Excellence in Action: An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Human Resources Division at Kent State University

Frank Kunstel, Ph.D.
Cathy L. Z. DuBois, Ph.D.
David A. DuBois, Ph.D.

February 19, 2010

"We are extremely fortunate to have the HR staff we have and I couldn't say enough about how wonderful they are!"
Employee comment from the 2010 Human Resources Effectiveness Survey.

Excellence in Action:
An Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the
Human Resources Division at Kent State University
Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Kent State University Division of Human Resources' self-assessment was led by three consultants in collaboration with members of the Division of Human Resources. Analyses represented three perspectives: (1) internal HR perspective – information provided by Division of Human Resources staff using a guide created by a panel of national HR experts American Management Association (AMACOM), which was supplemented with the division's process flow charts and workflow narratives, as well as discussions with consultants; (2) internal customer perspective – an online survey of KSU employees conducted to solicit their views about Division of Human Resources effectiveness; and (3) external peer organization / market perspective – a comparison of HR's performance metrics to those from several national surveys of Division of Human Resources.

RESULTS

Strengths

1. <u>Cost.</u> The university gets its money's worth from the Division of Human Resources.
2. <u>Alignment.</u> The Division of Human Resources' mission and strategic plan align well with the mission and strategy of the university.
3. <u>Staff expertise.</u> HR staff are competent, professional, and dedicated, with a customer-oriented attitude.
4. <u>Teamwork</u>. HR staff communicate and collaborate well.
5. <u>Structure</u>. The structure is appropriate for its current mission.
6. <u>Scope.</u> The Division of Human Resources has a scope appropriate to its current mission. All of the standard roles and responsibilities for its mission are addressed by the division. When compared to the AMACOM set of expectations and to the external comparison metrics utilized for this assessment, the KSU Division of Human Resources measures up.
7. <u>Compliance</u>. The Division of Human Resources has appropriate policies and knowledgeable staff.
8. <u>Benefits</u>. Employee benefits are comprehensive and generous; employees recognize and appreciate them.
9. <u>Innovation and Initiative</u>. The Division of Human Resources has implemented some innovative programs that have substantially reduced costs while contributing to employee well being.

Opportunities for Improvement

Division of Human Resources

1. <u>Timeliness.</u> Employees express concerns about the timeliness of responses to their requests.
2. <u>Staffing Levels</u>. The Division of Human Resources appears understaffed, to employees as well as in comparison to external metrics.
3. <u>Technology Utilization</u>. The HR internet presence provides useful information, but is not sufficiently user friendly.
4. <u>Visibility</u>. Many employees appear unaware that HR does more than hiring and benefits.
5. <u>Customer Contact Point</u>. There is no central point of contact between each university division / department and HR.
6. <u>Total Compensation</u>. Employees appear to think highly of the benefit package they receive from KSU, but they perceive that compensation is not competitive.

7. <u>HR Assessments</u>. HR needs to solicit employee input on a consistent basis.
8. <u>HR Metrics</u>. HR does not routinely use such metrics, although doing so would be useful.
9. *<u>Business Basics</u>*. HR needs to develop a deeper understanding of the business of the university so they can better advise and support all levels of management.

Line Managers' Role in Human Resources Management
10. <u>Performance Appraisal/Pay Increases</u>. Line managers give too many employees (> 60%) high performance ratings and merit pay increases, which provides employees with ineffective performance management and reduces the effectiveness of the compensation system.

Policies
11. <u>Fairness</u>. Employee perceptions of inequity exist, particularly with respect to classification and compensation policies.

The Role of Senior Leadership in Human Resource Management
12. <u>Manager Accountability for HR</u>. The pattern of results reflecting a high percentage of highly rated employees, a low rate of involuntary turnover, and HR staff comments indicating that line managers don't consistently follow through with their HR tasks suggests that line managers fall short in performing their HR duties. Although this issue is beyond the scope of this study, it is sufficiently important to merit further study.
13. <u>Strategic Orientation</u>. HR performs its transactional roles well, but could contribute more to the University if it were charged with transformational duties and afforded resources accordingly.

RECOMMENDATIONS
Division of Human Resources
1. <u>Lead From Strengths</u>. The Division of Human Resources has a solid portfolio of core strengths. Ensure that these core strengths are maintained and nurtured.
2. <u>Improve Timeliness</u>. Set elapsed time goals and monitor performance towards those standards; consider use of automated tracking systems.
3. <u>Refine Technology Utilization</u>. Improve the user design of all HR related systems.
4. <u>Evaluate Staffing Levels</u>. Examine whether staffing levels need to increase to effectively manage workload.
5. <u>Develop the KSU HR Brand</u>. Strengthen customer awareness and visibility of HR services and expertise by developing a brand for the Division of Human Resources.
6. <u>Establish Account Managers/HR Generalists for Each Major Customer Group</u>. Provide an integrated contact and response process for each major customer group.
7. <u>Promote the Value of Total Compensation to KSU Employees.</u> Develop and sell the total compensation package of Kent State to impact employee perceptions of market equity.
8. <u>Conduct Periodic Assessments</u>. Gather and analyze customer input on a regular basis.
9. <u>Use HR Metrics Consistently.</u> Utilize HR metrics to ensure consistent quality and effectiveness of services.
10. <u>Develop and Apply an Understanding of the Business Basics of the University.</u> Establish a process through which HR staff acquire current information about University business basics and use this information when they work with University management.

Line Manager Recommendations
11. <u>Address Imbalances in Performance Appraisals and Merit Pay Increases.</u> Work with line managers to improve their competencies in assigning performance appraisals and merit pay to develop a high performance organization.

Policies
12. <u>Evaluate the Fairness of University Policies in Targeted Areas</u>. Convene a task force to evaluate the equity of certain university policies and respective employee perceptions.

Senior Leader Recommendations
13. <u>Evaluate the HR Responsibilities of Line Managers</u>. Conduct a study to assess the performance of HR responsibilities by line managers and associated accountabilities. Such a study might include a review of job descriptions for the clarity of HR tasks, a survey of employees about the extent to which their managers perform HR tasks, or focus groups of managers to assess understanding and purpose of their of HR tasks.
14. <u>Utilize the Division of Human Resources to Support Strategic Initiatives</u>. Expand the mission and resources of the Division of Human Resources beyond purely transactional to strategic and transformational.

CONCLUSION
Stepping Up—Opportunities for a High-Performance Organization

The past decade has offered much discussion in management and business journals regarding the need for American organizations to transform themselves in order to be able to compete in the business environment of the 21st century. Together the influences of global competition, technology, and sustainability have revised the keys to success. Organizations must be able to transform themselves, and universities are no exception. Kent State University leadership recognizes this reality and has embarked upon a path of considerable transformation.

The Human Resources division is central to this effort because it can provide many initiatives to assist the transformation. Just as new buildings require architects and engineers to supply the expertise, tools, and processes to develop new physical infrastructure, a new university vision, mission, and culture requires human resources expertise and skills to develop and change the social infrastructure through which these are accomplished. To achieve the goals set forth by President Lefton, university management will need an array of skills and processes to engage employees in new strategic directions and workflow processes. However, the Division of Human Resources is currently neither appropriately staffed nor sufficiently empowered to serve as a transformational agent.

We believe many HR staff possess the requisite competencies to function at this higher level. The shift from transactional HR to transformational HR will require the commitment and support of university executive management, as well as intelligent planning within the Division of Human Resources. This conversion is imperative for KSU to achieve the level of excellence to which it aspires.

" . . a gem of a Human Resources Network at KSU."
Employee comment from the 2010 Human Resources Effectiveness Survey.

Introduction

This project arose from the confluence of three influences. First, President Lefton's strategic agenda for Kent State University proposes that all divisions within the university undergo a self assessment to examine efficiency and identify a plan for improvement. Additionally, as part of the move to Responsibility Centered Management at Kent State University, in March, 2009, the Budget Review Committee recommended that all service and support functions be reviewed to assure that these areas provide optimal services and operate as efficiently as possible. Finally, Vice President Walker sought a more formal assessment, which would involve perspectives from the academic community as well as external to the university, from the private sector. Thus, the Division of Human Resources initiated this self-assessment project in October, 2009, designed to identify current strengths and improvement needs, and to provide a baseline for continuous improvement.

Three consultants were hired to lead this self-assessment process. Dr. Cathy DuBois served as the internal consultant. She is an Associate Professor in the College of Business Administration at KSU and teaches courses in human resource management. Dr. Frank Kunstel was selected as the external consultant. He has over 30 years experience in human resources in the private sector. Dr. David DuBois, an industrial/organizational psychologist was added to the team to provide project support.

The assessment has been a collaborative project. The HR staff produced extensive documents to describe the scope of responsibilities, processes, workflows, and policies and practices of each HR function. The HR staff facilitated the implementation of the customer survey, and also researched comparative cost and productivity data.

Assessment results are reported in four sections. Section 1 reflects an internal analysis of the Division of Human Resources's processes and practices. Section 2 reflects the customers' perspective of the Division of Human Resources. Section 3 compares KSU HR metrics to those from similar HR functions in other organizations. Section 4 sets forth the summative observations and recommendations from the consultants.

The Domains of HR: A Framework for Interpreting Study Results

It is important to specify the scope and boundary conditions of this evaluation study. As a profession, the human resources function involves developing people and organizations. In this sense, it is pervasive throughout the organization, and ranges from managing the hiring, training, and compensation of talent; to supporting managers in leading their units and managing their people; to partnering with senior management to align units and people with organizational strategy, and to manage the organizational culture. SHRM, the professional society of human resource managers, frames the role of HR in this manner:

"The success of an organization is directly influenced by the actions of its HR professionals.
- HR directs the recruitment, training, career development and retention of an organization's most important asset — it's people.
- HR aligns people strategies with business goals.

- HR takes an active role to shape corporate strategy and keep their organizations competitive in the global marketplace.
- HR anticipates challenges and creates innovative solutions, so organizations can tactically execute plans, increase the bottom line and achieve success.[1]"

At Kent State, as at any organization, there are four distinct but related aspects of HR that are vital to organizational effectiveness and that are relevant to this study. These include:

1. the effectiveness of Human Resources in performing its normal functions (i.e., talent acquisition, benefits, employee relations, etc.);
2. the effectiveness of the partnership of Human Resources with line managers in managing people;
3. the effectiveness of the HR policies and practices for which Human Resources staff serve as stewards, but which are developed by senior administration, the Board of Trustees, and the law;
4. the effectiveness of the partnership of Human Resources with executive leadership in the development of organizational capabilities and culture, for which HR can play a transformational role if so supported by executive leadership.

The focus of this report is on the first of these—an examination of the goals, processes, and outcomes of the functional areas within the Division of Human Resources, because that is what we were tasked to do. However, because all four aspects of HR are intertwined with one another, some of the information that came forth in our review process shed light on the other three aspects of HR. Thus, although no data were gathered for the purpose of evaluating the effectiveness of HR's partnership with line management, HR policies or executive leadership, we do point out in this report where our data spoke to those aspects. A thorough understanding of these aspects of HR does merit investigation with appropriately targeted data collection. When reading this report, we recommend that the reader be cognizant of these four circles of influence within the Human Resource domain.

"They have helped me in many ways over the years and I'd like to thank them for their professionalism and personal attention to the different concerns I've had. KSU is well served by this professional department!"
> Employee comment from the 2010 Human Resources Effectiveness Survey.

---

[1] From Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM) website at: http://www.shrm.org/AboutHR/Pages/default.aspx, 2010.

Section 1: The Perspective from within the Human Resources Function

Procedure

The initial phase of the HR assessment was an audit of the division's operations and processes. The primary vehicle for this was a manual created by John H. McConnell, who enlisted the help of an advisory board of senior HR professionals to develop a comprehensive array of audit questions that would apply to a wide variety of organizations. This guide was published by the AMACOM. Several steps comprised this phase:

1. The Division of Human Resources completed the questions in the AMACOM guide. For each HR function there were 25-60 questions for the staff to answer. These questions addressed whether the function performed the operations that a well-functioning Division of Human Resources would typically perform. The questions for the most part were matters of fact rather than of opinion. For example, a typical question was, "Has the HR organization structure been communicated to all employees in the Division of Human Resources?" Or, "Do employees receive descriptions of the organization's compensation program at the time of hire?"

2. The HR staff produced documents to provide more detailed information about the operations and processes, such as process flow charts, relevant policies, workflow narratives, job descriptions, and job standards. Approximately 170 such documents were provided for this audit.

3. The consultants then interviewed staff members of each HR function to test the validity of the responses they gave to the AMACOM guide, to explore how the process flow charts and other documents were used, and to determine to what degree staff members were knowledgeable about the processes.

4. The consultants also separately reviewed a sample of the key processes to determine if they were appropriate—both thorough and efficient.

Findings

1. The operations performed by the Division of Human Resources are consistent with the guidelines of the AMACOM audit document. Further, the operations are consistent with those of high-quality HR functions, in the experience of the consultants. The Division of Human Resources does what it should be doing.

2. The HR staff appears to be knowledgeable and professional in their understanding of what a good Division of Human Resources should do. They are quite competent at describing their roles and responsibilities, at explaining their processes, and at articulating how they fit into the larger picture of the university.

3. HR Organization Structure and Scope

   – The Division of Human Resources has a scope of responsibilities and tasks that are consistent with effective HR functions.

   – The HR mission and strategy appear to be aligned with the university's mission and strategy.

   – HR staff are aware of the existence of the division mission and strategy. Some of them can describe it and others cannot. We also noted that many staff members lack knowledge of the "business/enterprise basics" of the university that an HR staff might be expected to know. For example, although all recognize that state funding is decreasing, the HR staff who were asked did not know basics such as what percent of the university's revenues come from state funding or how much it has recently changed.

   – The structure of the division is based on individual functions that tend to operate independently. The process flow charts indicate that teamwork between functions within HR is identified and implemented appropriately for this kind of structure. In addition, in our interviews it was clear that staff members involve each other as needed on an ad hoc basis. However, the nature of the structure does not readily facilitate cross-functional collaboration.

   – A management succession plan is under development, which needs to be supported by a management development program. There appears to be no comprehensive human resources planning process that would guide the long-term procurement and development of the university's human resources. We believe it is imperative that management succession planning and development are implemented. For example, when a staff member is promoted into a management position the learning curve is steep. This often exacts a toll on the performance of the new manager, as well as the performance of subordinates who might receive inadequate performance direction or support while the new manager builds skills. These performance gaps can be minimized through appropriate proactive planning and development.

   – The development of human resources employees is fostered through professional association memberships, professional training, and developmental activities.

4. HR Functions

   a. Benefits

      – The Benefits policies and procedures are thorough and consistent with good HR practice.

      – The process flow charts and workflow narratives indicate good HR practice. Benefits is a transaction-oriented function, so thorough processes and attention to detail are critical.

- There were no performance standards provided for Benefits staff. Development of these should be considered, including an elapsed time standard for response to manager and employee inquiries as this is indicated as a primary concern in the employee survey (discussed in the next section).

- Line managers often come to Benefits staff with questions. It would be useful for line managers to have a fundamental understanding of all benefits so they can answer a number of first line questions from employees. This information is available to managers from the HR function, but line managers don't attend to it sufficiently.

- It is our understanding that the Division of Human Resources is in the process of developing a proposal for a heath/wellness and disease management program. We support this because it's both a valued benefit to employees and a productivity and cost management benefit to the university.

"The benefits staff does a fantastic job! They are always busy and yet provide quality customer service on an individual basis."

"Our benefits package is GREAT.....thank you."
Employee comments from the 2010 Human Resources Effectiveness Survey.

b. Compensation

- The policies and practices of this function are consistent with good HR practice.

- The process flow charts and workflow narratives for the most part also indicate good HR practice; a few areas could use a more detailed breakout of steps taken.

- The process flow chart for <u>Annual Salary Increase</u> contains a step that says, "Gather information to propose the new fiscal year's across the board increase and salary structure change and model changes for cost impact." This is a complex and sophisticated series of steps and perhaps it would be more useful to break out several of these steps to specify in more detail what is involved. The same holds for several others of the flow charts, such as the <u>Job Description</u> chart.

- The performance standards for the Compensation function do include some time measurements. But there is no elapsed-time standard, which is important since the employee survey indicated a need to improve on the time it takes to get a position re-classified.

"Compensation and benefits staff and responsiveness to inquiries are outstanding!"
Employee comment from the 2010 Human Resources Effectiveness Survey.

c. Employee Relations

   – The policies and practices in this function are consistent with good HR practice.

   – The process flow charts and workflow narratives are detailed and thorough, and consistent with good HR practice.

   – The performance standards are time-bound and measurable.

   – Although data regarding the reason employees leave the university are collected, it is limited to categorical data. An online system for collecting more detailed exit interview data is being developed. We highly recommend implementing this system and systematically using the data it provides.

   – Although the KSU turnover rate is low, would be useful to examine who is leaving, with respect to performance and talent. If turnover is occurring among high potential talent, measures should be taken to retain these employees.

   – Listening posts were held in the past, and were very useful. There is a desire to reinstate them, which appears to be a good idea.

   – We believe that the scope of responsibility for this position is too broad for one person to be effective. Many of these responsibilities are direct HR support to managers and employees. Clearly, there's a perception among employees that there isn't enough of that kind of support being delivered. Survey results reported later in this paper support this observation.

   – There is a mal-distribution of performance ratings and merit increases in the performance appraisal system. We address this in item #5 below, and in the Recommendations section of this report.

d. EEO/Affirmative Action

   – The policies and practices in this function are consistent with good HR practice and with legal requirements. EEO/AA is heavily compliance-related and knowledge of all the regulations is imperative for this function.

   – The process flow charts and workflow narratives are consistent with good HR practice.

   – The performance standards for this function include due dates and elapsed-time measures. We did not ask for results of performance to standard and suggest that the function monitor its performance since the employee survey indicated that employees perceive a lack of timeliness on complaints and issues.

e. Labor Relations

- The processes and policies of this function are as expected in a well functioning labor relations function.

- The process flow charts and workflow narratives are consistent with good HR practice.

- The performance standards for the function are clear and comprehensive. They lack elapsed-time measurements, though we assume that some of these are dictated in the union contract.

- There appear to be difficulties inserted into the union-management relationship by current union leadership. Union stewards and officers have attendance and discipline issues, and the union president encourages union member grievance activity. Labor relations employees are attempting to establish more functional relationships with new union members and fair share employees. An opportunity to improve worker relations might be found through supervisor training, with a focus on the prevention of supervisor-worker issues.

f. Records

- The practices and policies of this function meet the requirements for an effective records function. Security and privacy of information appear to be properly protected.

- The process flow charts and workflow narratives are consistent with good HR practice.

- Some of the employee statistics that are indicated as compiled are not regularly produced and utilized, and were not available to consultants when discussing the AMACOM information. For example, there is no regular reporting of turnover. Voluntary and Involuntary turnover are indicators of performance management and could be useful in creating the organization culture the university desires. We see the lack of this report not as a failure of the Division of Human Resources but as a lack of interest by managers in this measurement as a management tool. (Note that such statistics were later calculated and provided to consultants for benchmarking purposes, as discussed in subsequent sections of this report.)

- We did not find any performance standards for this function.

- The Banner system has provided many challenges in reporting, in that many reports are cumbersome to create and require the support of Information Systems employees. The HR staff are to be commended in taking a very positive attitude in this transition to the Banner system. Rather than complain about lack of

functionality, they have chosen to focus on the positive, and readily speak about those areas where there is added functionality.

g. Talent Acquisition

   – The policies and procedures in this function are consistent with good HR practices.

   – The process flow chart and workflow narratives indicate good HR practice.

   – Information on the quantitative productivity (number of applicants) of recruiting sources and processes is currently collected, but not the qualitative productivity (e.g., which sources produce high performing employees). Such information could be used to more effectively target high potential talent.

   – The performance standards for the recruiters and the administrative staff are specific and thorough. They do not include elapsed-time standards, which should be considered. This is especially important since the employee results indicated that employees perceive that it takes too long to fill open positions.

h. Training and Development

   – The policies and practices of this function reflect good HR practice.

   – The process flow charts and workflow narratives demonstrate good HR practice.

   – Some of the performance standards are time-bound, but others are not. In one case, for example, progress toward milestones is required, but meeting the milestones is not mentioned.

   – Currently there is little opportunity to do training transfer-related evaluation by following up on behavior change and corresponding organizational results. The training function appreciates the potential value of such evaluation. Line managers should be more closely involved in training transfer evaluation, but they are likely to invest time in this only if they are held accountable to do so by their managers.

"The Training Staff seems to be a perfect example of teamwork and appears to genuinely support the personal development of KSU's employees."
Employee comment from the 2010 Human Resources Effectiveness Survey.

5. There appears to be a missed opportunity for the university to leverage performance management to support the goal of high-performance to which it aspires.

–   The distribution of performance appraisal ratings is heavily skewed toward above-average ratings. A normal distribution of ratings would be what the Division of Human Resources recommends to managers throughout the university, but the actual results do not comport with the recommendations. For example, the recommended percentage of employees who receive a "1" or "2" rating (both indicate that the employee "Exceeds Expectations") is 15%, but the actual percentage assigned by managers is nearly 60%.

–   This distribution then drives the merit increase. Because the merit budget is controlled to a specified number (as it should be), managers are not able to reward high performance with high merit increases. The difference in merit increase between an employee who is Outstanding and one who Meets Expectations is less than 1% of pay. Truly outstanding performers are rewarded with neither a meaningful appraisal rating nor a meaningful pay increase.

–   It appears that turnover is not tracked by most managers as a meaningful statistic to help manage performance, as reports are not created, requested or used on a regular basis. Involuntary turnover is a measure of the degree to which managers are identifying and taking action to remove poor performers. The involuntary turnover rate (which is reported in Table 11 in section three of this report) for the university is quite low.

–   It should be emphasized that performance management is not the sole province of the Division of Human Resources. The entire management system needs to share a common vision of how performance management should be carried out, and should hold itself accountable for achieving it. HR can be a leader in this, but not the leader.

