

**EMORY UNIVERSITY**  
**2010-2011 Assessment Report for Administrative and Educational Support Units**  
**Assessment Period Covered: September 1, 2010-August 31, 2011**

<b>Unit: Learning Services</b>	<b>Date Submitted: September 30, 2011</b>
<b>Contact Person: Anadri Chisolm-Noel</b>	<b>Email address: achisol@emory.edu</b>

### **I. MISSION STATEMENT**

#### **Human Resources MISSION STATEMENT**

"To support the University's long standing tradition of teaching, learning, research and service, the Human Resources Division strives to project pride and enthusiasm in service in response to the needs of a diverse community by:

- treating individuals with respect and dignity;
- communicating accurate and timely information;
- promoting fair and equitable treatment of individuals throughout the University;
- fostering an environment where individual contributions are valued and recognized;
- demonstrating a commitment to personal and professional development and internal mobility;
- ensuring the recognition of rights, responsibilities and privileges shared by members of the University community."

Learning Services supports the University's vision by forming strategic partnerships with departments that allow us to deliver quality, cost-effective professional development opportunities that improve employee performance and are tailored to the needs of Emory University.

### **II. OUTCOMES**

1. Leaders and individual contributors who participate in Learning Services programs will develop and demonstrate skills within the leadership and professional competencies that support the mission of the organization.
2. Emory will retain key leaders and employees as well as strengthen the leadership pipeline for future advancement opportunities within the University.
3. Learning Services will identify the top professional development needs of employees, faculty and leaders within the University.
4. Employees will be satisfied with the programs provided by Learning Services.

### III. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

#### **OUTCOME #1:**

Leaders and individual contributors who participate in Learning Services programs will develop and demonstrate skills within the leadership and professional competencies that support the mission of the organization.

#### **Supports School/Division Strategic Goals:**

Human Resources provides leadership in sustaining Emory as an “employer of choice”. We promote and foster an environment of excellence. We support diversity, individual development, and fair treatment of all employees as core values of Emory’s mission of teaching, research and healthcare to improve human well-being.

#### **Supports University Strategic Goals:**

Emory’s social and physical environment enriches the intellectual work and lives of faculty, students, and staff.

#### **FIRST METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME #1:**

##### **Method of Assessment:**

Utilize a 360 tool to determine if there has been an improvement in the leadership competencies from the beginning to the end of the program.

##### **Achievement Target:**

No specific target was set; however, it was expected that there would be a general trend of competency improvement, as rated by both the participants and their raters.

##### **Summary of Assessment Results:**

The results were analyzed for the first five cohorts from both the Manager Development Program (MDP) and the Supervisor Development Program (SDP); total N for each program was 62 and 61, respectively. Based on these results, it was found that for each cohort, there was improvement shown in all leadership competencies measured, as rated by the participant and by their raters. In general, there were similar levels of improvement observed for both groups, as rated by others. However, participants’ self-ratings of change were higher for the SDP than the MDP. This finding is likely due to a number of reasons:

- SDP participants are new to the management role. They rate themselves lower overall than do the participants in the MDP group for their average past proficiency, thus leaving room for more improvement.
- SDP participants tend to indicate that they have gained a great deal of confidence from the program, and those may see their behavior as more improved because they are more confident in what they are doing.

Further, self-ratings of change (improvement) were higher in self-ratings for each group than for ratings by others. This is not an unusual result, as the participant is more focused on their own behavior, the development they are experiencing and the changes they are making than are those around them.

It was interesting that when you look the cohorts for both programs, the three competencies showing the greatest amount of improvement and the three competencies showing the least amount of improvement were seen the same for both programs and by both the participants and there other raters with only one exception. Specifically:

Competencies showing the most improvement:

MDP Self-ratings	MDP Others' Ratings	SDP Self-ratings	SDP Others' Ratings
Aligning Performance for Success	Aligning Performance for Success	Delegating Responsibility	Aligning Performance for Success
Building a Successful Team	Building a Successful Team	Coaching	Building a Successful Team
Delegating Responsibility	Delegating Responsibility	Aligning Performance for Success	Delegating Responsibility

Competencies showing the least improvement:

