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Executive Summary

The 2008 Working at IOWA survey is the most recent step of an initiative that began in 2006. The Working at IOWA survey was created to measure the level of engagement of staff and faculty at the University, and then use the results to guide improvements in how employees experience the University. The project was intended to create a continuous improvement cycle to help the University achieve its goals for excellence: assess, prioritize and act on survey results, measure progress, and then repeat.

The 2008 survey was the first opportunity to measure and identify the progress made since 2006 in building a more positive and productive working environment. It will also serve to refocus our efforts for future improvements. This report provides the University community with the full 2008 survey results, offers observations, and identifies next steps for how this information can be used. The 2008 results will become the benchmark for the next survey, anticipated for 2012.

General observations from the 2008 Working at IOWA results:

- The participation rate in the 2008 survey was 62.3%, well above the 2006 rate of 42.6%. This is a very strong survey participation level and reflects the interest of the campus community in the Working at IOWA initiative.

- The demographics of the survey participants were generally consistent with University faculty and staff overall in terms of gender, sex, age, race and length of employment, and were similar to the 2006 survey participant demographics.

- University staff and faculty continue to be very positive about their work experience overall.

- A comparison of 2008 to 2006 response data shows statistically significant difference in 28 of 45 survey items. All the differences show a shift in the distribution of the six response levels in 2008 toward positive improvement.

- Progress was indicated in three of the five survey items targeted for improvement from the 2006 survey. These included managing work related conflicts, workload distribution and effective performance management. Survey results also indicate that opportunity for improvement still exists in these areas, along with effective communication on both the unit budget status and plans to strengthen the University.

The survey items with highest levels of agreement demonstrate a strong foundation for employee engagement:

- I look for more effective ways to do my work
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- I know what is expected of me in my work
- I understand how my job fits into the overall mission of the UI
- My unit has a strong focus on providing excellent service
- I have the basic resources I need to do my work

University Human Resources will continue to study the survey data to determine what campus wide initiatives can be most effective in addressing the items with the highest levels of disagreement:

- Poor performance is managed appropriately
- I am kept informed of our unit’s budget status
- Workloads are distributed fairly
- Work-related conflicts are managed constructively
- I am confident there is a clear plan to strengthen the UI

Analysis of the data by employee classification (faculty, professional and scientific and merit supervisory exempt staff, and merit staff) shows some differences in areas where there has been improvement, as well as in the items that may be targeted for future improvement for each classification.

These targeted strategies for improvement may include new strategies for communicating about budgets or strategic initiatives, and additional training or resources to help supervisors manage performance and conflict in the workplace. Among the many things that staff and faculty feel very positive about from their work experience at the University, these have the most potential for improvement.

The next steps for the Working at IOWA project include:

1. Distribution of specific 2008 Working at IOWA results to the colleges and divisions to allow them to review their own results, identify their progress since 2006 and set priorities for future improvement.

2. Continuing to work with campus leaders to develop and implement strategies to address improvements in the University work culture in order to foster engagement among University faculty and staff.

3. Providing reports to departments having at least 15 respondents to the survey, as requested by the college or division. No reports will be issued for any group with fewer than 15 respondents in order to assure the confidentiality of respondents.

4. As strategies are implemented to address improvements, communication should note that the actions taken are an effort to respond to the Working at IOWA survey results. In this way, staff and faculty can see the connection between their survey responses and the University’s efforts to improve.

5. Planning for the administration of the next Working at IOWA survey in 2012.
The 2008 results show there has been progress in building the positive work culture at the University, however, we aspire to continue the improvement. The high level of interest in the 2008 survey creates additional accountability for acting on the results to improve the work experience of faculty and staff. Efforts to continually improve the University work culture support engagement and the University’s goals for excellence. The effectiveness of the strategies used to address concerns identified in the 2008 results will be measured by repeating the survey again in 2012.

More information including both the 2008 and 2006 survey results and analysis is available on the Working at IOWA website: http://www.uiowa.edu/hr/working/index.html.
Background for Working at IOWA 2008

Based on the concepts of employee engagement, the Working at IOWA survey was developed to focus on the University’s effectiveness in fostering a work environment that demonstrates concern for faculty and staff well-being, builds upon the potential of individuals, and creates a highly effective and successful organization.