6. The Division of Human Resources has a "transactional" role rather than a "transformational" role within the university. This appears to be due to historical and current expectations for the division.

–   "Transactional" HR focuses on traditional personnel functions such as recruiting, compensation, benefits, labor relations, employee relations, and training.

–   "Transformational" HR includes traditional functions but also has a focus on how to help the entire organization develop and become more effective. This would include functions such as goal alignment of all divisions/departments with the goals of the organization, leadership development, team-building, intra- and inter-division/department collaboration, performance management, and conflict management. The terms "culture management" and "organization development" are often used to describe transformational HR. [2]

–   The Division of Human Resources fundamentally performs its transactional role well, with the usual stipulation that some areas need to improve. The Division of Human Resources has not been tasked with a transformational role, or given the resources it would need to

---

[2] Ulrich, D. (2007). The new HR organization. *Workforce Management*, *86*(21),40-44.

14

function at this level. This is a decision for the executive management of the university. The opportunity exists for the Division of Human Resources to become an even more valuable function for the university, if such is desired. We believe that many of the current HR staff members have the skills to work in such a role.

Section 2: The Perspective from Internal Customers

The next step of the assessment study focused on gathering the views of the internal customers of HR. For this, the HR managers and staff in collaboration with the Associate Vice President for HR and the consultants, developed an online survey to gather the opinions and comments of KSU's entire workforce.

Methods

The survey was developed in late November 2009. An initial set of questions was written by HR managers and directors and submitted to the consultants for review. The survey went through multiple iterations as consultants and HR managers/directors worked together to refine the questions. The consultants pilot tested the survey by giving it to 12 individuals on campus. These included two faculty members, a manager, and staff members in Undergraduate Studies, the College of Business Administration, Intercollegiate Athletics, Food Service, Housekeeping, Flashcard Office, Residence Services and the Bursar's Office. Comments from these individuals were used to revise the survey, which was then put into the Banner system by the Division of Human Resources with the assistance of Information Services.

The final version of the survey consisted of 63 statements that respondents could rate on a scale of 1 to 5, which were coded for data analyses to concur with the following scale[3]:
> 1 - Strongly Agree
> 2 - Agree
> 3 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
> 4 - Disagree
> 5 - Strongly Disagree.

The above coding scheme was used throughout this report. Thus, when interpreting the means displayed in the tables, _lower numbers_ represent _more favorable_ ratings, and *higher numbers represent less favorable ratings*.

On the instructions page at the beginning of the survey, participants received the instruction "If you think you do not have the information needed to respond meaningfully to a statement, skip the statement by selecting the 'Next Question' button." In addition to the survey statement ratings, an open ended response question was provided. It read: "Please state briefly any feedback you have for the Human Resources Division that has not been addressed in the previous statements."

Content. The survey had two sections of statements. The first 44 statements comprise the 'personal service' section; these statements address services that individual employees receive from the Division of Human Resources. The remaining 19 statements comprise the 'manager only' section; these statements address services that managers receive from HR staff when dealing with matters concerning their employees. The survey statements address the accessibility of HR staff, and the

---

[3] When originally presented in the survey, the scale was the reverse, with 1 representing "Strongly Disagree". The Information Systems Department delivered the dataset to the consultants with a recoding of the data, which was subsequently used for this report.

effectiveness and timeliness of the services offered. In the personal service section of the survey, a set of 11 survey statements addressed the overall functioning of the Division of Human Resources; the remaining 33 statements specifically addressed services in each area of HR (Affirmative Action, Benefits, Compensation, Employee Relations, Labor Relations, Records, Talent Acquisition, and Training and Development). A complete list of survey statements is presented in Appendix A.

Procedure. The survey was administered online via the Banner system, and was available to employees from December 3 through January 2, 2010. The survey was offered to 6,079 members of the Kent State University community, which includes all campuses, who are in an 'active community role' as designated in the Flashline system. It was publicized via a Flashline message from Vice President Willis Walker sent to university community members on December 3, with a follow-up message sent on December 18, 2009. A total of 950 employees accessed the survey, and 776 completed the survey, for a response rate of 12.8%.

Analyses. The consultants analyzed the survey responses from a variety of perspectives to facilitate interpretation of the data. Response means by groupings of customers and by area of HR were also calculated, both at the survey statement level and at the scale level (i.e., groups of related statements). Specific analyses were also completed to facilitate comparisons between Kent campus and Regional campus employees; and faculty, staff, and manager groups; as well as a breakout of mean responses for AFSCME employees.

Prior to analyses the data were screened for inappropriate response patterns. For example, some respondents completed the 'managers only' section, although they were not managers. These inappropriate responses were removed from the data set prior to analysis. Also, despite the instruction that preceded the Labor Relations questions, "The following three statements pertain to AFSCME Bargaining Unit only," hundreds of participants answered the Labor Relations questions. Although their responses were most likely based upon vague impressions, we chose to report them because they are compared with those of AFSCME employees in a table below.

The data screening process also revealed that some participants had inappropriately rated statements as '3' when they should have skipped the question. This finding is based both on an examination of response patterns and on written comments provided by participants in the open ended section. These inappropriate responses were not removed because we could not accurately determine when these responses were inappropriate. Leaving these responses alone has two effects on the data presented. First, it has <u>no</u> effect on the rank ordering of means presented in the results, because the 3 rating is in the middle of the scale. Second, it regresses scores to the median value of 3, making positive ratings appear less favorable (i.e., underestimating the true levels of effectiveness) and negative ratings less unfavorable.

Results

Corresponding to the survey, the results are presented in two parts, one for the survey ratings ('Quantitative Results'), and one for the content analyses of the open ended survey feedback ('Qualitative Results'). The presentations of results are followed by a discussion of these findings. Results detailed by individual survey statement and by HR Area are reported in Appendices B and C, respectively.

Quantitative Results.

The following tables display survey results from a variety of perspectives to support interpretation of participant responses. The survey responses from the 19 participants who work in the Division of Human Resources were excluded from the following analyses so that the numbers reflect how constituents outside the Division of Human Resources evaluate HR services. Thus, the results below reflect a total sample size of 757.

Table 1 displays the results for the whole sample (without Division of Human Resources participants, as noted above). The overall mean is 2.69, which reflects the mean across all 63 survey statements and all 757 participants. This result is between Agree (Agree = 2) and Neither Agree nor Disagree (Neither Agree nor Disagree = 3), which is consistent with the observations in Section 1, indicating a generally positive response to a generally effective Division of Human Resources. The mean for the manager only section was just slightly less favorable than the mean for the personal service section.

The results for each HR area represent the mean for each group of statements that address each HR Area. For example, there are 7 survey items related to Benefits; the mean rating across those 7 items for all survey participants is 2.45. The number of survey statements for each HR area is listed in parentheses next to the area. Note that the 11 statements that reflect HR in general are reported below those of the areas. Results are presented in descending order, from most favorable to least favorable mean ratings.

Table 1. Whole Sample Survey Results

Section / Area	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Respondents
Overall			
All Statements, All Respondents	2.69	.56	757
Survey Section			
Personal Service Statements	2.69	.56	757
Manager Only Statements	2.71	.61	169
By HR Area			
Benefits (7)	2.45	.68	756
Records (3)	2.65	.72	695
Training & Development (3)	2.72	.86	741
Talent Acquisition (3)	2.75	.69	743
Affirmative Action (4)	2.79	.60	703
Compensation (6)	2.81	.68	732

Employee Relations (4)	2.87	.72	724
Labor Relations (3)	2.99	.59	435
HR General Statements (11)	2.65	.71	739

Table 2 reports survey results presented by customer group. The overall mean here represents the average rating across all survey statements for the respondents from each customer group. The 'HR General Statements Mean' column reports the average rating for the 11 survey statements assessing overall HR performance. Again the ratings are organized from most favorable to least favorable score, indicating that Institutional Advancement is the most satisfied customer of HR services, and Business and Finance is its least appreciative customer (yet who also has an overall positive evaluation of HR). Note that the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion division is not represented in this table because there was only 1 participant from this division.

Table 2. Survey Results by Customer Group

Customer Group	Overall Mean	HR General Statements Mean	Number of Respondents
Institutional Advancement	2.54	2.33	19
Information Services	2.54	2.51	35
University Relations & Development	2.62	2.60	16
Vice Provost, Regional Campuses	2.63	2.59	106
Enrollment Management & Student Affairs	2.67	2.62	97
Office of the Provost	2.68	2.65	365
Office of the President	2.81	2.85	14
Business & Finance	2.91	2.85	104

To examine this in more detail, Table 3 shows the mean ratings for each customer group along with the break-out of mean ratings for each HR area. Based on Tables 1 and 2, we find what we expect here. For example, the same pattern of results is found for both the most and least satisfied customers—the Benefits area receives the highest rating and the Labor Relations area receives the least favorable rating. Note that the Division of Human Resources is not listed in either Table 2 or Table 3; their results appear in Table 4.

Table 3. Survey Results by HR Area within Customer Group

Customer Group	Overall Mean	Survey Statement Means by HR Area							
		Benefits	Records	Training & Development	Talent Acquisition	Affirmative Action	Compensation	Employee Relations	Labor Relations
Institutional Advancement	**2.54**	2.25	2.63	2.47	2.75	2.61	2.59	2.59	2.91
Information Services	**2.54**	2.18	2.45	2.39	2.52	2.59	2.85	2.80	3.00
University Relations & Development	**2.62**	2.35	2.60	2.98	2.94	2.61	2.71	2.78	3.00
Vice Provost, Regional Campuses	**2.63**	2.33	2.60	2.66	2.84	2.67	2.76	2.85	2.86
Enrollment Management & Student Affairs	**2.67**	2.54	2.62	2.61	2.61	2.72	2.73	2.84	3.15
Office of the Provost	**2.68**	2.47	2.63	2.76	2.71	2.83	2.76	2.84	2.88
Office of the President	**2.81**	2.39	3.00	2.88	2.73	2.88	3.11	2.78	3.00
Business & Finance	**2.91**	2.59	2.83	2.87	2.95	3.00	3.11	3.13	3.28
Overall Mean by HR Area	**2.69**	**2.45**	**2.65**	**2.72**	**2.75**	**2.79**	**2.81**	**2.87**	**2.99**

Note. This table is also organized both top to bottom, and left to right based on score rankings using the overall means – first column and last row. This further elaborates the relative strengths of the HR function.

Table 4 compares the mean ratings of survey participants from the Division of Human Resources with the mean ratings of the remainder of survey participants, who comprise the internal customers of the Division of Human Resources. The results show that HR employees consistently view their performance as more effective than do their customers. However, it's important to note that the level of this discrepancy is likely a smaller effect than shown, due to the previously mentioned artifact from some unknown number of respondents who rated statements as "3" (Neither Agree nor Disagree) when they should have skipped the item. Still, the finding is a notable one that bears attention by the Division of Human Resources.

Table 4. Survey Results Comparing HR vs. Customer Views

Section / HR Area	HR		Customers	
	Mean	N	Mean	N
Overall				
All Statements, All Respondents	1.84	19	2.69	757
Survey Section				
Personal Service Statements	1.84	19	2.69	757
Manager Only Statements	1.70	8	2.71	169
By HR Area				
Affirmative Action	2.33	18	2.79	703
Benefits	1.85	19	2.45	756
Compensation	1.75	18	2.81	732
Employee Relations	1.85	18	2.87	724
Labor Relations	2.04	9	2.99	435
Records	2.09	19	2.65	695
Talent Acquisition	2.08	19	2.75	743
Training & Development	1.70	19	2.72	741
HR General Statements	1.68	19	2.65	739

Table 5 displays mean ratings from a different organization of customer perspectives — by faculty, staff, and manager customer groups. Note that the mean rating from managers is the most favorable of the three groups.

Table 5. Survey Results by Job Type

Job Type Customer Groups	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Respondents
Managers	2.65	.50	232
Staff	2.69	.55	386
Faculty	2.76	.65	144

Table 6 compares the ratings of employees at the Kent campus with those of employees at the Regional campuses. The overall means are about the same, with the ratings by HR area alternating between being more and less positive.

Table 6. Survey Results Comparing Kent Campus and Regional Campus Views

Section / HR Area	Kent Campus		Regional Campuses	
	Mean	N	Mean	N
Overall				
All Statements, All Respondents	2.69	596	2.68	161
Survey Section				
Personal Service Statements	2.69	596	2.68	161
Manager Only Statements	2.72	140	2.66	29
By HR Area				
Affirmative Action	2.81	550	2.74	153
Benefits	2.46	595	2.41	161
Compensation	2.82	573	2.77	159
Employee Relations	2.87	569	2.88	155
Labor Relations	3.04	342	2.79	93
Records	2.65	546	2.63	149
Talent Acquisition	2.71	582	2.87	161
Training & Development	2.71	581	2.76	160
HR General Statements	2.66	582	2.65	157

Table 7 displays mean ratings for each campus in the KSU campus system. The most favorable ratings were given by participants at the Ashtabula campus, and the least favorable ratings were given by participants at the East Liverpool campus.

Table 7. Survey Results by Campus

Campus	Mean	Standard Deviation	Number of Respondents
Kent	2.69	0.56	596
Ashtabula	2.55	0.44	20
Trumbull	2.60	0.56	19
Geauga	2.62	0.54	21
Salem	2.62	0.35	14
Stark	2.69	0.66	42
Tuscarawas	2.77	0.36	23
East Liverpool	2.86	0.6	22

"I truly appreciate benefits staff visiting regional campuses to share information such as that for benefits enrollment."

"I work at one of the non-Kent campuses. HR is almost invisible here."

Employee comments from the 2010 Human Resources Effectiveness Survey.

Table 8 compares the mean ratings of AFSCME employees to the mean ratings of all other employees. The results indicate that AFSCME employees consistently rated the effectiveness of the HR function less favorably than did other employees, across all areas of HR.

Table 8. Survey Results Comparing AFSCME to Other Employees

HR Area	AFSCME Mean	AFSCME N	Others Mean	Others N
Overall				
All items, all respondents	3.27	40	2.66	717
By HR Area				
Benefits	2.81	40	2.43	716
Records	3.05	38	2.63	657
Affirmative Action	3.15	38	2.77	665
Talent Acquisition	3.23	39	2.72	704
Training & Development	3.43	40	2.68	701
Compensation	3.58	39	2.77	693
Employee Relations	3.64	39	2.82	685
Labor Relations	3.77	37	2.91	398
HR General items	3.2	40	2.62	699

Qualitative Results.

The survey also provided an option for participants to write comments and share concerns. As noted earlier, this question was phrased as, "Please state briefly any feedback you have for the Human Resources Division that has not been addressed in the previous statements."

This section of the survey provided a rich source of customer information, with 252 of the 776 participants (32%) providing 288 comments (some commented on more than one aspect of HR). One consultant performed a content analysis of this data, rating each comment for its target (i.e., which area of HR), tone (i.e., positive, neutral, or negative), and content (e.g., recognition, timeliness, website, etc.). The results of that process are displayed in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9 displays the numbers of comments by comment type and tone, and Table 10 further delineates them by HR area. The most frequent type of positive comment consisted of notes to recognize or appreciate some area, aspect, or individual in HR for the quality of services and assistance provided.   Thirty three (33) of the comments provided suggestions for improving services, and were neutral in tone. The survey participants provided 163 comments that reported concerns or service deficiencies in one or more areas of HR. The most frequent of these comments (56) involved the timeliness of services rendered. For example, Table 10 displays that 19 respondents reported long delays in response to inquiries to the Benefits area of HR. Even while reporting issues or

concerns, many of the respondents also noted that HR staff appeared competent and helpful, but they were simply too understaffed to serve their needs in a timely way.

Table 9. Content Analysis of Qualitative Survey Data

Comment Type	Total Comments	Tone		
		Positive	Neutral	Negative
Appreciation	58	58		
Timeliness	57		1	56
Effectiveness	43		2	41
Fairness	30			30
Suggestions	23	1	19	3
Website	22	1	4	17
Awareness	18		7	11
Dental	5			5
Total	**256**	**60**	**33**	**163**

"My feeling is that Human Resources is staffed by dedicated hard-working people who need more staff."

"The HR website has all of the pertinent information an employee needs and a manager needs, but it is difficult to navigate and the format is cumbersome."

Employee comments from the 2010 Human Resources Effectiveness Survey.

Table 10. Content Analysis of Qualitative Survey Data by HR Area

HR Area	Total Comments		Appreciation	Timeliness	Effectiveness	Fairness	Suggestions	Website	Awareness	Dental
			Type of Comment							
HR General	136		31	25	25	10	10	21	14	
Benefits	47		12	19	6		3		2	5
Talent Acquisition	19		3	6	3	3	2	1	1	
Training & Development	18		10		2		6			
Compensation	17		1	4	5	6	1			
Employee Relations	7		1		1	5				
Labor Relations	6			1	1	3			1	
Affirmative Action	5			1		3	1			
Records	1			1						
Total	**256**		**58**	**57**	**43**	**30**	**23**	**22**	**18**	**5**

Findings

1. Strengths

    – The overall survey results are consistent with the findings of the HR audit reviewed in Section 1 of this report – they reflect the performance of a competent, efficient, and dedicated staff. The numerous favorable comments on the division and individual staff members exceed expectations, and serve to underscore the strength of the goodwill acquired with internal customers through the ongoing effectiveness and engagement of the staff. It's clear that the core strength of HR is the professionalism of its staff.

    – The other leading strength of HR is the benefits program, both the options and the services provided. These core strengths appear to represent the heart of the division, and are the foundations upon which further improvements can be made.

    – Across employment groups, the ratings assigned by managers reflect the most favorable mean, followed by staff and faculty, respectively. This pattern reflects how much interaction employees in these groups have with HR employees, for managers have the highest need to use HR services and faculty have the lowest need. Thus, these numbers also demonstrate that HR staff are competent at what they do.

2. While overall the HR staff are seen as competent, the survey results also represent an alternate reality for a noteworthy number of employees. Some employees see the HR staff as being unavailable, unwilling to return messages, and untimely in their response. We suspect this is due to the fact that many employees only have one or two contacts with HR in a year. If those contacts are not productive, then the employee's perception is overall a negative one. While it is impossible to please everyone, the number of negative responses and comments is large enough to warrant follow up and work on this by the Division of Human Resources. Half of the concerns expressed in the written feedback referenced the related issues of timeliness and effectiveness, with most of these focused on accessibility and follow-up with customer issues. Such limitations to HR effectiveness are possibly due to some combination of understaffing and the lack of a system to track customer contacts.

3. Customer group:

    – The relative 'hot spots' by customer group include the Office of the President (which includes Intercollegiate Athletics) and the Business and Finance Division, with the key HR areas of concern involving Labor Relations, Employee Relations, and Compensation. Some follow-up appears merited, both internally within HR and with representatives of these customer groups. It should be noted that HR does not set compensation rates for Intercollegiate Athletics, which survey participants from Athletics might not have been aware.

    – A related issue to this is the lack of employee awareness of the scope of the services and mission offered by HR. Underlying both issues is the lack of a customer service representative who can effectively represent the division across all areas to customers.

These concerns suggest the usefulness of adding HR Generalists to the staff to serve as full service customer representatives, and to provide greater visibility to HR services.

4. The issue of fairness cut across most HR areas and addressed various issues with inconsistent policies and/or implementation, with some reporting that HR staff prejudges their concerns before listening and gathering complete information. The consultants suggest that perhaps one area of concern here is the conflict inherent in the organizational structure when HR representatives serve as employee ombudsmen, while reporting indirectly to the Vice President for Human Resources, who is also the Chief University Counsel, who represents management. It is likely that this structural conflict will need to be addressed before progress in employee perceptions of fairness can be improved.

5. The single most favorably rated statement in the survey concerns benefits, whereas the least favorably rated statement involves compensation. Despite the gap between perceptions of these two aspects of total compensation, low turnover rates suggest that total compensation satisfaction is sufficiently high to attract and retain employees. Given the positive rating for benefits, this provides an opportunity to market total compensation as a strategy for improving compensation perceptions. However, dissatisfaction with compensation is important because perceptions of inadequate pay can negatively impact performance and employee morale. Both the adequacy and perceived equity of KSU compensation rates merit further investigation, particularly within customer groups where ratings were least favorable.

6. The usefulness of the HR website was among the more positively rated statements in the survey, while its user friendliness was among the more frequently cited complaints. HR has three websites: the basic HR home page located on the KSU website and the online Jobs site, both of which are open to public viewing, and the 'My HR' and 'My Action Items' tabs in Flashline. HR has limited control over the Flashline pages, as those are part of the Banner system, but it's important that HR realize that employees see this as the HR website.

   Given that the website, along with direct contact with the Benefits area, is the most common point of contact between HR and its customers, it may be worthwhile to ensure that this resource is developed to its fullest. This is especially useful, considering that a well functioning, easy to use website may substantially reduce demands on employee time by providing effective self service opportunities. Investigating the incorporation of new wiki and other technological enhancements that can improve employee utilization of the website is warranted, as is the use of focus groups to determine and address what employees struggle with on the Flashline pages.

7. Labor Relations received the least favorable mean rating of all HR functions, and mean ratings of AFSCME employees were considerably worse than were the ratings of the remaining participants. Although poor union-management relations are commonplace in the United States, many organizations have created positive union-management relations. Because union-management animosity undercuts performance, steps should be taken to understand the factors that underlie these relationships, and what can be done to improve them.

Section 3: The Peer Organization/Market Perspective

To determine how the KSU Division of Human Resources operates in comparison to Division of Human Resources in other organizations, metrics from three external surveys were used.

1. PriceWaterhouseCooper Saratoga Institute Survey (PWC)
    This database includes metrics for more than 300 organizations, representing 12 industry sectors, which provided information from the 2007 calendar year. The average company in the report has annual revenue of $5.7 billion and roughly 17,000 employees. While many participating clients are global companies, results included in the report refer only to US operations. Results represent the all-industry medians, which are the midpoint values for all organizations in PWC Saratoga's database. Because PWC does not provide permissions to print their metrics in our report, they do not appear in the tables below. We are allowed only to reference their metrics loosely in our comments.