MDP Self-ratings	MDP Others' Ratings	SDP Self-ratings	SDP Others' Ratings
Leveraging Diversity	Leveraging Diversity	Customer Focus	Building Trust
Building Trust	Building Trust	Building Trust	Customer Focus
Customer Focus	Customer Focus	Leveraging Diversity	Leveraging Diversity

For more specifics on the findings, see the following attached reports for MDP:

- Competency Improvements for Cohorts 1 – 5
- MDP Cohort 1
- MDP Cohort 2
- MDP Cohort 3
- MDP Cohort 4
- MDP Cohort 5

For more specifics on the findings, see the following attached reports for SDP:

- Competency Improvements for Cohorts 1 – 5
- SDP Cohort 1
- SDP Cohort 2
- SDP Cohort 3
- SDP Cohort 4
- SDP Cohort 5

**Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services:**

While improvements were shown across all competencies, the level of improvement was not very high. This is partially due to the fact that the initial ratings were all approximately a 3.5 or higher on a 5.0 scale of proficiency. Therefore, the level for improvement to being the highest rating possible was only 1.5 or less (and more often much less). However, in order to determine if we could increase the level of competency improvement the following changes were implemented for Cohort 6 for both the MDP and SDP programs.

1. 360 degree feedback will no longer be given in group sessions, with the option for later one-on-one feedback, if desired. For Cohort 6, individual 360 feedback sessions were provided by a certified internal coach. The session also integrated the participant's Birkman feedback, as relevant with the 360.
2. Development planning sessions are no longer given as a group training session, with participants left to create their development plans on their own. The certified coach meets with the participants again after the feedback sessions to assist them in the development of meaningful and measureable development plans.
3. *Results Engine* (an on-line tool provided by Fort Hill Corporation) was piloted to determine if this would be helpful to participants. Participants' development goals are loaded into Results Engine, and emails are sent to the participants once per month for six months. Participants are able to click on a link that takes them to goals, and they update advancements made toward their goals, as well as respond to specific questions about how they are using the information presented in the workshops. (We will evaluate the utilization of Results Engine by the participants, as well as conducted either a focus group or survey to get their reactions to using this follow-up technology.)

## SECOND METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME #1:

### **Method of Assessment:**

Follow-up surveys and/or interviews are conducted with program participants, and sometimes with their leaders to determine if they have improved their leadership skills and if they are using the information that was learned.

**Achievement Target:** No specific target was set; however, it was expected that participants would indicate improvements in their skills.

### **Summary of Assessment Results:**

For the **Excellence Through Leadership Program (ETL)**, one-on-one interviews were conducted with the participants 8-10 months after their graduation from the program. The interview consisted of questions related to what had been most impactful and made the greatest difference in their leadership, ratings of the impact of each of the major segments of the program, questions related to any cost savings/revenue enhancements that were a direct result of implementing knowledge/skills learned in the program, their overall improved level of leadership, and if they felt the program was a good use of their time investment.

The results of the ETL interviews were very positive, with all respondents (13 of the 14 participants rating the investment of time as a 5 on a 5-point scale (where 5 was the highest

rating). Participants provided numerous examples of how they had utilized the knowledge and skills learned, as well as examples of cost savings resulting from the utilization. They also rated an average 3.88 on a 5-point scale the improvement in their leadership skills.

Quantitative data were also examined as it related to retention, promotions, merit increases, and movement across divisions.

For more details see the following attachments:

- ETL Interview Results
- ETL Alumni
- ETL Data

For the **EXCEL program**, designed and implemented for the staff in the Communications and Marketing Division, pre-and post- assessments were conducted to look at improved skill levels. Surveys were conducted with the participants, and surveys were conducted with their direct leaders. The leaders were only surveyed after the program and their responses were based on a scale of improvement since beginning the program. Focus groups were also conducted with the participants to request their feedback on what had gone well and what could be improved (this was the first of three cohorts that would be participating in the program).

Overall, the following results were found:

With regard to the pre/post survey of participants, the average score on all 11 items was higher on the post survey with an average increase of 0.92 on a 5 point scale.

- a. The highest gain (1.44) was found for their “ability to hold ‘crucial conversations’ to get the right results.”
- b. The lowest gain (0.06) was found for their “ability to collect appropriate information and feedback and use the information as the basis for decision making.” This small gain is the result of the participants rating themselves very high on this item in the pre-survey, thus leaving little room for improvement.