The original survey was the collaboration of Human Resources and a committee drawn from across the campus. The original survey was designed to focus on eight categories relevant to campus climate:

- Engagement
- Cooperation/Collaboration
- Supervisor Effectiveness
- Communication
- Confidence in Leadership Vision
- Commitment To Employee Well-being
- Customer Focus
- Flexibility
- Overall

Individual items were designed to address employee perceptions of their job, their unit and the University as an employer.

Respondents to the survey were asked to evaluate each survey item according to a six-point rating scale, ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." In addition, a "No Opinion/Not Applicable" option was provided for each statement.

Faculty, Professional and Scientific (P&S), Merit Supervisory Exempt/Confidential (MSE/C) Staff, and Merit Staff having at least 50 percent or greater regular appointments were asked to participate in the survey. Response data was examined as a whole and sorted by employee classification: faculty, professional and scientific and merit supervisory exempt, and merit staff. Demographic information was collected relating to respondents’ gender, race, age, years of employment, as well as organizational unit and department.
Administration of Working at IOWA 2008

Goals
In preparing to repeat the Working at IOWA survey in 2008, the following goals were identified:

1. Increase participation rates.
2. Compare the 2008 responses to the 2006 responses. Identify areas of change and identify areas for future improvement.
3. Provide direction for new action plans to build engagement and productivity.
4. Build enthusiasm among administration and faculty and staff for continuing work to improve the workplace environment at the University of Iowa.
5. Continue to demonstrate the University as an employer of choice.

In order to be able to compare data for the 2006 and 2008 results, only two modifications were made to the survey instrument itself (the survey text is available in the Appendix of this report). One question was dropped, and the references to faculty supervisors were clarified to be “DEO or departmental chair.”

Confidentiality
Confidentiality was maintained in three important ways:

- The UI Evaluation and Examination Service (EES) disseminated the survey, collected the data, and then deleted personal identifiers from the data file.
- Professor M. Bridget Zimmerman, the faculty member completing the data analysis, had access only to the amended EES files.
- Only anonymous data was received by University Human Resources and the Working at IOWA Committee.

Additional emphasis was placed in the promotional communications regarding the confidentiality of survey responses. An analogy to voting was used to show that survey administrators would see how many people responded, but would not see individual responses.

Level of Survey Data Reports Provided
Following the 2006 survey, colleges, divisions, and/or departments that had at least 30 respondents were able to receive a unit-specific report. The 30-respondent minimum did not allow for many units and departments to receive their local results, therefore, they were less able to make targeted improvements. At the request of the colleges and divisions and with demonstrated evidence that confidentiality would be maintained, it was decided that data in the 2008 survey would be provided to units and departments having at least 15 respondents. Results for groups of less than 15 respondents are only reflected in the results for the next larger organizational unit.

Promotional Strategies
Three new promotional strategies were utilized with Working at IOWA 2008.

Approximately 175 survey ambassadors were recruited from across the campus to help promote participation in the Working at IOWA 2008 survey. These individuals were
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asked to encourage the participation of their peers and colleagues. They were given information and resources in order to be able to address questions about the survey. The survey ambassadors significantly increased the personal contacts with staff and faculty to raise their awareness of the survey, assure them of confidentiality, and reinforce the value of the Working at IOWA initiative to employees.

Incentives in the form of $100 gift certificates were awarded by a random drawing from among survey participants. Winners were drawn each week the survey was open, and included one faculty member, one professional and scientific or merit exempt staff, and one merit staff member in each drawing. The incentive received mixed reactions but appeared to promote the participation of at least some survey participants.

A more extensive communication and marketing plan was also utilized with Working at IOWA 2008. This effort included more messages delivered through mass email, intranet systems, public kiosks, advertisements in multiple publications, and targeted messages authored by a variety of University and department leaders. Messages reinforced survey confidentiality, ease of participation, and actions resulting from the 2006 survey. The goal of a 60% participation level was emphasized, and the participation rate was publicized during the survey period.

Data Analysis Process
Professor M. Bridget Zimmerman, College of Public Health, compiled and analyzed the anonymous raw survey data collected by the UI Evaluation and Examination Service. Professor Zimmerman developed multiple tables for presenting the results, which are included in their entirety in the Appendix of this report.