2. College and University Professional Association (CUPA)
    CUPA-HR's HR Benchmarking and Workforce Planning Survey for 2009 contains results from over 200 institutions. For this HR evaluation project, the Division of Human Resources selected a subset of data which contained the responses of Doctoral extensive public universities nationwide.

3. Society for Human Resources Management Benchmarking Report (SHRM)
    This is the leading HR professional association in the United States. The data provided by SHRM came from two sources:
    – SHRM's 2009 Customized Healthcare Benchmarking Report, which covers all industries with 1,000 FTE's or more;
    – SHRM's 2009 Customized Human Capital Benchmarking Report, which covers Higher Education organizations with more than 1,000 FTE's.

One must always be cautious in using this kind of survey data for comparisons. Often the participating organizations are significantly different from the target organization in terms of size, nature of the enterprise, mission and role of HR and other variables. Nevertheless, comparison data based on either large samples or on specific variables can be helpful. It should also be noted that the KSU data were provided by the Division of Human Resources and are un-audited, as this is intended to be a self-assessment. For all KSU metrics, the Division used data from Calendar Year 2009 (1/1/2009 through 12/31/2009) and for snapshot data, the Division used data from November 1, 2009.

Table 11. General HR Metrics

SURVEY	METRIC	RESULT	KSU RESULT
SHRM	HR expense to FTE Ratio	$832	$795.26
CUPA	Ratio of Employee FTE to HR FTE	251.3	135

SURVEY	METRIC		RESULT	KSU RESULT
SHRM	Ratio of HR FTEs to Employee FTE x 100		.97	.74
CUPA	Turnover rate			
		Executives	8.7%	17.6%
		Exempt	7.2%	9.4%
		Nonexempt	8.5%	8.0%
CUPA	Voluntary rate			
		Executives	90.6%	100%
		Exempt	80.8%	83.9%
		Nonexempt	77.1%	89.3%
SHRM	Annual Turnover rate		23%	7.12%
	Voluntary Turnover rate		21%	6.25%
	Involuntary Turnover rate		13%	.87%

1. Compared to the private sector (for which some specific numbers cannot be reported), KSU HR is more productive in terms of cost per employee and in terms of the number of HR staff used to service the organization.

2. Compared to other Doctoral extensive public universities, Kent HR uses more HR staff to service the organization. However, we feel strongly that the CUPA statistic of 251.3 is problematic. One reason for this is because in all of the following tables for each function, CUPA reports more HR employees for the function than KSU reports. It is inconsistent that KSU has fewer employees in each function at the same time that their overall staffing ratio is higher. Thus, this comparison should be viewed with much skepticism.

3. Compared to the private sector, KSU has lower over-all turnover and extremely low involuntary turnover (subtracting Voluntary turnover from Total turnover). Compared to other Doctoral extensive public universities, KSU has about the same total turnover and slightly lower involuntary turnover. This Involuntary turnover rate is a significant indicator in terms of the university's performance management culture and is discussed elsewhere in this report.

Table 12. Talent Acquisition Metrics

SURVEY	METRIC		RESULT	KSU RESULT
CUPA	Time to fill vacant positions			
		Executives	106 days	145 days
		Exempt	77	47
		Nonexempt	53	61
SHRM	Time to fill		34 days	52 days
CUPA	Total FTE in Staffing/Recruiting		8.94	5.33
CUPA	Total number positions filled		678	308
CUPA	Ratio of Staff Hires to Recruiting Staff		75.8	54.4

CUPA	Ratio of Faculty Hires to Recruiting Staff	34.6	62.5

1. Compared to the private sector (for which some specific numbers cannot be reported), KSU HR takes only slightly longer to fill vacant positions.

2. Compared to other Doctoral extensive public universities, KSU time to fill vacant positions is higher for executives and nonexempt employees, but lower for exempt employees.

3. KSU HR Recruiting function has a low staffing ratio compared to the private sector and is mixed with regard to other Doctoral extensive public universities.

4. Note that the CUPA metric of Total Number of Positions filled is twice that of KSU. This is possibly because the KSU metric does not include internal hires, re-classifications of current jobs (i.e. promotions) or actual promotions. The CUPA metric most likely does include such hires, as most peer universities report in this manner.

Table 13. Benefits Metrics

SURVEY	METRIC	RESULT	KSU RESULT
CUPA	FTEs in Benefits department	7.22	5.5
CUPA	Institution's average health insurance cost per employee	$6,432	$7,956
SHRM	Total Health Care Cost per Covered Employee	$6,617	$7,956
SHRM	Employer contribution to monthly health care premium for Employee Only coverage	$305	$360
SHRM	% of premium Employer pays for Employee Only coverage	82%	90.3%
SHRM	% of premium Employer pays for Spouse/Domestic Partner coverage	57%	90.3%
SHRM	Annual Out of Network deductible for Employee Only coverage	$1,008	$1,500

1. KSU HR has favorable staffing level in Benefits compared to the private sector and to other Doctoral extensive public universities.

2. KSU health care costs are higher than private sector and than other Doctoral extensive public universities.

3. KSU is more generous in its health care premiums than private sector.

4. Benefits were rated very positively in the employee survey. There is room for the university to increase cost-sharing with employees if it should so choose, but it should be aware of the trade-off in employee satisfaction.

Table 14. Compensation

SURVEY	*METRIC*	*RESULT*	*KSU RESULT*
CUPA	Total FTE in Compensation	4.88	3.25
CUPA	**%** of FTE that receive salary changes outside of normal cycle		
	Executive	8.6%	Combined
	Exempt	12.5%	6.67%
	Nonexempt	10.2%	0
CUPA	**%** of FTE that received bonus or lump sum payments outside of normal cycle		
	Executive		
	Exempt	0	20%
	Nonexempt	0	0.96%
		11.4%	0.39%
CUPA	Average number of days to classify a new position		
	Executive	8.5	1
	Exempt	11	17
	Nonexempt	8	23
CUPA	Average number of days to reclassify a position		
	Executive	23	0
	Exempt	25	36
	Nonexempt	24	30

1. KSU Compensation staffing is higher than private sector and lower than other Doctoral extensive public universities.

2. KSU grants fewer salary adjustments outside of the normal cycle than other Doctoral extensive public universities, but more bonuses.

3. KSU Compensation function takes slightly longer to classify or re-classify positions. This result is not as glaring as the employee survey seemed to indicate. The Compensation function should consider exploring this discrepancy through interviews or follow-up surveys with internal customers.

Table 15. Training and Development.

This function included a survey from the American Society for Training and Development, the nation's leading professional training organization.

SURVEY	METRIC	RESULT	KSU RESULT
CUPA	FTEs in the training function	4.26	2.33
CUPA	Program topics offered by at least 80% of CUPA participating universities Job/skills development Supervisory/mgmt. Leadership/strategic planning Diversity Harassment Business processes	 Y Y Y Y Y	 Y Y Y Y Y
ASTD	Employees per Training staff member Emp. includes faculty & staff, Trng includes Classified staff Emp. Includes faculty & staff, Trng excludes Classified staff Emp. staff only and Trng includes Classified staff Emp. Is staff only and Trng. excludes Classified staff	287 for all Employees as ratio for each Training staff member	1705 2557 885 1328
ASTD	# of learning hours used per Training staff member Training staff # includes Classified staff Training staff # excludes Classified staff (KSU results include only HR learning hours)	5497 hours	3371 5057
ASTD	Number of learning hours used per employee (KSU results include only HR learning hours)	37	2
ASTD	Technology-based (on-line, webinar, etc.) proportion of learning hours	33%	44%
ASTD	Cost per learning hour used	$56.62	$33.61

1. KSU HR uses fewer staff members than other Doctoral extensive public universities.

2. HR training programs address the same topics that other Doctoral extensive public universities include in their training programs.

3. The ratio of HR training staff to all employees is better than the ASTD norm.

4. The number of learning hours utilized per training staff member is lower than the ASTD norm.

5. The cost per hour of training is better for KSU HR than the ASTD norm.

6. Training results are notoriously difficult to measure; hence most training metrics focus on inputs and participation. We recommend that the HR training function establish some processes to obtain post-course evaluations from participants and their managers some months after training in order to address training transfer results.

Table 16. Miscellaneous Measures

SURVEY	METRIC	RESULT	KSU RESULT
CUPA	Number of FTE in EEO/AA	4.16	1.7
CUPA	Number of FTE in Records, Compliance, Other	10.95	4.83
CUPA	Number of FTE in Employee Relations	4.25	1.99
CUPA	Number of FTE in Labor Relations	4.25	1

KSU HR compares favorably in terms of staffing compared to other Doctoral extensive public universities.

Table 17. Activity Sample

TASK	MEASURE
Total # of recruiting ads placed annually	1866
Total # of Independent Contractor requests processed annually	1915
Total # of assessments given to job applicants	931
Total # of references processed annually	870
Total of COBRA requests processes annually	572
Total # of FMLA requests processed annually	110
Total # of New Hire Manual Data entry adjustments for Benefits processed annually	348
Total # of Tuition Approvals processed annually	1563
Total # of new/revised job descriptions developed annually	89
Total # of Position Reviews completed that do not involve a job description	98
Total # of affirmative action complaints processed annually	52
Total # of ADA complaints processed annually	52

# of Dock Pats processed annually	780
# of assignment end notifications per year	415
# of LOAs processed per year	180
# of prior state service transactions per year	208
# of employee separations processed per year	365
# of unemployment cases processed annually	1,040
# of managers coached by ER regarding disciplinary process annually	85
# of employees coached/counseled by ER annually	325
# of employees counseled by Ombudsman annually	52
# of Labor Relations grievance hearings annually	62
# of pre-discipline hearings annually	46

The Division of Human Resources has useful metrics for many other tasks that were not included in the comparison surveys. Table 17 contains a sample of those tasks, which provide insight into the activity level of the division.

Section 4: An Integrative Perspective from the Consultants

In conducting this assessment, the consultants reviewed and analyzed numerous factors in the performance of the KSU Division of Human Resources.

> Process—We examined the scope of the division's tasks and structure and the existence of key HR processes by having the division respond to a self-assessment guide developed by the AMACOM through a panel of national HR experts. After the guide was completed we met with the staff members to interview them, discuss their responses and verify the results. We also reviewed the process flow charts and the workflow narratives that the division created to ensure these met with accepted HR practices.

> Quality—As a check on the implementation of the processes, a university-wide survey was conducted. The 776 employees who completed the online survey provided their perceptions of how the Division of Human Resources and its functional areas perform in terms of accessibility, timeliness, and quality.

> Cost—To assess the costs of the Division of Human Resources, the HR staff gathered and provided to us cost and other productivity data from both private-sector and university-sector professional surveys. We then analyzed these results to determine how the Division of Human Resources's costs compare to those of other Division of Human Resourcess.

These factors are used to present the strengths and shortcomings of the four domains of HR—the transactional processes within the Division of Human Resources, the policies of the University, the people management provided by unit managers, and the strategic human resource management provided by senior administration.

The Strengths of HR

1. Cost. The university gets its money's worth from the Division of Human Resources. The cost per employee of the Division of Human Resources compares favorably with the private sector. The Division of Human Resources also uses fewer staff members per hundred employees than the private sector does. Its ratio of FTEs to HR staff is lower (less productive) than that of other Doctoral extensive public universities, although the figure provided by CUPA is questionable as previously discussed.

2. Alignment. The Division of Human Resources has a mission and a strategic plan that align with the mission and strategy of the university.

3. Staff expertise. All of the HR staff members we met with bring significant experience to their positions, conduct themselves in a professional manner, and possess considerable knowledge about their functions. They are focused on the mission of HR. They have a customer-oriented attitude.

4. <u>Teamwork</u>. The HR staff appears to know when it is appropriate to involve or collaborate with each other. Some of their processes specify when such involvement is required, and where the need is ad hoc they appear to be sensitive to contacting their colleagues.

5. <u>Structure</u>. The structure of the Division of Human Resources is appropriate for its mission. The division's mission statement, as well as the mission statement of each functional area, focuses primarily on transactional functions. Although it is admirable that the functional structure match the mission, an opportunity for growth can be found in shifting to a transformational mission and structure. This is elaborated upon in the recommendations section of this report.

6. <u>Scope.</u> The Division of Human Resources has a scope appropriate to its mission. All of the standard roles and responsibilities for its mission are addressed by the division. When compared to the AMACOM set of expectations and to the comparison surveys utilized for this assessment, the KSU Division of Human Resources measures up.

7. <u>Compliance</u>. The division has the proper policies in place and the staff is knowledgeable about the legal requirements for human resources. This is a critical factor for any organization governed by state and federal regulations like KSU is.

8. <u>Benefits</u>. The university's employee benefits are broad in what they provide. Health insurance is particularly generous and the employee survey results indicate employees know and appreciate that they have a good benefits package.

9. <u>Innovation and Initiative</u>. The Division of Human Resources has taken the initiative to develop and implement some innovative programs and practices that contribute strongly to the mission and community of the University. Chief among these is a series of health initiatives which will save the University an estimated $3 million over the next three years. A second example is the Health Management program the Division of Human Resources is currently proposing. Together these initiatives demonstrate that the Division of Human Resources thinks with an ROI perspective and acts creatively to support the business of the university and the well being of its employees.

The Shortcomings of HR

Division of Human Resources
1. <u>Timeliness.</u> Many functions within HR lack time-measurable standards. Since the employee survey indicated a perception among employees that parts of HR do not respond in a timely manner, it would be useful to set elapsed-time measures and then monitor performance to those standards. This could be done by sampling performance, it need not be exhaustive. Special attention should be paid to the following:

      -time to respond to benefits inquiries;
      -time to fill openings;
      -time to respond to reclassification requests;

        -time to respond to affirmative action requests;
        -time to respond to discrimination-related requests;
        -time to respond to union contract issues.

2. <u>Staffing Levels</u>. Related to the timeliness issue, there is a perception among customers (as expressed in numerous comments) that HR is short-staffed, and that this is a major contributor to the perceived issues with timeliness and effectiveness. This is consistent with the benchmark data as well. Further, some positions, such as that of Employee Relations have responsibilities that are too broad for one person to fill. Finally, existing staff are so consumed by the transactional workload that little time is available to attend to the transformational activities and the development of organizational capacity.

3. <u>Technology Utilization</u>. While the survey indicates that university employees find the website helpful, they also report that it is not that user friendly. Improved user design and utilization of new technologies may improve customer perceptions while also reducing the time demands on HR staff.

4. <u>Visibility</u>. The survey data indicate that employees lack a basic awareness of the breadth and depth of HR services, frequently commenting that they had never heard of one or more of the HR Areas. Others, such as those at Regional Campuses, expressed concerns about a lack of visibility or accessibility to HR personnel. The Division of Human Resources believed that most employees knew how HR is structured and what each function does. It turns out that such was not the case. For example, many employees do not even know what the term "Talent Acquisition" means--let alone who the staff members are in that function. Survey results suggest that many appear unaware that HR does more than hiring and benefits.

5. <u>Customer Contact Point</u>. There is no central point of contact between each university division and HR, which results in HR not having a comprehensive view of the needs of each division / department. It also means each customer division / department does not have a consistent contact within HR as a "go-to" person. This results in divisions / departments experiencing frustration in how to work with HR, sometimes having several false starts. Further, a central point of contact would provide opportunities to create a stronger awareness of the scope of HR services and staff.

6. <u>Total Compensation</u>. As noted earlier, employees appear to think highly of the benefit package they receive from KSU, but they perceive that compensation is not competitive. The Division of Human Resources needs to address this by communicating more fully how competitive the total compensation program is, and by addressing any areas in which pay is not competitive. The stated goal of the division is to pay at market rate and provide strong benefits, which together comprise a total compensation package that is attractive yet effective in managing costs. For example, over 50% of KSU employees use the tuition benefit, which offers considerable value given the rising cost of higher education. HR should do a better job of selling their *total* compensation package to employees to impact *perceptions* of market equity by identifying and communicating ways in which KSU total compensation is advantageous in the marketplace.

7. <u>HR Assessments</u>. It would seem useful for the Division of Human Resources to establish mechanisms for more frequent sampling of employee needs and perceptions about the university and about HR. The survey conducted for this assessment is the first one in at least 5 years. The university needs to have a more frequent sense of its employees perceptions, and HR needs to have a more frequent sense about how it is doing for its customers and what needs its customers have. Such mechanisms might include focus groups, meetings with departments, and/or small sample surveys. HR is currently developing a university-wide engagement survey, which is a good step toward addressing this need.

8. <u>HR Metrics</u>. The Division of Human Resources was able to provide a variety of metrics to the consultants for the purposes of this audit. However, HR managers did not have these numbers at hand during our early discussions in November because they do not routinely use such metrics. HR metrics are the tools that HR managers ought to use on a regular basis to manage the effectiveness of the Division of Human Resources. Implementing a system of regular calculation and use of metrics is one means through which the HR function could improve its performance.

9. <u>Business Basics</u>. The Division of Human Resources can be a leader in deeply transforming the culture of the university to true "excellence in action", but effective participation in this process requires that HR employees develop a deeper understanding of the "business" of the university. They need to be conversant with such metrics as increase in student enrollment, changes in percentage of state funding, student satisfaction measures, changes in university budget priorities, and so forth. They must also understand the political environment enough to understand how these drive changes in the university's strategy. HR staff members currently are not ignorant of this information, but they need to develop a deeper understanding so they can engage managers in such things as why compensation budgets are what they are, what kind of qualities they should be looking for in new hires with respect to changes in the university strategy and business context, and how performance objectives need to be realigned to accommodate these dynamic changes.

Managers' Role in Human Resources Management
10. <u>Performance Appraisal/Pay Increases</u>. For unclassified employees, there is a strong, positively skewed distribution of performance ratings. In tandem with the fact that most pay increases hover around 3%, this creates problems for both HR and employees. When <u>most </u>employees are rated highly, the ratings lose credibility and can lead to dissatisfaction with pay when smaller increases don't match the performance ratings received. High performers need to know that their superior performance stands out, and is recognized by meaningful pay increases which cannot occur if most of the workforce is designated as the 'high performers'.

Policies
11. <u>Fairness</u>. From the employee survey, a number of participants noted concerns about fairness, primarily with respect to classification and compensation issues. It is outside the scope of this study to investigate the legitimacy of these perceptions. However, we do note the impact such perceptions, whether well founded or not, can have on employee' morale. This issue merits further consideration by the Division of Human Resources, and by appropriate other

University personnel with respect to perceptions of inequitable policies (e.g., between the Kent campus and regional campuses concerning classification and compensation issues).

The Role of Senior Leadership in Human Resource Management

12. <u>Engaging Frontline HR Resources: The Responsibilities of Line Managers</u>. The performance management issue in number 10 above is an example of a larger issue that exists within most organizations and, we have reason to believe, also exists within KSU. A large portion of a line manager's responsibility consists of human resources management in the sense of providing direction and leadership, setting goals, and handling individual employee issues. In many cases managers tend to default to the HR function to address these issues because such issues are awkward to handle, hold the potential to create conflict, or simply are out of the manager's skill area.

    In our interviews with HR staff when we asked about how they work with line managers, it was apparent that many managers struggle with the HR management portion of their responsibility. From the data in this study, it is not clear if this is a training or communication issue by the Division of Human Resources, or a skill or accountability issue by managers. For example, it would be primarily a manager issue if managers are using HR as a scapegoat to avoid discussing performance issues with employees (e.g., some managers may just say "HR won't let me" rather than explain why an employee does not deserve a reclassification), or perhaps most managers simply don't understand how essential their human resource responsibilities are to a well functioning organization. A third possibility is that senior administration is not holding managers accountable for competent performance of the HR duties of their job. A follow-up study with managers would be useful to pinpoint sources of this challenge to effective HR, and to design a more effective approach for developing and rewarding a high performance culture.

13. <u>Strategic Orientation</u>. It appears that many of the managers within the university have not yet developed an understanding of their role in promoting and supporting the university's strategic plan. This includes the management of change. This is an opportunity for managers and HR to collaborate further to develop the culture and implement the strategy that KSU seeks. HR professionals possess a range of expertise and skills with respect to organizational development and culture change that are necessary tools to effectively implement strategic goals. However, currently the Division of Human Resources mission and staffing levels limit their contributions to the processing of personnel transactions. Given the vision, mission, goals, and leadership towards culture change at the University, engaging the Division of Human Resources in developing organizational capacities for culture change are warranted. A useful first step in this direction would involve a study to evaluate the scope, structure, resources, and timeline for a potential change in HR mission and resources to support such an effort.

Recommendations

Division of Human Resources

1. <u>Lead From Strengths</u>. The Division of Human Resources has a solid portfolio of core strengths that includes a dedicated, professional staff; well developed processes; effective

intradepartmental teamwork and communication; and a clear strategic alignment with the University mission and goals.   As the division moves forward with implementing new initiatives, it will be necessary to ensure that these core strengths are maintained and nurtured.

2. Improve Timeliness. Set elapsed time goals and monitor performance towards those standards. Review automated tracking systems for tracking customer queries, and transactional processes to ensure no queries are lost, and that responses are timely.

3. Refine Technology Utilization. Review the user design of all HR related systems. We recognize that HR is held accountable for some systems for which it does not have control. Conduct a design charrette with system owners and HR customers to consider some redesign and alternatives. Explore new technologies to create more opportunity for customer self service. For example, wikis could be considered for building FAQs on the fly to be more responsive to customer needs.

4. Evaluate Staffing Levels. Based on survey feedback and benchmark data, a close examination of the adequacy of current staffing levels is warranted. Beyond improving customer satisfaction, include consideration of the ways in which increased staffing might add to organizational value. For example, the savings from improvements in benefits totaled $3 million. There is a case to be made that additional staff may be warranted to meet current workload demands, thus averting risks associated with loss of valuable HR team members, or dissatisfaction from ill served employees. Is there also a business case for how additional staffing can return value beyond the cost of their employment?