2. With regard to the post leader survey, on a 4 point scale where 1 = no improvement and 4 = great improvement, leaders provided an average improvement score of 2.16, indicating that there was some improvement in every area.
  - a. Two areas were tied for the highest area of improvement (2.33) by leaders:
    - i. “Constructively manage conflict or difficult situations” (which mirrors the participants’ highest rated item)
    - ii. “Making decisions” (which interestingly was where the participants saw the lowest area of improvement).
  - b. The lowest rated item by the leaders was 1.87 for “understanding financial systems and processes.”
3. Using a 5 point scale, where 1 = strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree, leaders provided an average score of 4.40 in response to “Overall, this program was a good use of time and resources.”
4. Participants provided high ratings of the courses and of the trainers for each course.
  - a. All ratings related to aspects of the courses for each course were rated over 4.09 on a 5 point scale, with only one exception. That exception was for the item titled “relevance to your job function” for the course Leading Effective Meetings, where participants provided a rating of 3.78.

- b. All ratings related to the effectiveness of the facilitators were above a 4.6 on a 5 point scale.
- c. Immediately after each course, participants rated their knowledge/skill prior to the course and following the course. All ratings indicated improvement in the skills/knowledge, with an average increase of 1.9 points on a 5 point scale.

For more details see the following attachment:

- Excel Program Evaluations Cohort 1

**Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services:**

Based on the results of the ETL data, two major changes were made to the program for future cohorts:

1. The half-day session on Conflict Resolution was eliminated and was replaced with a 2-day course, Crucial Conversations.
2. The project teams were provided with their project topics in December – a month sooner than in previous years, in order to provide a more reasonable amount of time to address the complex nature of the problems being addressed.
3. Although not a change to the ETL program, feedback from the group was used to develop a pilot program of develop for ETL Alumni.

Based on the results of the EXCEL data, minor changes were made to the program for the upcoming two cohorts:

1. Slight changes were made to the order in which the sessions would be delivered to maximize the use of the content.
2. The project teams were given their projects earlier in the program.

**OUTCOME #2:**

Emory will retain key leaders and employees as well as strengthen the leadership pipeline for future advancement opportunities within the University.

**Supports School/Division Strategic Goals:**

Human Resources provides leadership in sustaining Emory as an “employer of choice”. We promote and foster an environment of excellence. We support diversity, individual development, and fair treatment of all employees as core values of Emory’s mission of teaching, research and healthcare to improve human well-being.

**Supports University Strategic Goals:**

Emory’s social and physical environment enriches the intellectual work and lives of faculty, students, and staff.

**FIRST METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME #2:****Method of Assessment:**

Review the employment status and/or career mobility patterns of the participants in the Learning Services programs from 2008 to 2011.

**Achievement Target:**

While no specific goal was cited, we expect to see that these employees are still employees at the University; as well as have experienced career mobility within the organization.

**Summary of Assessment Results:**

Since 2008, 549 employees have participated in our leadership program; 480 (87.7%) are still employed at the University, and 69 (12.6%) have been terminated. Terminations include employees who have left the University for any of the following reasons: voluntary or involuntary resignations, poor performance/misconduct, reductions in force, end of temporary contracts, career changes, or medical leave.

The following chart provides greater insights about the career mobility and/or pay increases since the participation in one of the programs. Please note the abbreviations for the following programs:

- APP=Administrative Professionals Program, includes administrative assistants, secretaries and program coordinators.
- SDP=Supervisor Development Program, includes those who are new to supervision regardless of title (supervisor, manager or team leader).
- MDP=Manager Development Program, includes those who are experienced managers, typically those who have managed others for several years, and/or has greater areas of responsibility.
- Mentor & Mentee=Mentor Emory Program, pairs individuals with experienced professionals within the organization.
- ALP=Academic Leadership Program focuses on the professional development of Academic Leaders within the University; typically the person is a dean or chair.
- ETL= Excellence Through Leadership focuses on the professional development of Administrative Leaders within the University; typically the person is in a executive-level role.
- Multiple Moves indicates that some of the employees experienced more than one change in their role (e.g. lateral move, promotion) or increases in salary.