The reports include an analysis of position classification, demographics, and the responses to individual items. Responses were analyzed by the categories of:

- Engagement
- Cooperation/Collaboration
- Supervisor Effectiveness
- Communication
- Confidence in Leadership Vision
- Commitment To Employee Well-being
- Customer Focus
- Flexibility
- Overall

The correlation of responses within a category was previously verified as part of the 2006 data analysis.

Two scales were used in the analysis to rank the items for agreement and disagreement:

"Agree/Disagree" scale: In this form, the six potential responses were collapsed into two measures: Agree (including "Strongly Agree," "Agree," and "Somewhat Agree") and Disagree (including "Strongly Disagree," "Disagree," and "Somewhat Disagree").
Most strongly "Agree/Disagree" scale: In this form, the two most clear or strongly held opinions are combined as either Agree ("Strongly Agree" and "Agree") or Disagree ("Strongly Disagree" and "Disagree"). This takes out of consideration those whose opinions were only “Somewhat Agree” or “Somewhat Disagree”, to focus on those responses that were most definitive.

Descriptive statistics for the item responses scored as 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Somewhat disagree, 4=Somewhat agree, 5=Agree, and 6=Strongly agree are also provided for each item and category. This includes the median and quartiles and the mean and standard deviation.

New to this report is an analysis that compares the 2008 survey responses to the 2006 benchmark data. Responses to individual items from the two surveys were compared using the Wilcoxon-rank sum test with a test having a p-value <0.001 considered as statistically significant. This indicates any shift in the distribution of the six response levels in either direction. This statistical test identified significant differences in 28 of the 45 items, all of which were positive.
Survey Response and Demographics

Survey completion
A total of 9,747 completed surveys were received out of a potential 15,644, representing a 62.3 percent response rate. Analysis of responses by subgroups (position classification, gender, race, age, and years of service) confirm that the responses were largely representative of the population surveyed. Table 1 below provides a comparison of employee response rates for the 2006 and 2008 Working at IOWA surveys.

Table 1
Number and percent of respondents in relation to eligible populations by survey year and employment classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty 721</td>
<td>2261</td>
<td>2261</td>
<td>31.9% 1387</td>
<td>2389</td>
<td>2389</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;S/MSE 3638</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>47.9% 5806</td>
<td>8549</td>
<td>8549</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merit 1858</td>
<td>4729</td>
<td>4729</td>
<td>39.3% 2555</td>
<td>4706</td>
<td>4706</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 6217</td>
<td>14590</td>
<td>14590</td>
<td>42.6% 9748</td>
<td>15644</td>
<td>15644</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Survey Analysis and Comparisons to 2006

A summary of the responses for overall percentage agreeing is provided in Table 2. The columns give the percentage of respondents for each survey item who responded either “Strongly Agree, Agree, or Somewhat Agree.” For example, 83.2% of all respondents agreed with the statement, “Given the opportunity, I will tell other people great things about working in my unit” while 16.8% disagreed.

The 2008 Working at IOWA survey responses were compared with responses from the 2006 survey. The survey items for which there was statistically significant difference from 2006 are designated with an asterisk. All of the differences identified showed a shift in the distribution of the six response levels in the direction of greater agreement.