5. Develop the KSU HR Brand. Strengthen customer awareness and visibility of HR services and expertise by developing a brand for the Division. HR has been effective in implementing a customer service strategy. This perspective of the 'organization within the organization' can be extended to designing and deploying a brand around Division service offerings. This can be accomplished simply with a workshop involving some HR staff. In addition to a tag line and consistent graphical logo for print and online communications, brand development can be as simple as cross promoting services. For example, open enrollment day can also be used as an opportunity to create awareness about the range of HR services and activities delivered. Also, ensure that HR successes and accomplishments are well communicated to the KSU community, and that your 'brand' is managed to ensure customer understanding about HR, its offerings, and contributions.

6. Establish Account Managers for Each Major Customer Group. Provide an integrated contact and response process for each major customer group to ensure that HR is fully aware of the entire range of each customer group's needs, and to simplify customer group transactions with HR. The Account Manager should proactively organize to identify and address customer group needs, and to serve as the customer group advocate within HR. The Account Manager should also be responsible for creating strong visibility for HR with their customer accounts, and customer awareness of HR services and processes. To accomplish this, HR may need to consider adding staff.

7. <u>Promote the Value of Total Compensation to KSU Employees</u>. Evaluate the adequacy and advantages of the full range of pay, benefits, organizational culture, and lifestyle afforded by employment by KSU. Develop and sell the total compensation package of Kent State to impact employee perceptions of market equity and value received. Ensure that any compensation inequities are resolved.

8. <u>Conduct Periodic Assessments</u>. The University needs to have a more frequent sense of its employees' perceptions, and HR needs to have a more frequent sense about how it is doing for its customers and what needs its customers have. Such mechanisms might include focus groups, meetings with departments, and/or small sample surveys, in addition to periodic full scale surveys.

9. <u>Use HR Metrics Consistently.</u> Implement a system of regular calculation and use of metrics as one means of improving Division performance, and of ensuring consistent quality and effectiveness of services.

10. <u>Develop and Apply an Understanding of the Business Basics of the University.</u> Establish a process by which HR staff can stay informed about the business basics of the University, such as current enrollment, changes in student demographics, shifts in University budget priorities, changes in legislative and grant funding, and so forth. This can be accomplished by having someone collate and report basic figures on a regular basis, secure annual briefings from someone in Business and Finance or university administration, and by having periodic staff discussions about how these changes impact changes in HR services. For example, a change in the strategic direction of the university may precipitate a change in the discussions Talent Acquisition staff have with managers when developing staffing requirements and target competency profiles.

Line Manager Recommendations
11. <u>Address Imbalances in Performance Appraisals and Merit Pay Increases.</u> Collaborate with line managers and university administration about improving the performance appraisal and merit pay processes. This may include considerations of team and unit performance, changes to training, and an increase in manager accountability to accomplish a more effective appraisal and compensation program. Consider promoting the new program to managers and employees to increase adoption.

Policies
12. <u>Evaluate the Fairness of University Policies in Targeted Areas</u>. In collaboration with university administration, convene a task force to evaluate the equity of certain university policies and employee perceptions about them, including opportunities for employees to communicate their concerns. Whatever the findings, communicate them with employees to improve equity perceptions.

13. <u>Conduct a Study of Managers' HR Responsibilities</u>. Evaluate the job descriptions, training, and accountability of managers for performing their HR duties. Such a study might include a review of job descriptions for the clarity of HR tasks, a survey of employees about the extent to which their managers perform their HR tasks, or focus groups of managers to assess understanding and purpose of their HR tasks.

14. <u>Utilize the Division of Human Resources to Support Strategic Initiatives</u>. Senior leadership should consider expanding the mission and resources of the Division of Human Resources from a transactional unit to a strategic, transformative one. Just as new buildings require architects and engineers to supply the expertise, tools, and processes to develop new physical infrastructure, a new university vision, mission, and culture requires human resources expertise and skills to develop and change the social infrastructure. To achieve the goals set forth, managers will need an array of skills and processes to engage employees in new strategic directions and workflow processes. Providing these tools is within the expertise and skill sets of the Division of Human Resources, if tasked with this new transformative mission and provided with the resources to support it.

Conclusion: Stepping Up—Opportunities for a High-Performance Organization

The past decade has offered much discussion in management and business journals regarding the need for American organizations to transform themselves in order to be able to compete in the business environment of the 21st century. Together the influences of global competition, technology, and sustainability have revised the keys to success. Organizations must be able to transform themselves, and universities are no exception. Kent State University recognizes this reality and has embarked upon a path of considerable transformation.

The Human Resources division is central to this effort because it can provide many initiatives to assist the transformation. A "transformational" Division of Human Resources could do the following, as just a few examples:

1. Infuse its collaborations with managers with specific actions relevant to the university's strategy. For example, when an open position is being filled, HR and the hiring manager could discuss what experience and characteristics they would want to see in candidates that match the needs of the strategy. Or, HR could help managers prepare for discussions with employees about compensation decisions relative to the strategy. Or, HR could assist managers in involving staff members in establishing goals aligned with the university's goals and strategy.

2. Serve as a resource to help managers improve the functioning of their work teams. High-performing work teams have identifiable characteristics that differentiate them from other teams. They communicate differently, they develop goals differently, they engage in creative thinking differently, and they resolve conflict differently. HR could provide consultation to managers and to teams to develop these skills. President Lefton spoke in his State of the University address about the importance of an entrepreneurial spirit, of reducing red tape, and of finding ways to say "yes." He emphasized that every KSU employee needs to do this. HR could be a resource to foster this attitude.

3. Culture change is difficult. Managers and employees need help in not only dealing with change but initiating change. HR can provide resources to assist divisions in how to identify needed changes, how to plan the changes, and how to implement the changes. HR cannot be a content expert in the functions of each division, but it can be a process expert in the process of change.

The KSU Division of Human Resources has already engaged in some of these activities, through some of its training programs and its Organization Review Team. However, the division is currently neither appropriately staffed nor sufficiently empowered to serve as a transformational agent. We believe many of the HR staff possess the requisite competencies to function at this higher level. The shift from transactional HR to transformational HR will require the commitment and support of University executive management, as well as intelligent planning within the Division of Human Resources. This conversion is imperative for KSU to achieve the level of excellence to which it aspires.

Appendix A

HR Effectiveness Survey

Complete List of Survey Items

HR Effectiveness Survey

Note that statements 31, 43, 47, 48 and 68 were instructions to survey participants. The Banner software numbered these as survey statements. Thus, although 68 statements appear below, there are a total of 63 survey statements that participants were asked to rate.

1.   "When recruiting for job openings, Talent Acquisition fills positions in a timely manner."

2.   The Talent Acquisition staff helps provide good quality candidates for job openings.

3.   The job posting system makes it easy to find and apply for new jobs.

4.   The Benefits staff is accessible when I need them.

5.   The Benefits staff resolves benefits issues in a timely manner.

6.   The Benefits staff is knowledgeable about Kent State's benefits programs.

7.   The Benefits staff effectively runs the process for open enrollment in benefits programs.

8.   The Benefits staff effectively processes leaves of absence.

9.   "Kent State provides benefits that are about the same as, or better than, what other organizations provide."

10.   The Benefits staff provides me with clear information about benefits programs.

11.   The Compensation staff is accessible when I need them.

12.   The Compensation staff is knowledgeable about Kent State's pay programs.

13.   The Compensation staff effectively processes position reviews/audits for reclassification requests.

14.   "The Compensation staff provides pay rates that are about the same as, or better than, pay rates at other organizations."

15.   The Compensation staff effectively communicates pay-related policies and processes.

16.   The Compensation staff resolves pay-related issues in a timely manner.

17.   The Training and Development staff in Human Resources provides effective training and development programs for me.

18.   Training and development options that support career development are effectively publicized to Kent State employees.

19. The Training and development programs offered by Human Resources meet my needs.

20. The Employee Relations staff is accessible when I need them.

21. The Employee Relations staff responds to issues in a timely manner.

22. The Employee Relations staff supports improved teamwork within departments at Kent State.

23. The Employee Relations staff provides employee rewards and recognition programs that are meaningful to me.

24. The Affirmative Action staff responds to affirmative action issues in a timely manner.

25. The Affirmative Action staff is knowledgeable about compliance-related matters (complying with Equal Employment laws and regulations).

26. The Affirmative Action staff is helpful in bringing diverse employees to Kent State.

27. The Affirmative Action staff processes discrimination-related complaints and investigations in a timely manner.

28. "When I have an issue or question about my employment-related information that is kept by the Records staff, they are accessible when I need them."

29. The Records staff responds to employee records requests in a timely manner.

30. The Records staff is knowledgeable and helpful when I need assistance.

31. "The following items are about the Human Resource Division in general. Click ""Next Question."""

32. Human Resources contributes to making Kent State a great place to work.

33. Human Resources contributes to building employee job success.

34. Human Resources helps develop and manage the organizational culture of the university.

35. Human Resources contributes to building a diverse workforce at Kent State.

36. Human Resources provides effective employee relations programs.

37. "When I call the Human Resources Division, the receptionist listens to what I need and connects me right away with the correct person who can help me."

38. Human Resources provides me with clear and accurate information in a timely manner.

39. "Human Resources is receptive to my questions, concerns and feedback."

40. Human Resources answers questions with honest and relevant information.

41. The Human Resources website is helpful to me.

42. It is easy for me to find the resources I need on the Human Resources website.

43. "The following three statements pertain to AFSCME Bargaining Unit only. Click ""Next Question."""

44. The Labor Relations staff is knowledgeable about union-related programs.

45. The Labor Relations staff responds to union contract administration issues in a timely manner.

46. "Overall, the Labor Relations staff functions effectively."

47. "Please state briefly any feedback you have for the Human Resources Division that has not been addressed in the previous statements. Managers and supervisors should skip this item, click ""Next Question."" An opportunity for managers and supervisors to provide comments will be available at the end of the next section."

48. "The following items are for managers and supervisors only. Click ""Next Question"" if you are a manager or supervisor. If you are not a manager or supervisor please click ""Survey Complete."

   "Thank you again for taking the time to complete the Human Resources Survey and for your contribution to our assessment."

49. The Employee Relations staff helps employees improve their performance.

50. Human Resources helps Kent State employees follow employment-related laws.

51. The Talent Acquisition staff is accessible when I need them.

52. The Talent Acquisition staff is knowledgeable about recruiting issues.

53. The Talent Acquisition staff uses effective strategies and methods to recruit employees that meet job requirements.

54. "When a job opening arises, the Talent Acquisition staff provides managers with the technical assistance necessary to appropriately define the job and its associated requirements."

55. The Talent Acquisition staff provides managers with the technical assistance necessary to appropriately assess job applicants for necessary job qualifications.

56. The Talent Acquisition staff collaborates with departments to recruit the best qualified employees.

57. The job posting system is an effective tool that is easy to use.

58. The Compensation staff helps managers provide appropriate annual pay increases for employees based on performance.

59. The Training and Development staff is accessible when I need them.

60. Training and Development staff implements management training that is relevant to managers.

61. Training and Development staff offers management training that is properly scheduled so that it is available to managers when they need it.

62. Training and Development programs assist managers in supporting the strategic direction of the university.

63. The Employee Relations staff effectively assists managers in resolving employee-related issues.

64. The Employee Relations staff provides managers with adequate assistance in the completion of annual performance reviews.

65. "Human Resources' Organizational Review Team (ORT) assists managers in assessing and developing their department or work group on such factors as team work, communication, organizational structure, customer orientation, etc."

66. I am interested in using Human Resources services to increase the performance of my department and ensure alignment with the university's strategy.

67. Human Resources provides managers with effective support in managing organizational culture.

68. "Please state briefly any feedback you have for the Human Resources Division that has not been addressed in the previous statements. When finished click the ""Survey Complete"" button.

    Thank you again for taking the time to complete the Human Resources Survey and for your contribution to our assessment."

Appendix B

HR Effectiveness Survey

Whole Sample Means for Survey Statements

HR Effectiveness Survey

Survey Statement Whole Sample Means

This section presents survey statement means ordered in 2 ways:
1. Listed in the order in which they were presented to survey participants
2. Listed in rank order by statement mean

Survey Items in order of presentation	Overall Mean	Standard Deviation
1. When recruiting for job openings, Talent Acquisition fills positions in a timely manner.	3.11	.93
2. The Talent Acquisition staff helps provide good quality candidates for job openings.	2.72	.81
3. The job posting system makes it easy to find and apply for new jobs.	2.43	.99
04. The Benefits staff is accessible when I need them.	2.64	1.10
05. The Benefits staff resolves benefits issues in a timely manner.	2.67	1.04
06. The Benefits staff is knowledgeable about Kent State's benefits programs.	2.26	.90
07. The Benefits staff effectively runs the process for open enrollment in benefits programs.	2.38	.94
08. The Benefits staff effectively processes leaves of absence.	2.70	.75
09. Kent State provides benefits that are about the same as, or better than, what other organizations provide.	2.09	.93
10. The Benefits staff provides me with clear information about benefits programs.	2.47	.99
11. The Compensation staff is accessible when I need them.	2.64	.83
12. The Compensation staff is knowledgeable about Kent State's pay programs.	2.51	.77
13. The Compensation staff effectively processes position reviews/audits for reclassification requests.	2.96	.88
14. The Compensation staff provides pay rates that are about the same as, or better than, pay rates at other organizations.	3.25	1.05
15. The Compensation staff effectively communicates pay-related policies and processes.	2.76	.94
16. The Compensation staff resolves pay-related issues in a timely manner.	2.77	.88
17. The Training and Development staff in Human Resources provides effective training and development programs for me.	2.58	.98
18. Training and development options that support career development are effectively publicized to Kent State employees.	2.75	1.00
19. The Training and development programs offered by Human Resources meet my needs.	2.83	.96
20. The Employee Relations staff is accessible when I need them.	2.63	.84
21. The Employee Relations staff responds to issues in a timely manner.	2.71	.86
22. The Employee Relations staff supports improved teamwork within departments at Kent State.	2.95	.87
23. The Employee Relations staff provides employee rewards and recognition programs that are meaningful to me.	3.18	.94
24. The Affirmative Action staff responds to affirmative action issues in a timely manner.	2.90	.73
25. The Affirmative Action staff is knowledgeable about compliance-related matters (complying with Equal Employment laws and regulations).	2.65	.72
26. The Affirmative Action staff is helpful in bringing diverse employees to Kent State.	2.74	.80
27. The Affirmative Action staff processes discrimination-related complaints and investigations in a timely manner.	2.91	.65
28. When I have an issue or question about my employment-related information that is kept by the Records staff, they are accessible when I need them.	2.66	.79
29. The Records staff responds to employee records requests in a timely manner.	2.69	.79
30. The Records staff is knowledgeable and helpful when I need assistance.	2.60	.76
32. Human Resources contributes to making Kent State a great place to work.	2.58	.93
33. Human Resources contributes to building employee job success.	2.79	.94
34. Human Resources helps develop and manage the organizational culture of the university.	2.87	.95
35. Human Resources contributes to building a diverse workforce at Kent State.	2.53	.87
36. Human Resources provides effective employee relations programs.	2.80	.89
37. When I call the Human Resources Division, the receptionist listens to what I need and connects me right away with the correct person who can help me.	2.51	.95

38. Human Resources provides me with clear and accurate information in a timely manner.	2.71	1.02
39. Human Resources is receptive to my questions, concerns and feedback.	2.65	.96
40. Human Resources answers questions with honest and relevant information.	2.52	.88
41. The Human Resources website is helpful to me.	2.48	.94
42. It is easy for me to find the resources I need on the Human Resources website.	2.77	1.01
44. The Labor Relations staff is knowledgeable about union-related programs.	2.95	.62
45. The Labor Relations staff responds to union contract administration issues in a timely manner.	3.03	.62
46. Overall, the Labor Relations staff functions effectively.	3.00	.65

Survey Items, Manager Only Items

	Overall Mean	
49. The Employee Relations staff helps employees improve their performance.	2.90	.93
50. Human Resources helps Kent State employees follow employment-related laws.	2.31	.71
51. The Talent Acquisition staff is accessible when I need them.	2.70	.78
52. The Talent Acquisition staff is knowledgeable about recruiting issues.	2.62	.82
53. The Talent Acquisition staff uses effective strategies and methods to recruit employees that meet job requirements.	2.87	.85
54. When a job opening arises, the Talent Acquisition staff provides managers with the technical assistance necessary to appropriately define the job and its associated requirements.	2.75	.83
55. The Talent Acquisition staff provides managers with the technical assistance necessary to appropriately assess job applicants for necessary job qualifications.	2.77	.90
56. The Talent Acquisition staff collaborates with departments to recruit the best qualified employees.	2.88	.98
57. The job posting system is an effective tool that is easy to use.	2.65	1.03
58. The Compensation staff helps managers provide appropriate annual pay increases for employees based on performance.	3.09	1.09
59. The Training and Development staff is accessible when I need them.	2.38	.71
60. Training and Development staff implements management training that is relevant to managers.	2.55	.87
61. Training and Development staff offers management training that is properly scheduled so that it is available to managers when they need it.	2.55	.81
62. Training and Development programs assist managers in supporting the strategic direction of the university.	2.73	.91
63. The Employee Relations staff effectively assists managers in resolving employee-related issues.	2.60	.96
64. The Employee Relations staff provides managers with adequate assistance in the completion of annual performance reviews.	2.64	.94
65. Human Resources' Organizational Review Team (ORT) assists managers in assessing and developing their department or work group on such factors as team work, communication, organizational structure, customer orientation, etc.	3.01	.77
66. I am interested in using Human Resources services to increase the performance of my department and ensure alignment with the university's strategy.	2.73	.91
67. Human Resources provides managers with effective support in managing organizational culture.	2.94	.91

HR Effectiveness Survey

Survey Items in Rank Order by Overall Item Mean	Overall Mean
09. Kent State provides benefits that are about the same as, or better than, what other organizations provide.	2.09
06. The Benefits staff is knowledgeable about Kent State's benefits programs.	2.26
07. The Benefits staff effectively runs the process for open enrollment in benefits programs.	2.38
3. The job posting system makes it easy to find and apply for new jobs.	2.43
10. The Benefits staff provides me with clear information about benefits programs.	2.47
41. The Human Resources website is helpful to me.	2.48
12. The Compensation staff is knowledgeable about Kent State's pay programs.	2.51
37. When I call the Human Resources Division, the receptionist listens to what I need and connects me right away with the correct person who can help me.	2.51
40. Human Resources answers questions with honest and relevant information.	2.52
35. Human Resources contributes to building a diverse workforce at Kent State.	2.53
17. The Training and Development staff in Human Resources provides effective training and development programs for me.	2.58
32. Human Resources contributes to making Kent State a great place to work.	2.58
30. The Records staff is knowledgeable and helpful when I need assistance.	2.60
20. The Employee Relations staff is accessible when I need them.	2.63
04. The Benefits staff is accessible when I need them.	2.64
11. The Compensation staff is accessible when I need them.	2.64
25. The Affirmative Action staff is knowledgeable about compliance-related matters (complying with Equal Employment laws and regulations).	2.65
39. Human Resources is receptive to my questions, concerns and feedback.	2.65
28. When I have an issue or question about my employment-related information that is kept by the Records staff, they are accessible when I need them.	2.66
05. The Benefits staff resolves benefits issues in a timely manner.	2.67
29. The Records staff responds to employee records requests in a timely manner.	2.69
08. The Benefits staff effectively processes leaves of absence.	2.70
21. The Employee Relations staff responds to issues in a timely manner.	2.71
38. Human Resources provides me with clear and accurate information in a timely manner.	2.71
2. The Talent Acquisition staff helps provide good quality candidates for job openings.	2.72
26. The Affirmative Action staff is helpful in bringing diverse employees to Kent State.	2.74
18. Training and development options that support career development are effectively publicized to Kent State employees.	2.75
15. The Compensation staff effectively communicates pay-related policies and processes.	2.76
16. The Compensation staff resolves pay-related issues in a timely manner.	2.77
42. It is easy for me to find the resources I need on the Human Resources website.	2.77
33. Human Resources contributes to building employee job success.	2.79
36. Human Resources provides effective employee relations programs.	2.80
19. The Training and development programs offered by Human Resources meet my needs.	2.83
34. Human Resources helps develop and manage the organizational culture of the university.	2.87
24. The Affirmative Action staff responds to affirmative action issues in a timely manner.	2.90
27. The Affirmative Action staff processes discrimination-related complaints and investigations in a timely manner.	2.91
22. The Employee Relations staff supports improved teamwork within departments at Kent State.	2.95
44. The Labor Relations staff is knowledgeable about union-related programs.	2.95
13. The Compensation staff effectively processes position reviews/audits for reclassification requests.	2.96
46. Overall, the Labor Relations staff functions effectively.	3.00
45. The Labor Relations staff responds to union contract administration issues in a timely manner.	3.03
1. When recruiting for job openings, Talent Acquisition fills positions in a timely manner.	3.11
23. The Employee Relations staff provides employee rewards and recognition programs that are meaningful to me.	3.18
14. The Compensation staff provides pay rates that are about the same as, or better than, pay rates at other organizations.	3.25

Manager Only Items In Rank Order by Overall Item Mean	Overall Mean
50. Human Resources helps Kent State employees follow employment-related laws.	2.31
59. The Training and Development staff is accessible when I need them.	2.38
61. Training and Development staff offers management training that is properly scheduled so that it is available to managers when they need it.	2.55
60. Training and Development staff implements management training that is relevant to managers.	2.55
63. The Employee Relations staff effectively assists managers in resolving employee-related issues.	2.60
52. The Talent Acquisition staff is knowledgeable about recruiting issues.	2.62
64. The Employee Relations staff provides managers with adequate assistance in the completion of annual performance reviews.	2.64
57. The job posting system is an effective tool that is easy to use.	2.65
51. The Talent Acquisition staff is accessible when I need them.	2.70
62. Training and Development programs assist managers in supporting the strategic direction of the university.	2.73
66. I am interested in using Human Resources services to increase the performance of my department and ensure alignment with the university's strategy.	2.73
54. When a job opening arises, the Talent Acquisition staff provides managers with the technical assistance necessary to appropriately define the job and its associated requirements.	2.75
55. The Talent Acquisition staff provides managers with the technical assistance necessary to appropriately assess job applicants for necessary job qualifications.	2.77
53. The Talent Acquisition staff uses effective strategies and methods to recruit employees that meet job requirements.	2.87
56. The Talent Acquisition staff collaborates with departments to recruit the best qualified employees.	2.88
49. The Employee Relations staff helps employees improve their performance.	2.90
67. Human Resources provides managers with effective support in managing organizational culture.	2.94
65. Human Resources' Organizational Review Team (ORT) assists managers in assessing and developing their department or work group on such factors as team work, communication, organizational structure, customer orientation, etc.	3.01
58. The Compensation staff helps managers provide appropriate annual pay increases for employees based on performance.	3.09

Appendix C

HR Effectiveness Survey

Detailed Survey Results by HR Area

Detailed Survey Results by HR Area

This section presents the survey results, organized by HR Area, beginning with "General HR", and continuing from "Affirmative Action" through "Training and Development", with the additional areas, outside of the Division of Human Resources, that nevertheless are important components of accomplishing HR goals. These include workforce management (e.g., line managers), policy (e.g., university administration, legal), information systems, and payroll.

