By Construct Compared to Similar Size Agencies
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Survey of Employee Engagement
Agency Overall Climate Score
5-Year History
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Survey of Employee Engagement
Overall Climate Score
By Division - 2021 and 2019

Chart 7

GOAL > 350

Score 100-500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHD</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOA</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST SITES</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPD</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey of Employee Engagement
Overall Climate Score
2021

By Sub-construct: Comparison to Similar Size Agencies
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Chart 8
Levels of Employee Engagement

2021:
- Highly Engaged and Engaged: 65%
- Moderately Engaged: 27%
- Disengaged: 8%

Nationwide Benchmark:
- Highly Engaged and Engaged: 30%
- Moderately Engaged: 50%
- Disengaged: 20%