Table 2
Percentage of respondents agreeing with survey statements (includes “Strongly Agree”, “Agree”, and “Somewhat Agree” responses to each item) overall and by employee classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>SURVEY ITEM</th>
<th>Levels of Agreement: Overall and by Employee Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall 2008 % agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>27. Given opportunity, I tell other people great things about working in my unit</td>
<td>83.2 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34. I understand how my job fits into the overall mission of the UI</td>
<td>94.3 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40. Given the opportunity to be employed elsewhere, leaving the UI would be difficult for me</td>
<td>74.0 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41. Being a member of University community inspires me to do my best work</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42. I would not hesitate to recommend the UI to a friend seeking employment</td>
<td>88.5 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>SURVEY ITEM</td>
<td>Levels of Agreement: Overall and by Employee Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall 2008 % agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperation/ Collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My opinions are valued</td>
<td>79.4 *</td>
<td>82.7 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Faculty/Staff are respected</td>
<td>80.4 *</td>
<td>85.5 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. We work collaboratively in my unit</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The UI treats faculty/staff with respect</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I know what is expected of me in my work</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have the authority to make decisions</td>
<td>90 *</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel included in decisions that are made about my job</td>
<td>74.7 *</td>
<td>82.2 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I receive regular feedback about my work</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Feedback at annual review helps me improve my performance</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>69.7 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My unit’s goals are clear</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>83.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Faculty/Staff suggestions are encouraged</td>
<td>82.3 *</td>
<td>85.8 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I am kept informed of our unit’s budget status</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. The UI does a good job informing faculty/staff of policy changes</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>85.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customer Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My unit has a strong focus on providing excellent service</td>
<td>91.4 *</td>
<td>90.5 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flexibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I look for more effective ways to do my work</td>
<td>99.2 *</td>
<td>99.3 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I see the value in changes I am asked to make</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>82.6 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>SURVEY ITEM</th>
<th>Levels of Agreement: Overall and by Employee Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall 2008 % agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>13. Overall, I am satisfied with my work</td>
<td>89.3 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33. Overall, I think my Unit is moving in a positive direction</td>
<td>79.6 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Effectiveness</td>
<td>5. My supervisor acknowledges me for doing good work</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. My supervisor provides me with clear work expectations</td>
<td>81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. My supervisor values the work I do</td>
<td>86.5 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. Good performance is acknowledged</td>
<td>78.4 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Poor performance is managed appropriately</td>
<td>57.8 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Work-related conflicts are managed constructively</td>
<td>68.8 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. I am encouraged to participate in professional development</td>
<td>80.5 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. Workloads are distributed fairly</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Vision</td>
<td>24. Can go to supervisor to discuss inappropriate behavior w/o fear of negative consequences.</td>
<td>85.7 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28. I can speak openly about work related concerns with my supervisor</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43. I am confident there is a clear plan to strengthen the UI</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45. Overall, I think the UI is moving in a positive direction</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>SURVEY ITEM</td>
<td>Overall 2008 % agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. I have the basic resources I need to do my work</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/EWB</td>
<td>11. My workload is reasonable</td>
<td>75.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/EWB</td>
<td>18. There are resources in my unit to help build my job skills</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/EWB</td>
<td>25. Can go to someone to discuss inappropriate behavior w/o fear of negative consequences.</td>
<td>82.8 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/EWB</td>
<td>30. My unit has flexibility allow me to participate in UI sponsored committees</td>
<td>78.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/EWB</td>
<td>31. My unit provides support to help faculty/staff balance work/personal responsibilities</td>
<td>77.9 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/EWB</td>
<td>35. The UI does a good job recognizing the accomplishments of faculty/staff</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/EWB</td>
<td>37. The UI has a sincere interest in the well-being of faculty/staff</td>
<td>77 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/EWB</td>
<td>39. There are opportunities for promotion within the UI</td>
<td>75.6 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/EWB</td>
<td>44. The UI makes a strong effort to attract faculty/staff from diverse backgrounds</td>
<td>88.7 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the 2008 survey, we completed the first cycle in our continuous improvement loop and we can now assess both the current state as well as the progress that has been achieved since 2006. The most significant observations from the 2008 Working at IOWA Survey follow.
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**Response Rate**
The survey response rate increased, from 42.6% in 2006 to 62.3% in 2008. Response rates for all employee groups increased. The higher participation rate provides a more accurate reflection of the total population.

**Categories**
University employees continue to rate their experience as very positive in each of the categories measured: engagement, cooperation/collaboration, supervisory effectiveness, communication, confidence in leadership/vision, commitment to employee well-being, customer focus, and flexibility, as well as in how employees view their experience overall. The collective responses by category are well in the range of agreement as indicated by the median scores contained in the statistical summary. Overall, responses are most positive in regard to flexibility, customer focus and their overall experience at the University.

**Comparing 2006 and 2008**
The key to comparing the 2006 and 2008 results has been to identify items and categories with a notable difference. There were 28 of 45 survey items that showed statistically significant differences between the two surveys. All of those identified showed higher levels of agreement with the survey items for 2008 compared to 2006, indicating positive improvement.

There were differences between employee classifications in a number of items where significant improvement was identified:
- Faculty agreement increased in 28 items.
- Professional and Scientific and Merit Supervisory Exempt/Confidential (MSE/C) agreement increased in 11 items.
- Merit staff agreement increased in 13 survey items.

While different employment classifications showed improvement in different survey items, no single category remained unchanged across all employee classifications. Improvement was made at some level in every category.