This appendix is intended to assist managers in interpretation of the survey data for their function. Each section of the Appendix contains 3 Tables:

1. Survey statements for the Area, along with the overall mean rating across all respondents;

2. Survey statements with ratings from each customer group;

3. Survey comments, organized by topic area of the comment.

For ease of interpretation and use, the content of the Tables have been rank ordered by the mean ratings, including the Table columns (i.e., list of customer groups) for the second Table in each section. This will facilitate the use of this information as a tool within each functional area. For example, HR managers could meet with their staff and discuss:

-   Relative strengths (the first items) and weaknesses (last items) in Table 1 for the area.

-   Most and least appreciative customer groups for the HR Area in Table 2.

-   Highlight the call outs of appreciation, the suggestions, and the hotspots to address in the survey feedback provided in the third table in each section.

Ratings and Comments General to the HR Function

General HR	Overall Mean
41. The Human Resources website is helpful to me.	2.48
37. When I call the Human Resources Division, the receptionist listens to what I need and connects me right away with the correct person who can help me.	2.51
40. Human Resources answers questions with honest and relevant information.	2.52
35. Human Resources contributes to building a diverse workforce at Kent State.	2.53
32. Human Resources contributes to making Kent State a great place to work.	2.58
39. Human Resources is receptive to my questions, concerns and feedback.	2.65
38. Human Resources provides me with clear and accurate information in a timely manner.	2.71
42. It is easy for me to find the resources I need on the Human Resources website.	2.77
33. Human Resources contributes to building employee job success.	2.79
36. Human Resources provides effective employee relations programs.	2.80
34. Human Resources helps develop and manage the organizational culture of the university.	2.87
Total (Average across all items)	**2.65**

Item Number	Overall Mean	HR Mean		Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree and ending with 5 = Strongly Disagree with the mid-range at a 3.							
				IA	IS	Reg	UR&D	EM&SA	Prov	Pres	B&F
41	2.48	1.68		1.95	2.26	2.45	2.56	2.32	2.57	2.93	2.47
37	2.51	1.58		2.11	2.29	2.55	2.57	2.46	2.50	2.43	2.71
40	2.52	1.58		2.39	2.34	2.48	2.15	2.52	2.49	2.79	2.75
35	2.53	1.63		2.26	2.49	2.43	2.36	2.48	2.53	2.67	2.75
32	2.58	1.53		2.26	2.54	2.45	2.38	2.59	2.54	2.57	2.91
39	2.65	1.58		2.37	2.54	2.57	2.21	2.74	2.62	2.86	2.89
38	2.71	1.63		2.53	2.37	2.68	2.63	2.79	2.62	3.07	3.04
42	2.77	1.89		2.37	2.62	2.72	2.87	2.49	2.88	3.14	2.78
33	2.79	1.74		2.42	2.57	2.81	2.69	2.75	2.75	2.93	3.07
36	2.80	1.95		2.32	2.94	2.75	2.67	2.69	2.79	3.08	3.00
34	2.87	1.74		2.63	2.71	2.70	3.20	2.91	2.88	2.86	3.04
Mean	**2.65**	**1.68**		**2.33**	**2.51**	**2.59**	**2.60**	**2.62**	**2.65**	**2.85**	**2.85**

G	Awareness	0	I haven't dealt with most of the Division of Human Resourcess mentioned. I didn't even know that some of them existed.
G	Awareness	0	Did not know that there was an Organizational Development area in HR. There is no money available for "performance pay" since the annual increase is a set amount.
G	Awareness	0	I've worked at Kent State for 4 years and have never heard of the Organizational Review Team.
G	Awareness	0	Human Resources seems to provide programs that are helpful to the Kent Campus. The regional campuses have different needs and concerns that the Kent Campus. We should not always be expected to drive to Kent if we need training or to attend special programs. Many administrators on regional campuses, and faculty also, cannot leave the campus for a whole day to attend these things. Polycom or other technology could be used more effectively if the Kent staff does not want to travel to the regionals.
G	Awareness	0	It is unclear how to get "reclassified" or ever have any chance of making more money other then the 2% pay raise.
G	Awareness	-1	As I took this survey, I realized I don't have much experience or contact with HR, so much was 3=neutral. However, although my personal contacts with HR have been great, the generic communication about open enrollment, domestic partnership enrollment, and a couple of other things has been something I perceive as poor in comparison to other places I've worked since 1985. I love you PERSONALLY - but feel very disconnected from your role in the university.
G	Awareness	-1	Human Resources is invisible at KSU Regional Campuses.
G	Awareness	-1	I am a part time instructor for 25 years at a regional campus. I've never really heard from any of the organizations referred to in this survey. Didn't know they existed.
G	Awareness	-1	I have been a part-time employee for almost 20 years and have no idea of the services provided by Human Resources. Many of the trainings are during a time when I can not take advantage of them.
G	Awareness	-1	I have worked at KSU for over 20 years; have been able to become quite knowledgeable about most aspects of KSU systems; am considered a go-to person for info; and am inquisitive, tenacious, and intelligent - but I have yet to understand in-depth HR/personnel processes and as a result often cannot help the staff who come to me.
G	Awareness	-1	I work at one of the non-Kent campuses. HR is almost invisible here. Programs are all on the Kent campus. I have only twice had occassion to relate to HR: a very good experience with benefits, and a bad experience while on a hiring committee. Not enough contact to provide relevant survey information.
G	Awareness	-1	I have been a part-time instructor at a regional campus for 25 years. I have never heard of these groups referred to in this survey.
G	Awareness	-1	I don't think most people know whom to call for various things in HR. The different units within HR are not well known or understood. I usually have to make a couple of calls to find the person who can answer my question or help me.
G	Awareness	-1	Because of our campus location, we feel left out of the loop.
G	Awareness	-1	HR lacks ideal communication with regional campus employees. HR programs appear to be developed more for the main campus employees.
G	Effectiveness	0	As all too often at the University, there appears to be an across the board answer for all divisions, departments and their respective employees. A minimal amount of latitude and customization is provided for the diversity of them.
G	Effectiveness	-1	Sometimes answers to HR questions or rules within HR are different depending on who you talk to and there is not much cross-knowledge between the different HR areas. Everyone on the staff in each individual area of HR, i.e., employment, records, etc. should be on the same page with their answers so there is consistency. The HR instruction manual covers information very superficially. When questions arise, usually they require more detailed answers than what is offered in the instructions. Perhaps a more indepth version could be available for explicit questions in case the HR person convering that area is not available.
G	Effectiveness	-1	It would be more helpful if there were more training programs offered online. Also what seems to happen often is when you call a person at HR they are more often then not, not available at the time you call or you may receive 2 different answers to questions from individuals working in the same department. There needs to be more cohesiveness and definitive answers to questions.

G	Effectiveness	-1	I have had to contact different divisions in Human Resources in the last six months. In one instance, I was told that I would receive feedback via phone or email ASAP - and received Neither - EVER - this was in relation to discriminatory wording that was NEVER changed - in other words, n ot only were my concerns not addressed back to me directly, they were clearly ignored when subsequent materials were created. I have also been told that information was n ot readily available when I requested information about my benefits choices - I was told I could not KNOW who my beneficiary was - that all I could do would be to resubmit a form to change (or renew) a beneficiary and that I would need to do so online. In another instance, I was told that the online information displaying my benefits recipients was correct - as best as the system could present - although it was not exactly accurate in terms of the benefits recipients and their coverage. NO explanation was given for the discrepancy except that the system could not display the information. In short, I have NOT had very positive experiences of late.
G	Effectiveness	-1	I seem to fall between the cracks as unclasssifed staff. If you work in a department with extensive unclassified staff (IT), your colleagues can help you navigate through the MOUNTAINS of information. If I can call I usually get the help I need but the nature of my position makes it difficult to do my job and be on the phone. Otherwise you are emailing HR- which does not seem to be the best way to get answers. The response on email questions is slow or non existent. I have wondered if I am sending my questions to an address that is no longer used. I am sure that the majority of the faculty and staff have had positive interactions with HR.
G	Effectiveness	-1	In general, I'm happiest if I can find what I need on the website and not have to deal with the Human Resources Division. The few times that I've had to deal with HR, they've been fairly incompetent and ineffective.
G	Effectiveness	-1	I have found the receptionist to be less than helpful; I do not see any HR leadership or presence in the workplace. There should be some sort of HR call center that handled all HR questions efficiently.
G	Effectiveness	-1	HR as a whole should understand the statement provided in Mr. Walker's letter that employees of KSU are HR's customers. Too many administrative departments on campus don't know who their stakeholders are (employees and students) and need to start treating them with respect, compassion and with a friendly and helpful demeanor. Too many times both employees and students feel that they are an inconvenience to the person on the other end of the phone, whether we are talking to HR, the Registrar's, Bursar's, etc.
G	Effectiveness	-1	One basic problem that I see is that HR is geared toward the corporate environment rather than the university environment. These are different.
G	Effectiveness	-1	Regretfully, I have found HR to be more of a hinderance than a help generally. In fact, I am puzzled by many of the questions posed since they seem to imply that HR is striving to assume a bigger role than it does. One thing I think would be really helpful, more so than trying to do other things, is to make it easy and quick for new people to be hired. HR does not do anything to make my job easier or to make me or my associates more effective. This is not say that there aren't some fine staff members in HR but I have to be honest, my dealings have made me consider HR as really an obstacle. Please work on streamlining the practices and trust us to do our jobs.
G	Effectiveness	-1	hr is bad nerer any help that you can TRUST
G	Effectiveness	-1	HR is regularly overruled by our division "admin", which makes any HR contribution moot to most issues. Was it HR who lost the resume I submitted when I started here?
G	Effectiveness	-1	I have only been here for a couple of years, but what I have seen from upper management surprizes me. I have never worked at a place with such low morale. Besides how can you cost the university thousands of dollars and still keep your job.
G	Effectiveness	-1	It is very difficult to get through to the proper people. You get trf to a voice mail and then only after several phone calls do you get a response. Emails usually go unanswered. Reclassifications of employees is nearly impossible. The standards set for HR are not the same as they are for other areas on campus. Mary Jane Hannahs and Marianne Pickering are always responsive to requests.
G	Effectiveness	-1	Some receptionists are not the nicest people to see, shouldn't even be greeted by a rude person. I'd rather sit n wait for someone else.
G	Effectiveness	-1	This is the only place I have ever worked where noone wants to deal with HR because they dont help they just punish. You need to look at some The definition and training given related to Human Resources and go back to school,the rudeness of the Labor relations Manager and the evasiveness of the real problems are so blatent it is not funny and I am sure this survey will fall on deaf ears even after I insure that the AFSCME Members complain, we are almost to the point of picketting HR !!! What more do you need to know ????????? Micromanaging and low pay is alive and well at Kent State!!! Time to celebrate "huh" Mr. Walker ???

G	Effectiveness	-1	A serious assessment and overhaul is needed.
G	Effectiveness	-1	The elitist, royalism of senior administrators is an insult to the entire classified staff.
G	Effectiveness	-1	I personally feel the Ombudsman for clerical support is very ineffective. She does not present herself well, becomes very very defensive if she does not like what she hears, does not follow through with office problems nor does she work with the employee to resolve a problem. I would like to know where her expertise is. Please look into this matter.
G	Effectiveness	-1	I regularly receive wrong, inconsistant, or confilicting information from all areas of service within HR. I have found only two competent people in the entire division - Jerusha Kelson and Mary Jane Hannahs.
G	Effectiveness	-1	Culture and climate are determined by the head(s) of the departments/offices and what attitudes they will allow. HR may be trying to improve it, but those efforts are meaningless if the head(s) have a different idea of how to handle employees.
G	Effectiveness	-1	I was fortunate not to have starved to death, and been homeless on an overseas assignment. HR was effective in NOT providing help!
G	Effectiveness	-1	I often get conflicting answers from different members of HR.
G	Effectiveness	-1	On more tghan one occassion a HR staff member has told me that they would get back to me on a question or issue and I have NOT received a return call with a resolution to my issue.
G	Effectiveness	-1	I have regular, direct contact and exceptional relations with many areas of the HR staff including records, compensation, talent acquisition, labor relations and training. It appears to me that the biggest obstacle to providing superior results is that some of your most critical and knowledgeable staff is so very busy and split in their duties that it can result in inefficiencies.
G	fairness	-1	HR on the whole has been ineffective, confrontational and treats employees hostilely. They are the last people I want to deal with at the university. I wouldn't trust one of them for the correct answer or any concerned assistance. They are always treating employees as the enemy not an ally.
G	fairness	-1	Human Resource has been used to reduce diversity. The issues do not go away by retaliating against people who are trying to fix underlying problems. As individuals see what happens to people who are trying to constructively protect underrepresented minority students, staff and faculty; the view that the system is utterly corrupt is growing.
G	fairness	-1	The human resource division shows alot of bias and discriminatory practices. Not all employees are treated fairly and discipline is not applied on a equal basis. There appears to be no uniform policy
G	fairness	-1	The Human Resources Department is uncooperative and and treats employees as if they were there for the benefit of the HR Department, rather than the HR Department being a resource for the employees.
G	fairness	-1	Human Resources really means "Managements Representatives". They represent KSU's management not employees interests.
G	fairness	-1	I have found it to be very difficult to obtain other positions that I have applied for. I believe there is some discrimination in the Bursars office and have come to realize that many times when I have applied for a position the department Supervisor already knows who they are going to hire before interviews even take place.
G	fairness	-1	I've had the feeling that someone from HR was "taking sides." HR should be unbiased when it comes to helping resolve issues between employees.
G	fairness	-1	There doesn't seem to be an advocte for the employee when there is a problem between employee vs supervisor. HR rep takes the Supervisor side and doesn't listen to employees concern.
G	fairness	-1	In the IS division the culture is very poor. Employees work/live in fear. I don't understand this. Why are some employees "let go" and on the other hand new employees are hired without the "let go" employees ever getting a chance to re-train for the open positions?
G	fairness	-1	I find it riduclous that there are different classifications (and pay grades) for regional staff vs Kent campus staff. As a regional staff person, I am made to feel like a lesser skilled or valued employee because I CHOOSE to work at a regional campus vs the Kent campus. My education level and skill set are on par with my Kent campus colleagues if not exceed where they stand, yet I am classified differently even though I do the same job. The discrimination due to location is riduclous! It took months for a much overdo reclassification to take effect. I view HR as being a barrier rather than a partner in job success.

G	Recognition	1	Human Resources suffers from years of separation from the academic culture. The current leadership has done wonders to reverse this behavior. However, it remains and HR spends as much time making a managers efforts to move unit mission, especially in the academic sector, difficult as it does easy. I wish to emphasize that this culture is a produce of previous leadership in HR and NOT the result of current leadership. That leadership has spent considerable effort trying to remedy these historic issues, much to his credit. This survey is clearly one of his efforts.
G	Recognition	1	Thank YOU!
G	Recognition	1	As I took this survey, I realized I don't have much experience or contact with HR, so much was 3=neutral. However, although my personal contacts with HR have been great, the generic communication about open enrollment, domestic partnership enrollment, and a couple of other things has been something I perceive as poor in comparison to other places I've worked since 1985. I love you PERSONALLY - but feel very disconnected from your role in the university.
G	Recognition	1	I am fairly new and most of these issues have never been needed or addressed. Thank you for all you have to help me become acclimated to the university.
G	Recognition	1	I believe the Division of Human Resources has improved greatly during the past few years. Employees have been much more helpful and responsive.
G	Recognition	1	I have little experience with the division other than programs held for search committee chairs over the years. I can say that such programs are much better now than they were, say, 15 years ago.
G	Recognition	1	I have not had a lot of interaction with HR. However, every time I have had a question or concern, HR has been very helpful. Our compensation packages at KSU rival other organizations. **Thanks for all of your hard work.**
G	Recognition	1	I would like to make special mention of Sheba Marshall, who has been very helpful to me on a couple of occasions. I previously worked at Kent State and returned in 2008. I have seen a definite improvement in HR staff attitude and service since my previous employment experience here.
G	Recognition	1	I've experienced only good, helpful HR employees in my time here. I think the turtle-paced processes and lack of career tracks are a huge detrimental to the university - not the people.
G	Recognition	1	My limited interaction with HR has always been positive and helpful. I use the web site quite often. Our benefits package is GREAT.....thank you!
G	Recognition	1	Thank you for all you do! HR has helped me from Day One and continues to provide the professional support I need.
G	Recognition	1	The PAYROLL SECTION is IMPOSSIBLE to get hold of by phone (or e-mail) and when questions are posed there is never sufficient follow-up. They hide behind unaswered phones and a web interface that cannot ever answer specific answers for an individual's pay questions. This is a problem area within **what is, I think, a gem of a Human Resurces Network at KS**U. Try this test .. call PAYROLL from OUTSIDE the university without using your knowledge of specific people's extensions. You'll NEVER even get to a person to be able to pose a question and unless you pull rank with a title/name that is instantly recognized at KSU your message will go unanswered. It's entirely unclear why they're so unresponsive.
G	Recognition	1	Under VP Willis Walker, The "HR-Division" is very efficient and effective to all personnels and employees at Kent State University
G	Recognition	1	I think the Human Resources Division has an enormous on-going challenge handling the many needs of a very large work force. I think they do an amazing job! They have helped me in many ways over the years and I'd like to thank them for their professionalism and personal attention to the different concerns I've had. **KSU is well served by this professional department!**
G	Recognition	1	Karen Watson and Vanessa Vesely have been tremendously helpful to me in resolving employee problems and assisting with employee reclassification. Jerusha Kelson was highly professional and very helpful in the one hearing she conducted for one of my employees.
G	Recognition	1	Kent State University "HR-Division" currently well organized and very efficient and under full-complience of federal and state of policies, rules and regulation. VP-Human Resources (under general councel Willis Walker and his team) provides the best organized services to KSU environment
G	Recognition	1	Thank you for your openness and willingness to receive third party comments.
G	Recognition	1	The staff I've worked with in the past have always been friendly and willing to help me with my issues.
G	Recognition	1	However, there are several employees including Mary Jane Hannahs, Barb Casher, and Joe Vitale that are respected within the division.
G	Recognition	1	HRD is doing a great job. Tx...

G	Recognition	1	I would also like to compliment your Training Team for providing interesting growth opportunites for KSU staff. The Training Staff seems to be a perfect example of teamwork and appears to genuinely support the personal development of KSU's employees. Being fairly new to KSU, I'm not yet sure what the "effect" of this training will be or if it will actually result in any new opportunities within the University or not.
G	Recognition	1	Good Job!
G	Recognition	1	I appreciate the Impact program and my family and I have found very useful resources through it. When going through department mediation I felt umbuds person had already developed an opinion of the situations and I was not given equal amount of "sounding" time or opportunity to show my side of the situation.
G	Recognition	1	I feel strongly thar HR has been work very hard tothe needs of the University. They are more felxibile and willing to work with Depatments and Divisions more than ever.
G	Recognition	1	Again this is a much more friendly Department in the last couple of years. They are much of a service and support unit now than ever before.
G	Recognition	1	Human Resources is doing a good job, in the broad scope of their responsibilities. Like most areas of the University community, the human resource of their department is stretched thin. Sometimes it is better to concentrate on the basic responsibilities and wait to add new dynamics such as organizational culture, which I am not sure what this means, until times when the resources are better.
G	Recognition	1	Human Resources' services have improved considerably during the last two years. It is in the forefront of leading strategic change in the University community. As a University stakeholder, I am proud and appreciative of the role that Human Resources played in helping the University to weather the current economic crisis by facilitating prudent people-oriented decisions that did not result in layoffs and/or reduced employee pay.
G	Recognition	1	I have had limited need to contact Human Resources for personal issues since I have been at KSU, but have been satisfied with the service I have received.
G	Recognition	1	As a new employee, my overall experience with Human Resources has been positive. When trying to get my benefits in order, I did have difficulty connecting with the staff member I needed, but I attribute that to them being really busy rather than a flaw in the system.
G	Recognition	1	I have always had a good working relationship with HR.
G	Recognition	1	The Human Resource staff is exceptional! Whenever I have a question or concern and need to contact them, they graciously assist me and never make me feel like I'm bothering them. Marlo Kibler has to be one of the BEST HR people I've ever met! I worked for HR in manufacturing and they could take lessons from her as to how to treat and talk with people. We are extremely fortunate to have the HR staff we have and I couldn't say enough about how wonderful they are!
G	Recognition	1	They are all uniformly polite. Most are cooperative and want to be helpful.
G	Suggestion	0	Graduate Teaching Assistants are also employees at KSU. Their needs seem oddly caught in the middle of Human Resources & Graduate Studies. They are students and instructors, carrying sometimes up to 3 classes.
G	Suggestion	0	I wish there were more programs to help non-manager employees increase their performance. The only events that are ever offered are for managers. Also I wish we could conduct searches for new employees in our department as opposed to just hiring people - it becomes frustrating when we settle for a candidate. I often find that HR is not connected with the HR needs of the advising staff. We work hard to increase student retention and are always blamed when things do not go right - we get little recognition for what we do.
G	Suggestion	0	It seems that the Independent Contractor Determination Forms add an awful lot of work and time when it comes to routine services. Is there a way they could be implemented categorically rather than individually--e.g., one form for an entire year that covers the service that all of the individuals provide?
G	Suggestion	0	A minor comment only- I suggest that HR revise the standard position posting for "12 month contract" positions. This term is confusing to people coming from the private sector. Many assume the job is a 12 month TERM position and so don't apply thinking the job will be eliminated in 12 months. I have to clarify this in nearly every interview I do. I wonder how many solid candidates do not even apply to KSU because they think these positions are temporary.

