

AQIP PROJECT TEAM #1 (STAFF)
ANNUAL REPORT
SUBMITTED BY TEAM LEADER CHUCK COX
SEPTEMBER 1, 2006

Question #1: Describe the past year's accomplishments and the current status of this Action Project.

1. Staff subcommittee met 18 times during the academic year
2. Set ground rules and reviewed the charter
3. Conducted research for gaining insights from other institutions and agencies to include: US Department of Education, APPA Maintenance Staffing Guidelines for Educational Facilities, AQIP and internet searches
4. Had Evangel's human resources representative share EU policies on workload (FSLA regulations, overtime, comp-time, work-study, campus employment, and travel)
5. Reviewed data provided by the HR Rep regarding previous year's hours worked by department on non-salaried employees
6. Explored workload measuring instruments and decided that developing them (because of the diversity in types of work being done) would be too complex to develop, administer and draw conclusions.
7. Analyzed observations obtained from AQIP Conversation Day
8. Analyzed *Christianity Today* "Best Places to Work" survey taken by Evangel employees
9. Formulated, conducted and analyzed an Evangel University staff survey on workload with 141 of 189 returned. It was found that 32 % of those surveyed felt their workload to be heavy or very heavy. Others wondered about hiring practices, in addressing workload issues, and the communication process on how and why decisions are made. It was also felt that a few supervisors did not uniformly administrate university policies on work regulations.
10. Formulated, conducted and analyzed a survey on staffing of CCCU schools, honing in on those whose enrollments are in 1500-2000 range
11. Attempted to note trends or areas of concern at Evangel, from all the resources cited
12. Attempted to establish the desired workload state
13. Attempted to establish the current workload situation to note the gap and identify root causes
14. Formulated initiatives to tackle root causes
15. Submitted recommendations to the steering committee to seek approval of team's work and gain further instructions
16. Responded to a set of questions posed by a member of the steering team about the recommendations
17. Requested a full meeting with the steering committee for its collective thoughts on the recommendations

Question #2: Describe how the institution involved people in work on this Action Project.

Conversation Day results guided the AQIP Steering Team to target three issues or areas of concern. The one dealing with staffing adequacy and workload surfaced as the concern most cited. It became one of the projects.

The three projects were shared with all employees in a joint meeting. At the conclusion, volunteers were sought to serve on project teams. From the list of volunteers, the steering committee selected the teams striving to obtain groups representing all areas of the campus. Project Team #1 was formed and, understanding the distinction between staff and faculty practices and needs, two subcommittees were immediately established.

In May of 2005 the team was chartered and it set about its work. Chuck Cox, from the steering team was selected to serve as the Project Team #1 liaison, Jozette Ausbury as the staff team leader and Marilyn Quigley as the faculty team leader.

In October, the staff team leader, citing workload issues, resigned as leader but remained as a team member. Chuck Cox acted as interim team leader while seeking a new one. The leadership was offered to other team members, but none felt that they could take on the additional responsibilities. Chuck asked the team if they would they like for him to continue as the new leader, if approval could be gained. That was the consensus and approval was granted by the steering team in November.

The team lost a member in December due to a move out of state. It was determined that she would not be replaced to retain membership continuity. Members have met faithfully and consistently since that time.

In January 2006 the team had the opportunity to bring an update on its work at an all-employee meeting.

In March, a workload survey was administered to all staff members. Results of the survey were shared with the steering team and have been used in the formulation of the team's recommendations.

In June, the team's recommendations were submitted to the steering team for feedback.

Meeting agendas and outcomes have been shared with steering team leader, the subcommittee leaders and each member of the staff team. Meetings have been conducted using TQM principles as practicable. Assignments have been taken on by all members as each has shouldered his or her team role. Refreshments and regularly scheduled meeting times have helped in maintaining focus and momentum.

Question #3: Describe your planned next steps for this Action Project.

1. Having shared the staff team's recommendations with the steering team through E-mail, and given them some time to review and ask questions individually, the project team now needs to schedule a meeting with the steering team to seek its collective thoughts and insights.

2. From this meeting, further requests or refinement of the recommendations may be sought. If required, a timetable needs to be established to complete any additional tasks or refinements.
3. A final presentation to the steering committee will then be made.
4. Upon approval of the recommendations, the subcommittee will present them to Evangel's Campus Planning Council for approval and implementation.
5. As outlined in the recommendations, evaluation and assessment will be done systematically.

Question #4: Describe any “effective practice(s)” that resulted from your work on this Action Project.

1. Having the project team leader for the staff subcommittee also serving as the steering team liaison to the faculty subcommittee has been an unexpected benefit. The two subcommittees are distinctly different and have tackled their challenges uniquely. Still, they have been able to share insights from each other's work. For example, when results from Conversation Day indicated that workload and staffing adequacy were the #1 issue, it was not clear if this was a faculty or staff issue, or both. The staff team decided it needed to survey the staff employees to find out, and they proceeded to develop, administer and analyze the survey. Sharing this with the faculty subcommittee resulted in adapting the survey for their purposes providing both teams data for which future measurements can be made.
2. Dr. Howard Altman was brought in as a consultant for the faculty team. Even though the staff team knew that he had little expertise to share on staff employee workload, two members from the staff team joined the faculty team and participated in the daylong sessions with him. This proved to be very helpful as insights were gained into academic chair training on workload issues that are transferable to the training of staff supervisors.

Question #5: What challenges, if any, are you still facing in regard to this Action Project?

1. The staff team is anxious to complete its task. They have done an incredible amount of work getting to this juncture and are excited about their recommendations. They feel that these will provide vehicles for the university to proactively address staffing adequacy and workload issues. It is hopeful that their recommendations will gain the approval of the AQIP Steering Committee and Campus Planning Council.
2. The question of the agent to implement the team's recommendations is a point to be settled.