	APP		SDP		MDP	
<b>Total Number of Participants</b>	135		97		79	
<b>Active Employees</b>	119	88.1%	81	83.5%	70	88.6%
Same role	71	52.6%	36	37.1%	41	51.9%
Changes in Role	48	35.6%	45	46.4%	29	36.7%
Increase in Pay	26	19.3%	29	29.9%	13	16.5%
Change in Position	5	3.7%	9	9.3%	4	5.1%
Promotion	21	15.6%	18	18.6%	16	20.3%
Lateral Move	7	5.2%	6	6.2%	2	2.5%
Multiple Moves	10	7.4%	15	15.5%	6	7.6%
<b>Terminations</b>	16	11.9%	16	16.5%	9	11.4%

	Mentors		Mentees		ETL		ALP	
<b>Total Number of Participants</b>	54		78		85		21	
<b>Active Employees</b>	49	90.7%	72	92.3%	71	83.5%	18	85.7%
Same role	20	37.0%	22	28.2%	36	42.4%	14	66.7%
Changes in Role	29	53.7%	50	64.1%	35	41.2%	4	19.0%
Increase in Pay	15	27.8%	26	33.3%	32	37.6%	1	4.8%
Change in Position	6	11.1%	5	6.4%	4	4.7%	0	0.0%
Promotion	17	31.5%	19	24.4%	23	27.1%	3	14.3%
Lateral Move	7	13.0%	7	9.0%	2	2.4%	0	0.0%
Multiple Moves	12	22.2%	16	20.5%	12	14.1%	0	0.0%
<b>Terminations</b>	5	9.3%	6	7.7%	14	16.5%	3	14.3%

#### Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services:

Learning Services will use these results to further refine the content for the participants. In addition, Learning Services will capture success stories from some of the participants and use it for marketing purposes.

#### OUTCOME #3:

Learning Services will identify the professional development needs of employees, faculty and leaders within the University.

#### Supports School/Division Strategic Goals:

Human Resources provides leadership in sustaining Emory as an “employer of choice”. We

promote and foster an environment of excellence. We support diversity, individual development, and fair treatment of all employees as core values of Emory's mission of teaching, research and healthcare to improve human well-being.

**Supports University Strategic Goals:**

Emory's social and physical environment enriches the intellectual work and lives of faculty, students, and staff.

**FIRST METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME #3:**

**Method of Assessment:**

Conducted a campus-wide needs assessment in March 2011.

**Achievement Target:**

The Learning Services Needs Assessment includes the following details:

- 9433 Surveys were sent to respondents.
- 1713 people responded completed or partially completed the survey (18.1% response rate)
- 972 of the respondents were staff (56.7%).
- 453 of the respondents were in leadership roles, including supervisor, manager, director, chair, dean, principal investigators, etc (26.5%).
- 288 of the respondents are faculty members (16.8%)

**Summary of Assessment Results:**

**FACULTY (non-supervisory)**

On scale of 1 to 4, with 4 the highest; the following were identified as the top need for each category.

1. CUSTOMER SERVICE: Taking action to solve problems (2.71).
2. HIGHER EDUCATION: Understanding how higher education works (2.54).
3. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS: Communicating effectively (2.92).
4. PERSONAL LEADERSHIP: Prioritizing and managing time effectively (2.77).
5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT: Managing projects effectively. (2.62).

**STAFF (non-supervisory, including faculty members)**

On scale of 1 to 4, with 4 the highest; the following were identified as the top need for each category.

1. CUSTOMER SERVICE: Taking action to solve problems (2.73).
2. HIGHER EDUCATION: Understanding how higher education works (2.37).
3. INTERPERSONAL SKILLS: Communicating effectively (2.90).
4. PERSONAL LEADERSHIP: Performing well during periods of change, high stress or uncertainty (2.78).
5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT: Improving work processes, minimizing rework, duplications and errors (2.86).

**LEADERSHIP** (e.g. supervisors, managers, directors, deans, chairs, vice presidents, etc.)

On scale of 1 to 4, with 4 the highest; the following were identified as the top need for each category.