G	Suggestion	0	As a six year employee of the university, I think the HR department should integrate into IS further. While statistically, some of the numbers appear appropriate, I don't see management being graded/measured with the criteria in the very survey I am working on. I think measurable, objective management team criteria should be defined and used as a guide to determining effectiveness and that personnel in leadership positions are living up to or meeting the expectations of the institution. To develop and maintain the KSU work culture, you have to reinforce, recognize and encourage the behaviors we want to see, and train away from behaviors we do not want to see.
G	Suggestion	0	dept head makes decision about not hiring needed staff so that remaining employees are not required to work overtime shifts to make up for less staff. hr should be another voice in this type of matter.
G	Suggestion	0	Classified staff should be required to fill-out the comment sectionof the performance evaluation. At this time that is not required and does not help managers understand underlying issues as there are not comments on what the employee's views are.
G	Suggestion	0	I would like to see HR make it easier at the end-of-the-year when Benefits are renewed. If there is no change in benefits, it should not be necessary for the domestic partnership certification be completed again and again, if there is no change in the partnership. It clearly states in the certification that false declaration or failure to notify the University in a timely manner of a dissolution constitutes fraud and can result in damages and/or termination. I find it invasive that I have to give property tax, checking and beneficiary information to HR every year and I don't like the fact that when I renew that the former information that I provided is not returned to me. I have not idea where you are putting this information, who is accessing it and how it will be disposed of when you get 10-15 years of the same documents.
G	Suggestion	0	My feeling is that Human Resources is staffed by dedicated hard-working people who need more staff. It is evident that everyone in that department is very busy. I think they could operate more efficiently if they added more staff.
G	Suggestion	0	My main suggestion would be that there is a lack of a path for me to advance. I feel stuck at the level where I am currently working. I feel stifled because I can't see how to apply my strengths to my job. I feel that the job I've been working at for ten years has limited my ability to branch out within the university and apply my skills in a new area. I'd like to have more options, I guess.
G	timeliness	0	I suspect that most HR staff is spread too thin.
G	timeliness	-1	My frustration is the time is takes to get an answer to a question. Often times I have to follow up several times before I get an answer.
G	timeliness	-1	The people at the Human Resources Division are very good at transferring my calls to voicemails of people who never reply back and, apparently, have the answers that I need to my questions.
G	timeliness	-1	The website is informative....ONCE you find what you are looking for. The staff respond to inquiries...but sometimes a couple of days can pass before you get your answers. The application process is not user friendly for applicants. the applications that a search committee receive are confusing (I believe this is a "print command" issue) There are not enough "staff only" events/communications
G	timeliness	-1	They are too slow to respond, too ineffective and senior staff is unethical.
G	timeliness	-1	When I call with questions, I never get an answer. The person is usually out of the office and anyone who answers the phone cannot answer any questions, even simple ones.
G	timeliness	-1	My biggest complaints come from messages left and not returned. I am left to pursue other avenues to get the answers needed to move forward. Affirmative Action should pay all bills directly from their budget for services offered from Disability Services. I have been burned and never was reimbursed for Interpreters charged to my school for a faculty search. Not even the direct supervisor addressed the matter. Understood that all monies are university monies but the process is not a good one. Double bookkeeping in this institution is ridiculous and such a time waste. It is not a clean way to handle independent budgets. I have had problems all over this area to receive phone calls back, emails answered, etc. Job performance in this area should absolutely be addressed and those with authority made accountable.

			With a division that should be built on a customer service base, HR has always appeared to be unfriendly. I must admit that when I have been able to work with individuals face to face, I realize there are wonderful employees in HR that are just trying to do their best, but work with someone over the phone or leave a message or send an email and more times than not it won't be answered and/or the person will be very unfriendly. I'm told it's because they are under staffed. Well the whole University is understaffed and we are all dealing with that but we are NOT all reacting that way. For example, I called records on Tuesday concerning a part time employees pay for the Thanksgiving holiday, and she still hasn't called me back 4 days later! The next day is too late for payroll and she is aware of that - or she should be! Thank you for letting me get just a little of my chest.
G	timeliness	-1	
G	timeliness	-1	Employees of the Division of Human Resources do not follow up with you regarding your questions and concerns.
G	timeliness	-1	Many times my emails or phone calls have not been returned. At times phones are not answered. Benefits needs to respond to questions regarding new benefits - they have not.
G	timeliness	-1	Some people return phone calls emails and other in HR never return calls or emails. I left 3 messages and an email for HR and to this day never received a call back. So I joined a program somewhere else instead of KSU because I never received and call back. Hopefully you would have a receptionist with pleasant voice.
G	timeliness	-1	The issue I have with HR is the availability of staff when I have a question. Often times, I have called and couldn't leave a voicemail because voicemail boxes are full. Sometimes I have called and left a voicemail and haven't gotten a return call. While I certainly appreciate the huge responsibility the HR department has, I think some additional improvement to employee response is needed
G	timeliness	-1	The lack of response to "called-in" valid questions is indeed appalling!
G	timeliness	-1	When I've called over to talk to a person at Human Resorces, I have got a call back after several days.
G	timeliness	-1	In order to improve the performance of HR, I feel they need to be more timely in following up with phone calls and emails. There are times when I have to follow up 2 or 3 times to get an answer. There are times when I call and the voicemail is full so you cannot leave a message. The time frame for the hiring process needs to be improved.
G	timeliness	-1	No one ever answers their phone. You always have to leave a message or several messages and you still don't get a phone call back. It can take days to get through to someone, even by e-mail.
G	timeliness	-1	The receptionists should be somewhat knowledgeable of Human Resources basic questions. Often, they pass calls off to one person, who passes off to another person, who passes off to another person without questions being answered or information shared. The turnaround time for messages/emails to be returned is typically (in my experience) more than 2 business days which is not helpful when it is needed and sometimes calls/emails are not even responded to at all. It may be helpful to create a listing of duties that each unit within HR is responsible for as it is not always intuitive as to who handles what and that contributes to the 'run around' that I perceive HR provides to me as an employee of KSU dealing with HR/Benefit related items for my department. When issues are resolved, it's a wonderful feeling, but it's almost as if expectations are lowered so if an issue is resolved within one week it is a success. There are some very knowledgeable and capable staff members at HR, but with the 'run around' that is usually the first experience, it's easy to have a negative view of the entire department which is not the way things should be. Front lines (e.g. receptionists) with more information may help eliminate this perception.
G	timeliness	-1	I have called about different situations and have to call back. I know everyone is busy, but that also incudes me. It is frustrating not to get an issue resolved within a timely manner.
G	timeliness	-1	I don't feel that the H/R office at Kent-Stark has the answers we need or gives us timely answers. I am assuming they have to get their feedback from the Kent Campus but within the last year or so there has been numerous time where we have waited a lengthy amout of time for an answer or have to push for it. In my opnion that office should be our first stop, especially on some things, but it doesn't seem to be a good, timely answer. The people working in the office are great, no problem with that.
G	timeliness	-1	I think Human Resources over all can be a helpful place. However, they seem to be rather difficult to get a hold of. In the past I've left a lot of emails or voice mails and never received a response. Once I finally got to a person they were usually very helpful. But I had to work really hard to get to that point...

G	timeliness	-1	My biggest complaint, and what I hear many people say is that nobody is ever available at human resorces. Voice mails are returned, but sometimes too late to be of help.
G	timeliness	-1	KSU is a great place to work overall. Where I answered less than "Strongly Agree" it is ONLY because the staffing has been cut so much that the few remaining employees can't meet the needs of so many employees in a timely manner. When I do get assistance, it is courteous, knowledgeable and pleasant. But I usually have to wait and/or request information several times. HR works very hard, is very helpful, but they are over taxed and it shows. Thanks for asking.
G	timeliness	-1	Overall I am satisfied with the Human Resource staff. The biggest issue is calling and having to leave voicemail, and the response time between.
G	timeliness	-1	HR is a strong team with very knowledgable individuals. Due to the volume, I believe the department would be more effective if additional assistance would be provided to them. The lack of assistance to administrators can cause lengthy delays with the process. I think the University would be better served if additional assistance was provided to HR.
G	timeliness	-1	Receptionists listen well and transfer my phone call, but I almost never get a live person even after several attempts.
G	website	1	Pleased to find many of the forms I need available online.
G	website	0	HR could use a cleaner website. Also, I would suggest that a greater effort be made to recruit a more diverse workforce, but that is often difficult in this part of Ohio.
G	website	0	Web sight layout / interface could be improved.
G	website	0	would be very helpful to add a "who to contact with this type of question" feature to the WWW site
G	website	-1	I have heard prospective employees have issues with filling out the on-line application and attaching items.
G	website	-1	Finally, I do have some difficulty navigating the HR web pages to find what I need. I have had difficulty finding professional development opportunities and information such as payroll schedule. Forms, on the other hand, are easy to locate.
G	website	-1	The website is clumsy and not helpful. Open enrollment is communicated via electronic sources--some face to face meetings are held on the Regional Campuses but only on one day--many facult have split assignments like myself and cannot meet on that day.
G	website	-1	The 'jobs' web site is confusing and cumbersome. It never takes you directly to the job ad of interest (via a link), but makes you search all over through various fields to get back to what you are searching for.
G	website	-1	The FlashLine interface is disastrously bad and the process for signing up for benefits is both painful from an interface perspective and far too onerous to try to figure out the best benefits package.
G	website	-1	The on-line application process is not as user friendly as I feel it should be. To add a most recent employer to the application, I have found that entire section of the application must be deleted and started fresh to include the most recent position held. Very time consuming.
G	website	-1	The website is not always user friendly and it's hard to get the right person without being transferred several times.
G	website	-1	The website is very confusing. It is hard to get the information I need in two clicks or less.
G	website	-1	I think the job link on the KSU home page is not easy to find for persons seeking employment at Kent State. It should be more prominent on the page.
G	website	-1	The HR website has all of the pertinent information an employee needs and a manager needs, but it is difficult to navigate and the format is cumbersome. This is particulalry true for the time off submission and approval process where the information could easily fit on one screen, but requires constant scrolling and flipping to a second page.
G	website	-1	Re: the HR website - I eventually find what I'm looking for there, but a lot of the links don't work. Re: this survey - I answered a lot of questions with neither agree nor disagree, when a better answer would have been not applicable - it would have been something I've never had cause to use.
G	website	-1	The time reporting web app is worse than trash. It is a pain to use.

G	website	-1	While the information given during open enrollment was usfull, the web app that you is crap. It is clunky, ugly, and a real pain to have to use. Please use a better interface, everyone and their brother knows that you are able to do this with the system we use.
G	website	-1	The online employment tool needs work. It is not reliable when printing out applications and resumes for searches. Changes need to be made to how and when "regrets" letters are sent out to those who are not interviewed at all. This shouln't wait until the end of the search! In general, the entire tool should be upgraded and improved.
G	website	-1	the HR website is terrible and hard to navigate. HR needs to offer more face to face training at the regional campuses.
G	website	-1	It is difficult to find information on the website/flashline. It's hard to know whether information will be on the myHR page or on Flashline.
G	website	-1	Re: the HR website - I eventually find what I'm looking for there, but a lot of the links don't work. Re: this survey - I answered a lot of questions with neither agree nor disagree, when a better answer would have been not applicable - it would have been

Detailed Results for Affirmative Action

Affirmative Action	Overall Mean
25. The Affirmative Action staff is knowledgeable about compliance-related matters (complying with Equal Employment laws and regulations).	2.65
26. The Affirmative Action staff is helpful in bringing diverse employees to Kent State.	2.74
24. The Affirmative Action staff responds to affirmative action issues in a timely manner.	2.90
27. The Affirmative Action staff processes discrimination-related complaints and investigations in a timely manner.	2.91
Total (Average across all items)	**2.79**

Item Number	Overall Mean	HR Mean	Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree and ending with 5 = Strongly Disagree with the mid-range at a 3.							
			IS	IA	UR&D	Reg	EM&SA	Prov	Pres	B&F
25	2.65	2.06	2.53	2.53	2.54	2.52	2.65	2.63	2.69	2.94
26	2.74	2.22	2.50	2.63	2.38	2.66	2.63	2.79	2.92	2.90
24	2.90	2.50	2.65	2.71	2.67	2.80	2.86	2.92	2.92	3.09
27	2.91	2.53	2.76	2.81	3.00	2.79	2.81	2.94	3.00	3.03
Mean	**2.79**	**2.33**	**2.59**	**2.61**	**2.61**	**2.67**	**2.72**	**2.83**	**2.88**	**3.00**

AA	Fairness	-1	Affirmative Action is one-sided period.
AA	fairness	-1	Kent State has falsified Affirmative Action records in order to cover up a pattern of ignoring legitimate and documented discrimination. The person who complained was retaliated against.
AA	fairness	-1	Diversity appears to be synonymous with African American. Even at that, we do not have a homogenized distribution of Af. Am. They are clustered in groups such as Upward Bound, Human Resources and previously the Aids grant. Remember Sex, Age and Religion are also the basis for protected classes that need to be encouraged.
AA	Suggestion	0	HR could use a cleaner website. Also, I would suggest that a greater effort be made to recruit a more diverse workforce, but that is often difficult in this part of Ohio.
AA	timeliness	-1	There are issues in our department that employee relations and affirmative action should have handled and did not this year. In the past these were handled better. Recruiting and emp secialist have been outstanding this year, along with records. Benefits are hard to get a hold of, and I am always leaving voice messages. Sometimes it takes a few days before they return phone calls. Training for management is good. The need for Office training is not. We should have hands on training for employees. I personnally trained a few in our department in some areas. A series of excell, word, power point, and publisher are needed. Several people paid for outside classes to learn pivot tables is one example. This would be a vital tool during reviews.

Detailed Results for Benefits

Benefits	Overall Mean
09. Kent State provides benefits that are about the same as, or better than, what other organizations provide.	2.09
06. The Benefits staff is knowledgeable about Kent State's benefits programs.	2.26
07. The Benefits staff effectively runs the process for open enrollment in benefits programs.	2.38
10. The Benefits staff provides me with clear information about benefits programs.	2.47
04. The Benefits staff is accessible when I need them.	2.64
05. The Benefits staff resolves benefits issues in a timely manner.	2.67
08. The Benefits staff effectively processes leaves of absence.	2.70
Total (Average across all items)	**2.45**

Item Number	Overall Mean	HR Mean		Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree and ending with 5 = Strongly Disagree with the mid-range at a 3.							
				IS	IA	Reg	UR&D	Pres	Prov	EM&SA	B&F
9	2.09	1.50		1.83	1.74	1.94	1.63	1.79	2.19	2.14	2.09
6	2.26	1.63		2.00	2.11	2.15	2.25	2.07	2.22	2.41	2.51
7	2.38	1.61		2.09	2.00	2.20	2.38	2.36	2.45	2.48	2.40
10	2.47	1.63		2.20	2.37	2.32	2.25	2.43	2.52	2.56	2.53
4	2.64	2.32		2.29	2.33	2.56	2.88	2.57	2.62	2.75	2.89
5	2.67	2.11		2.31	2.53	2.54	2.81	2.79	2.60	2.85	2.98
8	2.70	2.17		2.59	2.68	2.61	2.25	2.71	2.78	2.60	2.72
Mean	**2.45**	**1.85**		**2.18**	**2.25**	**2.33**	**2.35**	**2.39**	**2.47**	**2.54**	**2.59**

B	Awareness	0	I think that there needs to be better communication from H.R. to the employees about benefits/programs/etc.that Kent State offers to it's employees.
B	Awareness	0	I have not had very much contact with the Human Resource Dept. I do expect to be in contact in the near furture, I expect to be signing up for classes for fall 2010. There was one question I was concerned about, I was sure or told what the policy is for funeral leave. I took the days off for my Dad's funeral but really didn't know what I was legally allowed. At that time I was to upset to really check it out, but was told by a co-worker that I could have taken 5 days. Is that true?
B	DENTAL	-1	Concerning the Benefits information, the change in the dental plan was very confusing, and it was not clear whether the form sent needed to be filled out by everyone. I advised others in my office that only those signing up for the DHMO needed to complete the form. I hope that was the correct information.
B	DENTAL	-1	I am very disappointed with the switch from Aetna to DeltaCare DMO. The selection of dentists in this area is horrible. This is the most affordable plan for an employee who has a family and there are no dentists in Portage County on the list. I feel this is discrimination towards employees with families. Secondly, we were not informed of the switch until we were doing open enrollment. If an employee did not read the booklet carefully and did not look at their selection during the open enrollment process carefully, they may not have even noticed with switch. I have coworkers who did not realize they no longer will have Aetna dental insurance until someone told them. This is very poor communication. Finally, the information on Delta Dental's website was confusing as to who was covered under the DMO. After open enrollment we received communication that we had to choose a dentist with a link to the pdf file that listed covered dentists. It was then that I realized my dentist was not covered even though it had appeared they were covered under the DMO on Delta Care's website. I will not be choosing this plan again next year.
B	DENTAL	-1	The new Dental benefits that KSU has shoved down our throats are a disgrace and have left me without proper dental care, when I was assured by HR that the $5 a pay dental coverage was the same as Aetna--IT WAS NOT and IS NOT the same coverage and not ONE dentist in Portage County accepts it because it is worse than welfare coverage. I find it appauling that a state university offers dental coverage to employees that is worse than a welfare plan that no dentist will accept except a mall dentist because they can't survive in private practice because they have such poor skills--and the only way to get the proper dental insurance now is to pay $50 a month for it when I use to pay $10. In addition, I called before open enrollment about this and was told oh it's the same coverage and also that our medical contributions were not going up because of the audit HR did and that it save the university alot of money, only to find out one week later that the medical contributions that we pay did go up after being lied to by HR that they weren't going up. My 2 or 3 percent raise has been eate
B	DENTAL	-1	The change to a new dental provider caused some confusion. My present provider, American Dental Centers, was not listed on the provider list, and there were none in Portage County, so I chose a provider in Stow. I was told that this is in the process of being rectified. Another employee said she chose American Dental Center as her provider. I understand I can change back to ADC, but would not have changed if they had been listed.
B	DENTAL	-1	The new dental plan situation has been disheartening, confusing, aggravating, unnecessarily complicated, and disappointing. To not have a covered dentist in Portage county and the options limited to dentists who are primarily linked to national chains is unacceptable. Questions have led to the impression that HR has/had no idea what the situation actually is. Statements that "nothing has changed" and the 2010 plan is the "same" are, intentionally or not, misleading. The whole situation has been mismanaged and incompetently handled.
B	Effectiveness	-1	I mostly use this division to seek out information about health care benefits. I really do not find the staff to be very helpful. They push any issues onto the provider--which is the problem to begin with. I have a neighbor who works at YSU and was the sole person handling benefits for all staff and faculty-- a staff of one with one assistant. She is always trouble shooting for faculty and seeking out information for them. I do not see that kind of service given to this faculty from this division.
B	Effectiveness	-1	I try to avoid EVER contacting Staff Benefits because it is so completely frustrating. Unfortunately I had a surgery and a non paid faculty leave, so I have had to talk to them. Then I had a major error in my paycheck that is still not corrected after 3 months! Receptionist on the phone is shockingly rude. It's almost impossible to get a benefits office person "live." Emails go unanswered. Phone calls go unreturned. Case details have to be repeated to everyone you DO get on the phone, as it seems no information is shared. The communication between Staff Benefits and Faculty Personnel seems to be a big problem. I tremendously appreciate the benefits I have at KSU, but when I need to actually use them, or ask a question, it is infuriating. It's known on campus that you do everything you can to avoid having to deal with people in Staff Benefits.
B	Effectiveness	-1	I understand some of the benefits staff serve all campuses and are not always at the Kent campus and that is why they are not always available when I call. That is why I answered some of my questions the way I did. It's not really their fault.
B	Effectiveness	-1	Medical information has been a real problem.....you need to get the "right person..........who cares about your problems".

