**R**elationships
**E**ducation
**A**ppreciating Contributions
**C**ollaboration
**H**onest Communication

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY-SAN ANTONIO
STRATEGIC PLAN 2022–2026

**Employee Engagement Task Force**
**August 9, 2022 11:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**
**Meeting Notes**

- **Roll Call**: Jarrick Brown, Martha Olivos-Gonzalez, Carl Sheperis, Dr. Wu, Reed Vesey, Sandra. DeGrassi, Jessica Loudermilk, Craig Elmore, Megan Wise De Valdez, Vanessa Torres
- **Missing**: Art Olague, Mary Kay Cooper
- **Start Time** : 11:02 AM

- "REACHing for a better tomorrow"
    - R – Relationships (Strength in Survey)
    - E – Education (Employees don't know their benefits)
    - A – Appreciating contributions
    - C – Collaboration
    - H – Honest communication
        - Thoughts? – Sandra
            - Megan – Sounds good to me
            - Carl – nice acronym, fits what the tasks force is trying to accomplish and captures critical elements
            - Reed – should work just fine
            - Sandra – send me any other ideas

- Review Data, cont'd-Faculty and staff comparison (pp 1-9)
    - What are the primary problems with our employee engagement at TAMUSA?
        - Carl – how much digging has everyone done into the process? Breakdown between full time and part time faculty. Working to get this breakdown to us, MAC Book is at Apple store.
        - Carl – purpose is to differentiate between faculty and staff. Clear differences between engagements of the two. Staff was more positive with 375/500 overall score, faculty overall score 340/500 puts us in cautionary area. If you remove Adjunct faculty, the score continues to decrease. These scores are even lower because the part time faculty reported more engagement in the survey. Areas of strength are similar among both faculty and staff. Faculty workplace score of 375/500 they see their workplace as safe and satisfactory. Faculty supervisor score was 379 and the community score was 368. Staff saw similar work group 414 supervision 413 Community score. 406 Areas of concern, pay score was low for both, internal communication, and job

satisfaction 324 F vs 363 S. Internal communication and job satisfaction are key elements, in my opinion.

- o Construct 1 (Work Group)
    - 90% staff vs 69% faculty on work group corporates. We have good % of faculty that views collaboration among peers as a problem. Overall, staff thinks workgroup collaborate and corporate well. 2.5% of staff disagreed with this, very low.
    - Sandra – I wonder if this is the nature of the job we do? A lot of faculty are working independently on their class.
    - Dr. Wu – depends on if you have a project or discipline..
    - Megan – I think we are University that is building, so faculty are tasks with doing much more for their programs/colleges. When asked this question, what I read "are there people working together to improve their program" A lot of discontent with faculty to pull their weight.
    - Sandra – we can have focus groups expand on this question, because it sounds like the question sounded different to everyone.
    - Megan – there needs to be clarification on this, I see record or bigger picture of it all.
    - Dr. Sheperis – How we question will determine how we investigate these findings in the focus groups. "why is that there"
- o "In my workgroup, my opinions and ideas count"
    - 35% were neutral to strongly disagree, large group of faculty don't feel valued for their ideas. Staff is more positive at 84%, there is a lot of room for improvement.
- o "My workgroup regularly uses performance data to improve the quality of our work"
    - Carl – How do we use evaluations? How do those drive change? Faculty and staff are seeing the performance data is more than not being used effectively to bring about change. 54% F and 45% S are between neutral and strongly disagree that data is used to improve the quality of work.
    - Sandra – I do not think people saw this question as performance 'evaluation'
        - Carl – we could clarify with focus group about this question
    - Reed – "Do I have the data to perform my job" could reword question, ask focus group what they thought when they read this question.
    - Megan – I did not think about it about evaluation, might suggest for focus group if and how much any of it had to do with not understanding their guidelines for performance.
    - Carl – 51% vs 81% faculty/staff relative to teamwork. Almost 50% were between neutral and strongly disagree for faculty, only 17% of staff saw problem with feeling of teamwork.
    - Megan – might have been perceived as this idea work within a working group, rather than in total.
    - Sandra – item 3 for faculty, 20% neutral and 9% don't know. Might have been a poorly worded question, almost a third of respondents did not understand question.
    - Sandra – last deans meeting, was open to having small focus groups.
    - Jarrick – having focus groups of different classes.

- o Strategic
  - ▪ Carl – reputation of the institution was seen as problem across the board.
    - • 42% and 47%
  - ▪ Sandra – how much of that is within our control? How do you think we can influence
  - ▪ Jarrick – SSE has been huge with telling our story to the public. Working more with MarCom to get stories out, we know our own successes but how can we publish that?
  - ▪ Carl – How do we get ownership of telling stories at an individual level? Sense of pride of the students we produce and how we get that out to the public. How do we advance that from an engagement standpoint?
  - ▪ "I know how my impact others in the institution"
    - • Staff much stronger at 85%
  - ▪ Services to match the needs of those we serve
    - • Faculty at 53% and staff around 79%
  - ▪ Carl – regardless of faculty or staff, having a full understanding of the operations of the institution and what services are provided to the public, students and our employees is important. Emails don't do enough to informing staff of the services provided to them.
  - ▪ "Our institution communicates effectively with the public"
    - • 27% faculty and 39% staff. Big piece of taskforce, not just about MarCom. From each department, each division, how do those communications strategies get employed in a way that makes a difference.
    - • Sandra – but this is with the public, thought our bigger issue was communication with Upper Management to us. But this is to the public.
    - • Megan – We have people with national regonizie for the work they are doing with research, and I had a faculty member who could not get a press release.
    - • Carl – clear difference in how constructs are worded. This is going towards reputation of the intuition and strategy. How do we leverage the knowledge base internally, can be part of focus group. Clarify where we're going with the constructs.
    - • Sandra – Focus groups for faculty will be held during college meetings during the fall. Mary Kay will know more about Staff focus groups. 10 or less is my recommendation.
    - • Megan – departmental level, people are so closed off. Feel like perspectives globally will be more important, departments will become echo chamber. Only concern would be logistics.
    - • Carl – World Café Model, large room breakdown into small tables.
  - o Are there any "low hanging fruit" opportunities for increasing employee engagement?
- • Plan for focus groups and/or surveys to dig deeper into the data
  - o Faculty and Staff

- • **Meeting Adjourn:** 11:59 AM