Of the five items targeted for improvement from the overall 2006 survey results (those with highest levels of disagreement), three of the items showed statistically significant improvement in 2008. These included managing work-related conflicts, workloads distributed fairly and poor performance managed appropriately. The improvement identified from those items supports the positive impact of the Working at IOWA initiative. Positive change has occurred, which may be attributable at least in part to targeted initiatives to address work environment issues. The survey allows us to see where improvement has occurred and better focus on the areas for future development.
Report Summary and Next Steps

Significant progress was made toward the achievement of the goals for Working at IOWA 2008:

- New promotional and communication tools drove very strong participation rates. This may also reflect the recognition the Working at IOWA initiative has gained within the campus community.
- The 2008 data reinforced that overall, staff and faculty feel very positive about their work experience at the University.
- Comparison to 2006 data indicates success in working toward continuous improvement and a more engaged workforce. The 2008 results will refocus attention on areas of concern and how they can continue to be improved at both a University and local level.
- The increased participation in the Working at IOWA 2008 survey indicates greater enthusiasm for the survey and increases accountability for using and acting on the survey results.
- The visibility of the Working at IOWA initiative continues to demonstrate the University’s commitment to providing a positive work culture, supporting employee engagement and continuously improving. This initiative also builds the reputation of the University as an employer of choice.

The survey items with highest levels of agreement demonstrate a strong foundation for employee engagement:

- I look for more effective ways to do my work
- I know what is expected of me in my work
- I understand how my job fits into the overall mission of the UI
- My unit has a strong focus on providing excellent service
- I have the basic resources I need to do my work

University Human Resources will also continue to study the survey data to determine where campus-wide initiatives can be most effective. The top five areas of disagreement overall include:

- Poor performance is managed appropriately
- I am kept informed of our unit’s budget status
- Workloads are distributed fairly
- Work-related conflicts are managed constructively
- I am confident there is a clear plan to strengthen the UI

Examples of campus wide strategies for improvement include new strategies for communicating about budgets or strategic initiatives, or additional training or resources to help supervisors manage conflict in the workplace. The survey results should not be
taken to indicate that our challenges are unique to the University of Iowa. It simply reflects that among the many things University faculty and staff feel positive about, these have the most potential for improvement.

Looking at individual classification results will also be used to guide future actions. For example, for merit staff, the area of most disagreement is being informed of the unit’s budget status. For faculty, professional and scientific and merit supervisory staff, the most disagreement is with the statement regarding managing performance. In targeting initiatives, we must also be cognizant of the needs of different employee groups.

The next step for Working at IOWA is to provide college and division-level survey results. Vice President Susan Buckley and Associate Provost Susan R. Johnson will again meet with each dean and vice president, along with their Senior Human Resources leader, to discuss their results. The Senior Human Resource Leader and their dean and vice president can also request reports specific to their departments and units. Based upon the analysis of these results, colleges/divisions and departments will be able to identify where improvement has occurred and develop action plans to address local concerns.

As steps are taken to respond to the 2008 Working at IOWA survey results, it will be important to communicate the intent to respond to the survey. In that way the campus community can be aware of how their responses are being used. By connecting actions to past survey results, we can maintain the visibility and interest in Working at IOWA, leading up to the 2012 survey.
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Appendices:

1. 2008 Survey Items
2. Data tables for all respondents*
3. Data tables for faculty respondents*
4. Data tables for professional & scientific and merit supervisory exempt respondents*
5. Data tables for merit respondents*

Each set of data table contains the following elements:

1. Demographics of 2008 respondents
   a. Race
   b. Age
   c. Gender
   d. Years of employment
2. Respondents by classification: faculty, professional and scientific and merit supervisory staff, merit staff
3. Distribution of survey respondent and participation by college/division
4. Responses to individual items by category
5. Items by total percent of all agree responses: “strongly agree, agree, and somewhat agree”. Items by total percent of all disagree response (“strongly disagree, disagree, and somewhat disagree”) is simply the inverse of item 5.
6. Items by percent “strongly disagree” and “disagree” responses only
7. Items by percent “strongly agree” and agree” responses only
8. Descriptive statistics of response scores by item
9. Descriptive statistics of average score by category
10. Comparison of item responses for 2008 with 2006 survey responses using p–value <0.001 as the criteria for a statistically significant difference

*Items by total percent of all disagree response (“strongly disagree, disagree, and somewhat disagree”) is the inverse of item 5.