B	Effectiveness	-1	Some health insurance premiums went up more than 50% for next year. While I understand that 20% of this is due to changes in the employee share of costs, how does the rest add up to 50% from two years of increases. The individual rates went up more more than family. Why? Note that I am not complaining about the increase in rates. I'm wondering why there has been no communication to explain the reasons for this large increase, particularly given the story in the Stater a couple of months ago in which HR personnel were quoted as saying the actual increase in health care costs over the past year was a manageable 6%.
B	Recognition	1	Bob Hall and Renee Romine are wonderful trainers. All the folks in Benefits have been extremely patient and helpful when I have called with questions or concerns.
B	Recognition	1	Compensation and benefits staff and responsiveness to inquiries are outstanding!
B	Recognition	1	I appreciate the benefits and support the university gives its staff and the support HR gives to those who contact them.
B	Recognition	1	I work at one of the non-Kent campuses. HR is almost invisible here. Programs are all on the Kent campus. I have only twice had occassion to relate to HR: a very good experience with benefits, and a bad experience while on a hiring committee. Not enough contact to provide relevant survey information.
B	Recognition	1	I would like to make special mention of Sheba Marshall, who has been very helpful to me on a couple of occasions. I previously worked at Kent State and returned in 2008. I have seen a definite improvement in HR staff attitude and service since my previous employment experience here.
B	Recognition	1	My limited interaction with HR has always been positive and helpful. I use the web site quite often. Our benefits package is GREAT.....thank you!
B	Recognition	1	The Benefits staff was immensely helpful and accessible when I was a new employee here last year.
B	Recognition	1	The benefits staff does a fantastic job! They are always busy and yet provide quality customer service on an individual basis.
B	Recognition	1	Based on my experiences, the benefits group and the training folks are the Division of Human Resources's strongest performers.
B	Recognition	1	As a new employee I found the benefits staff exceptionally responsive and very attentive, energetic, and creative in helping me resolve problems.
B	Recognition	1	I truly appreciate benefits staff visiting regional campuses to share information such as that for benefits enrollment.
B	Recognition	1	The Human Resource staff is exceptional! Whenever I have a question or concern and need to contact them, they graciously assist me and never make me feel like I'm bothering them. Marlo Kibler has to be one of the BEST HR people I've ever met! I worked for HR in manufacturing and they could take lessons from her as to how to treat and talk with people. We are extremely fortunate to have the HR staff we have and I couldn't say enough about how wonderful they are!
B	Suggestion	0	Employees not notified when vacation accrual is near maximum. Employees loose time!
B	Suggestion	-1	Through an "oversight" on the part of Human Resources or payroll, I'm not sure who, I lost 62.22 hours of vacation because I was not notified that I needed to use it or lose it. With the majority of departments "short staffed", maybe the maximum hours allowed to be carried over needs to be increased or at least notify staff members that are maxing out earlier in the year so that they are able to use the vacation time or donate it to someone who needs it.....early June maybe?
B	Suggestion	-1	Human Resources should review the way unclassified employees log vacation and sick time. Currently these employees are on the honor system, essentially free to take time off time without entering it in Banner for approval. Supervisors approve time off only if it is actually entered in the system. Sick leave and vacation accruals that are not drawn down continue to grow for these employees, while classified employees are required by Kronos to account for every 15 minutes of time on a schedule based on pre-set log-in and -out parameters. This situtation creates a disparity in the way unclassified and classified employees are allowed to utilize sick leave and vacation benefits. I would propose this suggestion: provide some kind of real accountablility for unclassified employees that would eliminate the opportunity to by-pass the logging of sick leave and vacation time. Thanks for considering my concern.
B	timeliness	-1	When i went on maternity leave it was difficult to find info regarding the leave, the processing was delayed and the leave was entered incorrectly. It was a frustrating matter.

B	timeliness	-1	In general it seems as if there is a shortage of staff and clear communication needed to manage employee issues in an effective manor. I never receive any type of confirmation from HR when donating time (if it is received or used) or utilizing one of their services. When I was dealing with a serious family illness and needed to take FMLA leave, it took weeks to even receive responses from staff. I had to call and email numerous times to receive confirmation of my request. I was given incorrect information and sent paperwork to the wrong place, prolonging the resolution.
B	timeliness	-1	My interaction with Benefits has been very negative. Although the staff is friendly, they handled my problems poorly and, in effect, made mistakes, almost costing me thousands of dollars, that I had to spend hours on to get cleared up. Although they admitted to their mistake, it took too long to get resolved.
B	timeliness	-1	Once employees are hired in, they have very little interaction with Human Resources unless they need something. Human Resources tends to be low-profile from the employee point-of-view. Also the Benefits department is slow in responding and doesn't always follow through. I've waited days or weeks for correspondence or phone calls to be answered. Every time I call, the person I'm dealing with is out of the office. This can be frustrating! Most of my experience with H/R was during my interviewing and hiring phase and I was treated well and very appreciative of the great attitudes there and during Orientation training! Thank you!
B	timeliness	-1	Our experience with trying to contact employee benefits about health care has been terrible. People don't call back and don't have answers if they do.
B	timeliness	-1	The benefits dept need more help. I think their lack of response to issues is due to their workload. More employees should be hired in this department to get the job done sufficiently.
B	timeliness	-1	The staff benefits office is understaffed and does not respond to questions in a timely manner. I had problems with open enrollment..could not select the health insurance I wanted and couldn't get help...no response. Also I didn't get the dental provider I wanted but enrollment was closed. There is not even a dental provider in the county we work in! The domestic partner benefits process is degrading and discriminatory...and you have to "recertify" every year.,...do married couples have to prove they are still married every year? The staff even sent an e-mail that disclosed the identities of all with domestic partner benefits to everyone that has them. This was a violation of HIPPA! The Flexible Spending Accounts company is a joke. They audited me and prevented me from continuing to use my card even though I faxed them the relevant information. I lost a few hundred dollars on that fiasco. Although I'm sure HR staff would have helped me with it, it would be best if they hired a good company in the first place since my time is valuable and I don't want to spend it in HR trying to reconcilel with the FSA benefit company. The experiences I have had with Affirmative Action have also been negative. They did not respond in a timely manner to a bogus complaint against me....never interviewing me or investigating the complaint. It was eventually dropped but receiving the paperwork on this and not being able to even give my side of the situation was stressful. The Job Opp site is hard to use. I have a friend that is a career coach and the clients she has referred to the site have found it extremely hard to use. KSU overall is a great place to work, but some of these offices really need to get with it or KSU will lose its reputation as a great place to work. Of all the HR offices, staff benefits is the worst. If they are understaffed, give them more help!
B	timeliness	-1	There are only a handful of people who are responsive in the HR department. Benefits can never be contacted on the first phone call and occasionally it takes a couple of phone calls and/or emails to talk to someone about a problem/question. Other areas of HR are much better than Benefits, but could stand a little improvement.
B	timeliness	-1	Very difficult to make appt to review benefits --too much phone tag. When I came in, sat it waiting room ignored for 1/2 hr. Most unimpressive.
B	timeliness	-1	When I submitted my Open enrollment form I wasn't sent a confirmation email. I received an email about 3 days later that I needed to submit my Open Enrollment selections. I emailed HR and was told that there was an error in the software and that you had indeed received my selection. Could you trouble shoot this before you send it out campus wide? I have a hard time receiveing calls back from HR when I leave a voice mail, especially with one person in particular (I won't name names).
B	timeliness	-1	Upon hire, my original benefits paperwork was lost. I had to resubmit at the last minute. Benefits staff is almost impossible to reach. For a simple question, I called Benefits & left a message. No one returned my call. I did this again. No one called back. I emailed Benefits in general & the staff person who had conducted my orientation. No one returned my email. Several weeks past with no response from anyone. I called the main number again & finally reached a person. She connected me with a staff person who told me that the info I had gotten on the website was several months out of date. She gave me the correct information. I called her back later with a follow up question. She never returned my call. No one in benefits ever apologizes for any mistakes no matter how major.

B	timeliness	-1	I have been trying to contact benefits about the new vision insurance for a month with no luck. I also think additional Banner training is necessary for HR personnel and HR needs to investigate and cooperate with other departments within the Banner system. For example, whether a position is a primary or secondary position will become critically important when going live with grant effort reporting. Also, why can't benefits be encumberred on grants? Why do benefits on deferred pay not deduct during the 9-month period? Last year, on the last day of open enrollment, I could not enroll due to a computer glitch of some kind. When I went to HR to register in person at 2pm, the staff member was just about to leave for the day. I do not think it is wise to have no coverage on a day when critical deadlines occur. Had I not been able to register in person, I would have been without insurance coverage for a year!
B	timeliness	-1	I rarely have the need to deal with HR in any way, but one of the last times (when the proof of dependency change was effective last year), I emailed twice to clarify and never received a response. I didn't feel that the need to provide documentation was clear in the benefit renewal process and I was questioning the letter received from Med. Mutual. If there is going to be an email account for contact, it should be monitored regularly and responses in a timely fashion.
B	timeliness	-1	Some phone messages never get responded to by Benefits staff.
B	timeliness	-1	Have had numerous past occassions of leaving numerous voicemail messages (Benefits, specifically FMLA-back in Feb 2009) and not getting responses BUT have seen improvement within the past months with this. Improvement with phones in general. Always getting "someone" to talk to and not going to voicemail! Great improvement on this.
B	timeliness	-1	I've had several bad experiences with Human Resources. The first was with filling out FMLA paperwork. The problem was HR kept losing it. I'd fill out another FMLA request and I'd get a call saying I can't make the request without the paperwork from the doctor etc. when, in fact, I already turned this in. I ended up keeping the originals and giving HR a copy. Then, every time they'd ask for it, I'd just give them another copy. Another issue I had was the time it took for my job promotion to get approved. I took my supervisor almost 4 years. My supervisor commented to me that in all the businesses he worked at he never had such a frustrating experience. I've been at KSU for over 20 years and I've seen this happen over and over. Someone is trying to get promoted. HR drags it out for so long that the person gets so frustrated they quit and then a replacement is hired at the job level the person was trying to get promoted to in the first place. A little ridiculous don't you think.
B	timeliness	-1	Make benifits more easily reachable and have them call people back. There has only been one time that I have not hung up the phone completely frustrated with HR.
B	timeliness	-1	I find the Benefits and Records Departments especially difficult to reach. When phone messages are left, I still don't expect a return phone call.
B	timeliness	-1	I have found it very difficult to reach HR staff with regard to questions about vacation/leave. It takes multiple calls and/or e-mails to receive a response. In particular, I am very frustrated by a situation in which a portion of my leave of absence wasn't properly recorded for nearly a year. Eight months after being assured that my vacation balance was correct, my vacation balance suddenly dropped by 120 hours! Had I known this was going to happen, I would have planned my year very differently! I was very disappointed by the response I received and the lack of accountability I witnessed. I realize mistakes happen, but I could not have been so nonchalant had I made such a huge mistake with a student! Also, I am baffled by the fact that pay ranges seem to be updated periodically, yet my pay is never adjusted accordingly. Despite my annual raises, it seems I can never move deeper into my pay grade. Thus, a new person will enter the University making only slightly less than someone in the same range with ten years' experience!

Detailed Results for Compensation

Compensation	Overall Mean
12. The Compensation staff is knowledgeable about Kent State's pay programs.	2.51
11. The Compensation staff is accessible when I need them.	2.64
15. The Compensation staff effectively communicates pay-related policies and processes.	2.76
16. The Compensation staff resolves pay-related issues in a timely manner.	2.77
13. The Compensation staff effectively processes position reviews/audits for reclassification requests.	2.96
14. The Compensation staff provides pay rates that are about the same as, or better than, pay rates at other organizations.	3.25
Total (Average across all items)	**2.81**

Item Number	Overall Mean	HR Mean	Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree and ending with 5 = Strongly Disagree with the mid-range at a 3.								
			IA	UR&D	EM&SA	Prov	Reg	IS	Pres	B&F
12	2.51	1.33	2.50	2.23	2.47	2.52	2.42	2.47	2.85	2.61
11	2.64	1.28	2.47	2.36	2.60	2.64	2.53	2.47	2.85	2.88
15	2.76	1.78	2.37	2.92	2.69	2.75	2.59	2.85	3.15	3.01
16	2.77	1.61	2.61	2.77	2.70	2.71	2.73	2.85	3.31	2.99
13	2.96	1.89	3.00	2.92	2.77	2.87	2.95	3.15	3.00	3.33
14	3.25	2.61	2.74	3.07	3.22	3.13	3.29	3.29	3.29	3.74
Mean	**2.81**	**1.75**	**2.59**	**2.71**	**2.73**	**2.76**	**2.76**	**2.85**	**3.11**	**3.11**

C	Effectiveness	-1	I am amazed at the LOW salary offered by Kent State. I did some research into a similar position at Tri-C and was dumbfounded to find that a COMMUNITY COLLEGE pays about 30% more for the same exact job I am doing at Kent State. That's really inexcusable.
C	Effectiveness	-1	My particular position has been asked to reclassified several times--it sat for a year with absolutely no resolution and was never processed to a higher grade. My department needs my skills in order to function, but since HR never reclassified my job, I am unable to perform numerous duties that would better serve the students, faculty and administration although in other departments jobs magically get upgraded without ever being reposted etc. I think this is ridiculous that my skills could serve the university better but cannot be utilitized because of HR never processing my reclassification several times.
C	Effectiveness	-1	payroll needs to be more efficient so less mistakes to employee checks are made
C	Effectiveness	-1	The process for rewarding outstanding effort and skills through pay increases seems designed to avoid doing so. Supervisors and managers should be able to increase salaries through a less cumbersome process than the PDQ.
C	Effectiveness	-1	I think the Affirmative Action Dept/EEO complaints are just for show at KSU. The Payroll dept is very helpful while the Benefits staff/Coordinator are sometimes curt and rude.
C	fairness	-1	In the last "by-out"; I'm learning that some staff were given approval to work another year and some where not. I feel it should have been all or none.
C	fairness	-1	With the conversion from paper to an electronic system at the university, including Banner, clerical staff has had to learn a multitude of new advanced skills that is not required by the average clerical person outside the university community. I believe the impact of the transition to an electronic system was shouldered by a large percentage of the clerical staff that needed to learn many new programs within a swift time frame to accomplish the required tasks. The clerical staff took on more responsibilities at a higher lever of expertise with no extra pay. I believe this inequality between the staff's knowledge and the pay scale needs to be addressed. As publicly stated, the university accomplished its goals with regards to higher enrollment. The President and faculty received well-deserved bonuses; however, staff did not receive any type of extra monetary bonus for the university's success. For the university to work together it needs to view its workforce as a wheel – all parts are important, no matter if you are the President, maintenance worker or secretary. I believe without one part of the wheel, say a spoke, the wheel keeps turning, but it is harder for the wheel to work. We are all important in the picture of success and this type of reward gives the impression that the efforts of some are more important and valued higher than others, even though all worked equally hard to help Kent State achieve its goals. I believe this needs to be reviewed.
C	fairness	-1	Certain positions here at kent state in the bargaining unit have not been updated since 1994. I disagree with the stores clerk pay grade as compaired to the delivery worker position as I do delivery workers duties also.
C	fairness	-1	HR does an adequate job of conveying KSU's organizational ideals, the work culture of the org generally falls short of stated ideals. Org change will not happen w/out real changes in fundamental policies and philosophies. Wide disparities exist in how policies are administered between depts, with regard to hiring processes, accountability and performance expectations. True incentives are scarce; some pockets of KSU have made some progress, but existing incentives are inconsistent, and truly significant job perf rewards are reserved for upper mgmt. Top execs should be eligible for such incentives, but extending such programs selectively is discouraging and inequitable for the majority of frontline employees working just as hard on the org's behalf. Accountability is a major issue. Key positions are often arbitrarily filled, while responsible managers are often required to jump through hoops to justify their frontline hiring decisions. HR lacks sufficient personnel resources to make real progress changing the work culture of an org of ~4,500 employees. Rank and file hears the President's msg ("year of yes")and tries to embrace it, but frequently face administrative obstacles when they try to implement real change ("not how we do things here"). Mid and upper mgmt need to accept that real org change requires their commitment vs lip service.
C	fairness	-1	However, I feel that position titles and pay rates unfairly disadvantage regional campus employees. There are some job titles that are not allowed to be used on regional campuses even though employees are fulfilling the requirements of that job and more.

C	fairness	-1	Some of my concerns may not have answers: 1) there is a perception that what we are paid by KSU is much lower than the private market. It would be interesting to know what some of us would make in the private market - we might be surprised at what we are "not" worth; yet if it is true, why can we not work to increase pay levels to fair market? 2) I sometimes feel frustrated because I feel pidgeon holed in my position with no career ladder available and don't know what to do to be considered for promotions. How does one get noticed? 3) Get frustrated when you see the beginning, middle and high end of pay ranges - why can we not be better compensated within the positions we work in so we don't have to move or leave to make better pay?
C	Recognition	1	Compensation and benefits staff and responsiveness to inquiries are outstanding!
C	Suggestion	0	I believe it should be easier for classified staff to be re-classified so that they may be compensated fairly for all they do.
C	timeliness	-1	I've been waiting for a contract since the beginning of the school year and to date am still working under my old contract. There is speculation that I and my coworkers will be moved to a different contract but we've heard nothing from the provost office. I don't know if this is related to HR or not.
C	timeliness	-1	The PAYROLL SECTION is IMPOSSIBLE to get hold of by phone (or e-mail) and when questions are posed there is never sufficient follow-up. They hide behind unaswered phones and a web interface that cannot ever answer specific answers for an individual's pay questions. This is a problem area within what is, I think, a gem of a Human Resources Network at KSU. Try this test .. call PAYROLL from OUTSIDE the university without using your knowledge of specific people's extensions. You'll NEVER even get to a person to be able to pose a question and unless you pull rank with a title/name that is instantly recognized at KSU your message will go unanswered. It's entirely unclear why they're so unresponsive.
C	timeliness	-1	The processes for reclassification/pay rate changes are extremely difficult and take a long period of time. It is ridiculous that it takes over a year for a reclassification to be processed. In addition, it is nearly impossible to get promoted within the organization. The employees that do a good job and try to advance are put through a rigorous interviewing & application process and should be rewarded for past performance.
C	timeliness	-1	Have had several incidents with payroll not getting paperwork from HR on temp and new employees in a timely manner.

Detailed Results for Employee Relations

Employee Relations	Overall Mean
20. The Employee Relations staff is accessible when I need them.	2.63
21. The Employee Relations staff responds to issues in a timely manner.	2.71
22. The Employee Relations staff supports improved teamwork within departments at Kent State.	2.95
23. The Employee Relations staff provides employee rewards and recognition programs that are meaningful to me.	3.18
Total (Average across all items)	**2.87**

Item Number	Overall Mean	HR Mean	Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree and ending with 5 = Strongly Disagree with the mid-range at a 3.							
			IA	Pres	UR&D	IS	Prov	EM&SA	Reg	B&F
20	2.63	1.83	2.21	2.64	2.64	2.55	2.62	2.65	2.50	2.88
21	2.71	1.83	2.42	2.64	2.85	2.62	2.67	2.70	2.69	3.00
22	2.95	1.83	2.68	2.85	2.92	2.97	2.93	2.89	2.84	3.24
23	3.18	1.94	3.05	3.00	2.54	3.14	3.14	3.10	3.30	3.41
Mean	**2.87**	**1.85**	**2.59**	**2.78**	**2.78**	**2.80**	**2.84**	**2.84**	**2.85**	**3.13**

ER	Effectiveness	-1	The staff ombudsman is not effective in that role. Her actions do not indicate support for the staff member. Some of her verbal comments to staff could reasonably be interpreted as inappropriate.
ER	fairness	-1	There are major discrepancies between classified and unclassified "rights". Hourly employees in our department are treated like second class citizens. Educational/training opportunities are encouraged based on ethnic background not an employee's desire or ability. Hourly employee concerns regarding personnel issues have been squelched with "supervisor has the right to refuse to meet with ombudsman." Many new employees leave as soon as they can find other employment. If we were "allowed" to evaluate supervisors would someone in HR would get the message that there are problems.
ER	fairness	-1	There is preferential treatment for specific individuals. In theory, this system is to provide assistance and fair resolution for all employees regardless of status.
ER	fairness	-1	Labor relations is an inaccurate term. call it what it is: the (union) employee punishment arm of CE&O, whose operating method seems to be: We shall intimidate you through fear of disciplinary action or termination. If we accuse you of something, you are automatically guilty,no other outcome is possible or acceptable!
ER	fairness	-1	i am a skilled trade steam fitter and a certified welder. my job classification has been denied an inequity raise in pay grade through the audit program at ksu. my fellow tradesmen ie: electrician, hvac tech,energy mgmt.tech, stationary engineer, have been upgraded to pay grade 9 using article 37 of the contract with local153.please help us any way you can achieve equlity with our fellow skilled tradesmen. thank you ....jk
ER	fairness	-1	I am not happy with the performance review system that is in place for unclassified administrator staff. It does not adequately recognize the very real differences in the work that we do. RC library directors should be evaluated as library faculty.
ER	Recognition	1	My experience with HR has been great with regard to the HR employee relations and HR training/development groups. My experience with regard to the HR talent acquisition group has been very poor. My experience with the HR records group has been average.

Detailed Results for Labor Relations

Labor Relations	Overall Mean
44. The Labor Relations staff is knowledgeable about union-related programs.	2.95
46. Overall, the Labor Relations staff functions effectively.	3.00
45. The Labor Relations staff responds to union contract administration issues in a timely manner.	3.03
Total (Average across all items)	**2.99**

Item Number	Overall Mean	HR Mean	Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree and ending with 5 = Strongly Disagree with the mid-range at a 3.							
			Reg	Prov	IA	Pres	IS	UR&D	EM&SA	B&F
44	2.95	2.00	2.82	2.87	2.91	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.10	3.13
46	3.00	2.11	2.87	2.86	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.17	3.35
45	3.03	2.25	2.93	2.91	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.17	3.37
Mean	**2.99**	**2.04**	**2.86**	**2.88**	**2.91**	**3.00**	**3.00**	**3.00**	**3.15**	**3.28**

LR	Awareness	-1	I have not had a lot of experience with human relations staff due to being a regional campus employee that has only been here for a little over a year. However, the one time I did, staff was helpful, but not in a timely manner, took me 2 months to get a pay issue resolved. Missing one paycheck for that long of a time is very hard on a lot of people.
LR	Effectiveness	-1	The top management of the Human Resources Division has significantly contributed to the horrific relations between management and AFSCME.
LR	fairness	-1	In the HR department, the Labor Relations are a joke. Labor Relations Staff are adversarial towards Labor and too friendly with Management. Decisions about grievences or other concerns are predetermined between LR and Management. Hearings on issues are a dog and pony show. In these hearings the Labor Relations Staff has shown that they are hostile towards Labor instead of being a neutral party in disputes. HR does Managements bidding. Regardless of the pettiness or importance of the dispute, HR and Management predetermine the outcome. HR should base their decisions on what is best for the University. Management is not the only representative body of the University. Labor is also a big part of the University. Managers make selfish decisions at times that are based on personal prejudice towards inividual members of Labor. HR never questions the motives of Management and always sides with them, without ever hearing from Labor. The hearings that are used for disciplinary actions are a complete farce. In these hearings a Labor member has to prove innocence instead of Management proving guilt. It is really unfair and impossible to defend oneself under these conditions.
LR	fairness	-1	cannot get an answer to labor problems. Dept. head would not give yes or no answer. Felt like I got noting but C-Y-A answers. He would not commit, leaving me out to hang.
LR	fairness	-1	I dont understand how the University can let the union call the shots ...I almost lost my job because the union did not want part time temps there...I have been at KSU for 10 years now and I am still not hired...I love my job and the people I work with... I would love to be a real KSU employee...dont understand why some of us can not be hired.
LR	timeliness	-1	Need to improve on the follow-through and decision-making response after a pre-discipline hearing is held. A month or more for receiving a disciplinary decision is less than adequate when immediate, effective respsonse is needed. It makes the infraction seem unimportant or not worthy of a penalty.

