Last staff survey was conducted in 2008

Pulse survey, conducted in October 2011, consisted of 29 questions and one open comment section

Harvard-wide pulse survey results:
- Staff engagement level remained at 75% (U.S. Best Employer Benchmark 77%)
- Harvard engagement score held up overall, despite challenging economic environment, both globally and inside Harvard
- Response rate 61%

FAS pulse survey results:
- Staff engagement level 73% (73% in 2008)
- Response rate 62%
Next Steps

• Shared FAS-wide survey results with FAS senior leaders

• Shared FAS-wide survey results with FAS staff members via FAS HR iSite

• Shared individual division/department data with administrative deans and department administrators
  › Shared survey results at May 17 Department Administrators meeting

• Divisional deans and most department administrators will have division-wide/departmental data that they can share with their groups

• Develop FAS-wide steps to address focus areas
How Engagement is Measured/Drivers

Drivers of Engagement

Quality of Life
- Work/Life Balance
- Work Environment

Work
- Day-to-Day Work
- Resources/Processes

Organizational Practices
- Diversity
- Performance Review Process
- Organizational Reputation

People
- University Leadership
- Local Leadership
- Immediate Manager/Supervisor
- Coworkers/Workgroup

Opportunities
- Future Opportunity
- Learning & Development

Total Rewards
- Pay
- Benefits
- Recognition

SAY

STAY

STRIVE

Engagement

ACTION AREAS

BEHAVIORS
The Context for Measuring Staff Engagement

2008 Staff Survey
- Global Financial Crisis
- Endowment Decline
- Budget Reductions
- VERIP
- RIF
- Salary Freeze
- Hiring “Frost”
- Allston Campus Stoppage
- Change in EVP Leadership
- H1N1

Attained Best Employer Score of 75%, up 9 points from 2006
Priorities suggested by findings:
- Local Leadership
- Pay for Performance
- Career Mobility
- Resources & Work Processes

Environment
- Global Economic Growth & Stability
- Significant Gains in Endowment
- Local Budget Management
- Employee Perception of Job “Security”
- Decentralization

2009-2011
- Conducted Current State Analysis, Identified Engagement Priorities
- Leadership and Communications
- Local Leadership
- Manager Capability and Effectiveness
- Performance Management
- Resiliency/Empowerment

Local Engagement efforts focused on:
- Enhanced leadership visibility and communications
- Non-monetary employee recognition
- Alignment of org. priorities and individual efforts through performance management process
- Pulse Surveys conducted by HBS, HKS, HLS, SEAS, and FAD
- Participation in 2010 and 2011 “Great Colleges to Work For” Survey (Chronicle of Higher Education)

2011
- Conducted two-pronged research effort to understand what has happened to employee engagement since 2008
- Listening Tour
- Pulse Survey

Goal was to see where things stand, update understanding, and make mid-course corrections

- Enhanced leadership visibility and communications
- Non-monetary employee recognition
- Alignment of org. priorities and individual efforts through performance management process
- Pulse Surveys conducted by HBS, HKS, HLS, SEAS, and FAD
- Participation in 2010 and 2011 “Great Colleges to Work For” Survey (Chronicle of Higher Education)
Schools Are Somewhat Tightly Clustered

Harvard University 2011 Score (75%)
## 2011 v. 2008 Engagement for Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Divinity School</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Business School</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Medical School</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Kennedy School</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Arts &amp; Science</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard School of Public Health</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Graduate School of Design</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Law School</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Engineering &amp; Applied Sciences</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Overall</td>
<td>7333</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Harvard-wide Areas to Sustain and Improve

Areas to Improve

2011

- Career Opportunities
  Aon Hewitt Rank: #1
- Local Leadership
  Aon Hewitt Rank: N/A
- Employer Reputation
  Aon Hewitt Rank: #9
- Recognition
  Aon Hewitt Rank: #2

Areas to Sustain

2011

- Employer Reputation
  Aon Hewitt Rank: #4
- Day-to-Day Work
  Aon Hewitt Rank: #1
- Learning and Development
  Aon Hewitt Rank: #18
- Coworkers
  Aon Hewitt Rank: #15

Aon Hewitt’s rank is provided for comparison purposes. This number represents the ranking of this particular Improve or Sustain driver in Aon Hewitt’s Global Database.
So What? Why Does Engagement Matter?

• In the for-profit world, companies with engaged workers perform better
  › Companies with engagement levels over 65% consistently outperform their competition and realize larger profitability and revenue growth

• Here at Harvard, we need a workforce that is:
  › Invested in Harvard’s success; inspired to give their discretionary effort
  › Agile, willing to learn and change, adaptive to:
    - new and better ways of accomplishing work
    - new organizational models for providing services to faculty and students
  › Cooperative, collaborative, and engaged