1. COACHING: Coaching employees to be successful on a new task/responsibilities (3.02).
2. COMMUNICATION: Communicating effectively and providing effective feedback (3.22).
3. DEVELOPING OTHERS: Motivating and inspiring others (2.77).
4. HR POLICIES: Understanding and communicating HR policies and procedures (2.31).
5. LEADERSHIP: Prioritizing and managing time effectively (2.95).
6. STRATEGY & COLLABORATION: Managing change and gaining commitment (2.84).

**Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services:**

Based on these findings, Learning Services will refine the course offerings to reflect the top needs indicated in this needs assessment. In addition, we will share the findings with specific departments. This will allow us to identify additional professional development opportunities for employees and create additional partnerships within the organization.

**OUTCOME #4:**

Employees will be satisfied with the programs provided by Learning Services.

**Supports School/Division Strategic Goals:**

Human Resources provides leadership in sustaining Emory as an “employer of choice”. We promote and foster an environment of excellence. We support diversity, individual development, and fair treatment of all employees as core values of Emory’s mission of teaching, research and healthcare to improve human well-being.

**Supports University Strategic Goals:**

Emory’s social and physical environment enriches the intellectual work and lives of faculty, students, and staff.

**FIRST METHOD OF ASSESSMENT FOR OUTCOME #4:**

**Method of Assessment:**

Review a sample of end class surveys (using Survey Monkey) from the various courses offered by Learning Services.

**Achievement Target:**

On scale of 1 to 5, with 5 the highest; Learning Services wants to achieve a satisfaction rate of 4.0 or higher.

**Summary of Assessment Results:**

In the review of the sample, we achieved an average satisfaction rate of 4.1.

**Use of Assessment Results to Improve Unit Services:**

While the target goal was met, we want to consistently improve our course delivery to participants. This information will be used to strengthen the presentation skills of the facilitators and refine course content.

**IV. What outcomes will your unit assess next year?**

**Outcome 1:** Employees will be satisfied with the general enrollment classes provided by Learning Services.

<b>Method:</b> Quarterly, review the end of class surveys to determine participant satisfaction.	<b>Achievement Target:</b> On scale of 1 to 5, with 5 the highest; Learning Services wants to achieve a satisfaction rate of 4.5 or higher for 85% of our general enrollment classes.
---	--

**Outcome 2:** Leaders and individual contributors who participate in Learning Services programs will develop and demonstrate skills within the leadership and professional competencies that support the mission of the organization.

<b>Method:</b> Utilize a 360 tool to determine if there has been an improvement in the leadership competencies from the beginning to the end of the program.	<b>Achievement Target:</b> On scale of 1 to 5, with 5 the highest; want to see an improvement in the level competency to 4.0 or higher from 75% of the supervisors and managers who participate in the programs. Currently, the level is 3.5.
---	---

**Outcome 3:** Leaders and individual contributors who participate in the special/customized training programs.

<b>Method:</b> Conduct pre and post assessment of all the participants to determine if there has been an increase in the skill level associated with the training session.	<b>Achievement Target:</b> On scale of 1 to 5, with 5 the highest; want to see an improvement in the level competency to 3.5 or higher.
<b>Method:</b> Conduct pre and post assessment of all the supervisors to determine if the employees have improved and/or applied the skills from training in the workplace.	<b>Achievement Target:</b> On scale of 1 to 5, with 5 the highest; want to see an improvement in the level competency to 3.5 or higher.

## V. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Please remember to attach supporting documentation such as surveys, questionnaires, charts, tables, spreadsheets, and detailed descriptions of assessment findings. If you have questions about what should or should not be included with the report, please contact the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness.

## VI. REVIEW PROCESS

Please forward your 2010-2011 assessment report to the Dean of your college/school or the Vice President/Vice Provost of your administrative division for review and electronic signature. This review will ensure that the information included in this report is accurate and that your unit is engaged in a systematic process of continuous improvement.

Peter Barnes

September 30, 2011

---

Dean/Vice President/Vice Provost

---

Date

## VII. SUBMISSION OF REPORTS

Please email reports to David Jordan, Director of Institutional Effectiveness ([David.M.Jordan@emory.edu](mailto:David.M.Jordan@emory.edu)) by October 1, 2011.