Detailed Results for Records

Records	Overall Mean
30. The Records staff is knowledgeable and helpful when I need assistance.	2.60
28. When I have an issue or question about my employment-related information that is kept by the Records staff, they are accessible when I need them.	2.66
29. The Records staff responds to employee records requests in a timely manner.	2.69
Total (Average across all items)	**2.65**

Item Number	Overall Mean	HR Mean		IS	Reg	UR&D	EM&SA	Prov	IA	B&F	Pres
			Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree and ending with 5 = Strongly Disagree with the mid-range at a 3.								
30	2.60	1.79		2.38	2.55	2.62	2.60	2.58	2.53	2.79	3.00
28	2.66	2.05		2.50	2.59	2.54	2.62	2.66	2.71	2.83	3.00
29	2.69	2.42		2.47	2.67	2.83	2.67	2.65	2.65	2.87	3.00
Mean	**2.65**	**2.09**		**2.45**	**2.60**	**2.60**	**2.62**	**2.63**	**2.63**	**2.83**	**3.00**

R	Effectiveness	0	my experience with the HR records group has been average.
R	timeliness	-1	Graduate student contracts need to be more clear about working over breaks. I'm not sure what you mean by Employee Relations Programs. I think university employees could benefit from a training on facilitating meetings better and better advertisement of trainings. As of a few months ago, I felt the Records department was understaffed and/or needed to do more cross-training. Perhaps this has changed more recently but I have had situations where a fairly simple issue is not resolved for a week or two because the person is out of the office for training.

Detailed Results for Talent Acquisition

Talent Acquisition	Overall Mean
3. The job posting system makes it easy to find and apply for new jobs.	2.43
2. The Talent Acquisition staff helps provide good quality candidates for job openings.	2.72
1. When recruiting for job openings, Talent Acquisition fills positions in a timely manner.	3.11
Total (Average across all items)	**2.75**

Item Number	Overall Mean	HR Mean		Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree and ending with 5 = Strongly Disagree with the mid-range at a 3.							
				IS	EM&SA	Prov	Pres	IA	Reg	UR&D	B&F
3	2.43	1.53		2.40	2.07	2.48	2.43	2.32	2.44	2.75	2.54
2	2.72	1.84		2.36	2.74	2.69	2.85	2.88	2.74	2.38	2.91
1	3.11	2.32		2.94	3.05	2.98	3.00	3.17	3.37	3.57	3.34
Mean	**2.75**	**1.90**		**2.52**	**2.61**	**2.71**	**2.73**	**2.75**	**2.84**	**2.94**	**2.95**

TA		0	Again, I'm not sure who is on the "Talent Acquisition Team." I'm not sure if that's an umbrella term for a group of people or whether I actually deal with them, but don't know them as such. It could be a marketing issue, but I tend to associate the "Talent Acquisition" folks with executive officers and coaches, not with faculty or staff. Perhaps that's wrong.
TA	Awareness Effectiveness	-1	My experience with regard to the HR talent acquisition group has been very poor.
TA	Effectiveness	-1	Kent State University's Human Resources Division, in conjunction with the department I work for, have failed a loyal, long-time employee, and ultimately, their responsibility to the students in the quality of staffing.
TA	Effectiveness	-1	Talent acquisitions is difficult to work with and change their policy (unwritten) at will.
TA	fairness	-1	Filling positions. In searches to fill positions, I have observed managers conduct phone interviews. I feel this is a method of exclusion for members of minority groups. Therefore, when interviews are conducted, the candidates look and talk like the interviewing managers.
TA	fairness	-1	I applied for a job on campus in a College where others in my unit just rolled out into newly created positions. I had to apply to this position and then wasn't given an interview. Other applicants on campus with less experience in the area were given interviews. On campus jobs are very skewed based on the committee members.
TA	fairness	-1	In my dept. their are to unfilled positions on the books for years making a chance for advancement impossible. 1.Paint Shop Superintendent 2.Paint Shop Supervisor
TA	Recognition	1	Mary Jane Hannahs does the best job in your office, she is fair, professional, always available, eager to help and most of all honest.
TA	Recognition	1	In addition--losing Mary Stith (spelling on that) was a true loss, she was an incredible asset to Mary Jane Hannahs and Mary Jane Hannahs is an incredible person herself. Between the two of them, they were incredibly efficient, answered questions honestly and were extremely helpful.
TA	Recognition	1	HR has some great folks, but one of the best employees at HR is Mary Jane Hannahs. She goes out of her way to make my job as a manager easier. She always gets back with me and is highly knowledgeable, as well as being pleasant and friendly.
TA	Suggestion	0	I feel that when evaluating applications for employment, current staff should be considered first for the position, especially when they come highly recommended. Human Resources may not know how closely related the 2 positions are and therefore may be passing over a person with job related experience.
TA	Suggestion	-1	I feel that civil service positions should be offered FIRST to current employees. Too many jobs are filled by outside employees. Current employees have little chance for promotion. It is very, very discouraging. More emphasis should be put on promotions within. It is hard to watch higher level positions being filled from "outside. A better support system is needed for employees who are having difficulties with co-workers/employers. The current Ombudsman is totally worthless. My experience has not been good and I have heard numerous complaints from many others. The program should be seriously reviewed.
TA	timeliness	-1	Hiring at Kent State is cumbersome at best. The length of time and red tape to go through has you losing candidates. Ohio University does not seem to have the issues we have a Kent State in hiring faculty. The fact that I couldn't answer some of the services this division offers was telling to me--it should also be telling to you.

			Job searches take WAY too long. We lose great candidates because of our slow turnaround. Many jobs on campus already have an "heir apparent" but the process remains the same and wastes committee and candidates' time. More "Internal postings" or "Strong internal candidate" disclaimers need to be added to job descriptions. There was no question asking "how long does it take to get a preferred candidate approved through Affirmative Action." It seems to stop there. It should be a 1-2 day turnaround there and it's a bottleneck. Training is good but not plentiful for all levels of professionals. There are people on campus who'd like to move up and there's not a lot of support from HR to groom these people. Career tracks are desperately missing for administrative staff.
TA	timeliness	-1	
TA	timeliness	-1	The talent acquisition team seems to be very short handed. It is difficult to get a response from them in a timely manner.
TA	timeliness	-1	When applying for a position, I may go weeks/months without hearing an update. I may not hear anything until I get a rejection email or a call for an interview. I realize there are a lot of people applying but maybe at least the people on campus who are applying could be kept up to date?
TA	timeliness	-1	I have recently hired a part-time clerk. The time involved in the application, assessment, and review process was extremely cumbersome. I am at a regional campus- and the applicants had to come in to take an assessment test- only to have it not working properly- and they had to come back in at another time to complete the test. All that for a part-time position? Many of the applicants had to leave another part-time job to be able to come in at the exact time the test was given. No flexibility in the test schedule. It would have been more efficient if we could have given the assessment test, and handled the process at the local level.
TA	timeliness	-1	It is impossible for the HR dept. to complete all of the steps in the hiring process that they have taken on...from preliminary interviews to inperson interviews to checking references...this is too much. It takes too long because HR personnel are too busy and takes valuable information away from the hiring supervisor that is necessary to make an informed hiring decision.
TA	website	0	We should have a better way for academic search committee to view applicant info on-line where all relevant info can be viewed. In most cases letters of recommendation and grade transcipts are still handled in paper form making the review of files partly electronic and partly paper based.

Detailed Results for Training and Development

Training & Development	Overall Mean
17. The Training and Development staff in Human Resources provides effective training and development programs for me.	2.58
18. Training and development options that support career development are effectively publicized to Kent State employees.	2.75
19. The Training and development programs offered by Human Resources meet my needs.	2.83
Total (Average across all items)	**2.72**

Item Number	Overall Mean	HR Mean		Scale: 1 = Strongly Agree and ending with 5 = Strongly Disagree with the mid-range at a 3.							
				IS	IA	EM&SA	Reg	Prov	B&F	Pres	UR&D
17	2.58	1.61		2.11	2.37	2.48	2.55	2.62	2.75	2.79	2.73
18	2.75	1.79		2.51	2.26	2.66	2.66	2.79	2.94	2.86	3.06
19	2.83	1.67		2.54	2.79	2.69	2.78	2.87	2.93	3.00	3.13
Mean	**2.72**	**1.70**		**2.39**	**2.47**	**2.61**	**2.66**	**2.76**	**2.87**	**2.88**	**2.98**

TD	Effectiveness	-1	It was very confusing and misleading being hired as a part-time employee and having the entire orientation only covering full-time information, paperwork, benefits, TUITION REIMBURSEMENT, etc.(when hired, I was told part-time qualified for this. Now, after further fine-print reading, I find I am NOT qualified because I don't work enough part-time hours; must be 26 hours a week minimum- very confusing and misleading.) There was someone else who was part time in my orientation class that was just as confused. There should be separate orientation classes for full and part time, then correct information will be given; also at time of hire, the exact minimum hours needed for part-time tuition reimbursement should be stated, since this is a huge perk that many people apply to Kent for in the first place.
TD	Effectiveness	-1	there is not enough training opportunities that are publicized to create awareness. More Banner training within departments is necessary. Many members of staff have no idea how to use Banner. My office does not promote trainings for classified staff members.
TD	Recognition	1	As a new employee of Kent State University I would like to compliment the Human Resources staff on the effective and informative orientation training I received.
TD	Recognition	1	Bob Hall and Renee Romine are wonderful trainers. All the folks in Benefits have been extremely patient and helpful when I have called with questions or concerns.
TD	Recognition	1	Most of my experience with H/R was during my interviewing and hiring phase and I was treated well and very appreciative of the great attitudes there and during Orientation training! Thank you!
TD	Recognition	1	My experience with HR has been great with regard to the HR employee relations and HR training/development groups.
TD	Recognition	1	Thanks for the trainers in the "ALICE" programming..
TD	Recognition	1	all the training session I have taken have been informative. Rob Hall and Renee Romaine have done wonderful jobs.
TD	Recognition	1	Training and Development have always been consistently very good, and Bob Hall in particular is excellent. Compensation is generally good though I wish the process was a little more transparent for reclassifications. When I first started at KSU five years ago, I felt that customer service at the Terrace Annex was poor, particularly in the reception area. Lots of low energy, and indifferent responses to questions. Not a good way to start my KSU experience. Overall, I've felt HR has improved service over the past 2 years, but there is room for growth and improvement.
TD	Recognition	1	Based on my experiences, the benefits group and the training folks are the Division of Human Resources's strongest performers.
TD	Recognition	1	Employee Education is great.
TD	Suggestion	1	Training for management is good. The need for Office training is not. We should have hands on training for employees. I personnally trained a few in our department in some areas. A series of excell, word, power point, and publisher are needed. Several people paid for outside classes to learn pivot tables is one example. This would be a vital tool during reviews.
TD	Suggestion	0	Could use more computer classes, training for promotion? and Banner-related classes should be offered to all staff regardless if you are using on the job or not , in order to learn.
TD	Suggestion	0	There need to be more in-house retirement workshops for employees.
TD	Suggestion	0	It would be great if managers could receive more assistance with their own career development. there should be more opportunities for career growth at KSU, especially for staff of color. succession planning for executive level teams should also be encouraged or required. we lose a lot of good employees because there is no way to move up and stretch to the next level of a career. why train someone for 10 years here and let another institution benefit from that investment? especially with folks who also receive tuition remission...what a financial waste?
TD	Suggestion	0	HR needs to insert itself in our organizations more deeply. I think to manage the KSU culture, HR needs to integrate further into the organization at lower levels to get a better sense of their business and their needs. Unfortunately we are not necessarily the best arbiters of what's best for our teams. We tend to bring in the same kind of people, that share similiar thinking. That's a challenge we need coached out of.
TD	Suggestion	0	Need to better train managers about harrassement.

Comments Broken out by Line Managers, Senior Administration, and other Divisions

Workforce Management (W)

Dept	Area	Target	Type	COMMENTS
AA	W	fairness	-1	Diversity appears to be synonymous with African American. Even at that, we do not have a homogenized distribution of Af. Am. They are clustered in groups such as Upward Bound, Human Resources and previously the Aids grant. Remember Sex, Age and Religion are also the basis for protected classes that need to be encouraged.
B	W	Awareness	0	I think that there needs to be better communication from H.R. to the employees about benefits/programs/etc.that Kent State offers to it's employees.
B	W	Effectiveness	-1	Some health insurance premiums went up more than 50% for next year. While I understand that 20% of this is due to changes in the employee share of costs, how does the rest add up to 50% from two years of increases. The individual rates went up more more than family. Why?

Note that I am not complaining about the increase in rates. I'm wondering why there has been no communication to explain the reasons for this large increase, particularly given the story in the Stater a couple of months ago in which HR personnel were quoted as saying the actual increase in health care costs over the past year was a manageable 6%. |
B	W	Recognition	1	I appreciate the benefits and support the university gives its staff and the support HR gives to those who contact them.
B	W	Suggestion	-1	Through an "oversight" on the part of Human Resources or payroll, I'm not sure who, I lost 62.22 hours of vacation because I was not notified that I needed to use it or lose it. With the majority of departments "short staffed", maybe the maximum hours allowed to be carried over needs to be increased or at least notify staff members that are maxing out earlier in the year so that they are able to use the vacation time or donate it to someone who needs it.....early June maybe?
B	W	Suggestion	-1	Human Resources should review the way unclassified employees log vacation and sick time. Currently these employees are on the honor system, essentially free to take time off time without entering it in Banner for approval. Supervisors approve time off only if it is actually entered in the system. Sick leave and vacation accruals that are not drawn down continue to grow for these employees, while classified employees are required by Kronos to account for every 15 minutes of time on a schedule based on pre-set log-in and -out parameters. This situtation creates a disparity in the way unclassified and classified employees are allowed to utilize sick leave and vacation benefits. I would propose this suggestion: provide some kind of real accountablility for unclassified employees that would eliminate the opportunity to by-pass the logging of sick leave and vacation time. Thanks for considering my concern.
B	W	timeliness	-1	When i went on maternity leave it was difficult to find info regarding the leave, the processing was delayed and the leave was entered incorrectly. It was a frustrating matter.

B	W	timeliness	-1	The staff benefits office is understaffed and does not respond to questions in a timely manner. I had problems with open enrollment..could not select the health insurance I wanted and couldn't get help...no response. Also I didn't get the dental provider I wanted but enrollment was closed. There is not even a dental provider in the county we work in! The domestic partner benefits process is degrading and discriminatory...and you have to "recertify" every year.,...do married couples have to prove they are still married every year? The staff even sent an e-mail that disclosed the identities of all with domestic partner benefits to everyone that has them. This was a violation of HIPPA! The Flexible Spending Accounts company is a joke. They audited me and prevented me from continuing to use my card even though I faxed them the relevant information. I lost a few hundred dollars on that fiasco. Although I'm sure HR staff would have helped me with it, it would be best if they hired a good company in the first place since my time is valuable and I don't want to spend it in HR trying to reconcilel with the FSA benefit company. The experiences I have had with Affirmative Action have also been negative. They did not respond in a timely manner to a bogus complaint against me....never interviewing me or investigating the complaint. It was eventually dropped but receiving the paperwork on this and not being able to even give my side of the situation was stressful. The Job Opp site is hard to use. I have a friend that is a career coach and the clients she has referred to the site have found it extremely hard to use. KSU overall is a great place to work, but some of these offices really need to get with it or KSU will lose its reputation as a great place to work. Of all the HR offices, staff benefits is the worst. If they are understaffed, give them more help!
B	W	timeliness	-1	I rarely have the need to deal with HR in any way, but one of the last times (when the proof of dependency change was effective last year), I emailed twice to clarify and never received a response. I didn't feel that the need to provide documentation was clear in the benefit renewal process and I was questioning the letter received from Med. Mutual. If there is going to be an email account for contact, it should be monitored regularly and responses in a timely fashion.
B	W	timeliness	-1	I've been at KSU for over 20 years and I've seen this happen over and over. Someone is trying to get promoted. HR drags it out for so long that the person gets so frustrated they quit and then a replacement is hired at the job level the person was trying to get promoted to in the first place. A little ridiculous don't you think.
C	W	fairness	-1	In the last "by-out"; I'm learning that some staff were given approval to work another year and some where not. I feel it should have been all or none.
C	W	fairness	-1	With the conversion from paper to an electronic system at the university, including Banner, clerical staff has had to learn a multitude of new advanced skills that is not required by the average clerical person outside the university community. I believe the impact of the transition to an electronic system was shouldered by a large percentage of the clerical staff that needed to learn many new programs within a swift time frame to accomplish the required tasks. The clerical staff took on more responsibilities at a higher lever of expertise with no extra pay. I believe this inequality between the staff's knowledge and the pay scale needs to be addressed. As publicly stated, the university accomplished its goals with regards to higher enrollment. The President and faculty received well-deserved bonuses; however, staff did not receive any type of extra monetary bonus for the university's success. For the university to work together it needs to view its workforce as a wheel – all parts are important, no matter if you are the President, maintenance worker or secretary. I believe without one part of the wheel, say a spoke, the wheel keeps turning, but it is harder for the wheel to work. We are all important in the picture of success and this type of reward gives the impression that the efforts of some are more important and valued higher than others, even though all worked equally hard to help Kent State achieve its goals. I believe this needs to be reviewed.
C	W	timeliness	-1	I've been waiting for a contract since the beginning of the school year and to date am still working under my old contract. There is speculation that I and my coworkers will be moved to a different contract but we've heard nothing from the provost office. I don't know if this is related to HR or not.
ER	W	fairness	-1	There is preferential treatment for specific individuals. In theory, this system is to provide assistance and fair resolution for all employees regardless of status.

ER	W	fairness	-1	Labor relations is an inaccurate term. call it what it is: the (union) employee punishment arm of CE&O, whose operating method seems to be: We shall intimidate you through fear of disciplinary action or termination. If we accuse you of something, you are automatically guilty,no other outcome is possible or acceptable!
G	W	Awareness	0	Did not know that there was an Organizational Development area in HR. There is no money available for "performance pay" since the annual increase is a set amount.
G	W	Awareness	0	Human Resources seems to provide programs that are helpful to the Kent Campus. The regional campuses have different needs and concerns that the Kent Campus. We should not always be expected to drive to Kent if we need training or to attend special programs. Many administrators on regional campuses, and faculty also, cannot leave the campus for a whole day to attend these things. Polycom or other technology could be used more effectively if the Kent staff does not want to travel to the regionals.
G	W	Awareness	-1	Human Resources is invisible at KSU Regional Campuses.
G	W	Awareness	-1	I have been a part-time employee for almost 20 years and have no idea of the services provided by Human Resources. Many of the trainings are during a time when I can not take advantage of them.
G	W	Awareness	-1	I have worked at KSU for over 20 years; have been able to become quite knowledgeable about most aspects of KSU systems; am considered a go-to person for info; and am inquisitive, tenacious, and intelligent - but I have yet to understand in-depth HR/personnel processes and as a result often cannot help the staff who come to me.
G	W	Awareness	-1	I work at one of the non-Kent campuses. HR is almost invisible here. Programs are all on the Kent campus. I have only twice had occassion to relate to HR: a very good experience with benefits, and a bad experience while on a hiring committee. Not enough contact to provide relevant survey information.
G	W	Awareness	-1	Because of our campus location, we feel left out of the loop.
G	W	Awareness	-1	HR lacks ideal communication with regional campus employees. HR programs appear to be developed more for the main campus employees.
G	W	Effectiveness	-1	HR is regularly overruled by our division "admin", which makes any HR contribution moot to most issues. Was it HR who lost the resume I submitted when I started here?
G	W	Effectiveness	-1	I have only been here for a couple of years, but what I have seen from upper management surprises me. I have never worked at a place with such low morale. Besides how can you cost the university thousands of dollars and still keep your job.
G	W	Effectiveness	-1	The elitist, royalism of senior administrators is an insult to the entire classified staff.
G	W	Effectiveness	-1	Culture and climate are determined by the head(s) of the departments/offices and what attitudes they will allow. HR may be trying to improve it, but those efforts are meaningless if the head(s) have a different idea of how to handle employees.
G	W	Effectiveness	-1	I was fortunate not to have starved to death, and been homeless on an overseas assignment. HR was effective in NOT providing help!
G	W	fairness	-1	Human Resource has been used to reduce diversity. The issues do not go away by retaliating against people who are trying to fix underlying problems. As individuals see what happens to people who are trying to constructively protect underrepresented minority students, staff and faculty; the view that the system is utterly corrupt is growing.
G	W	fairness	-1	I have found it to be very difficult to obtain other positions that I have applied for. I believe there is some discrimination in the Bursars office and have come to realize that many times when I have applied for a position the department Supervisor already knows who they are going to hire before interviews even take place.
G	W	fairness	-1	I've had the feeling that someone from HR was "taking sides." HR should be unbiased when it comes to helping resolve issues between employees.

G	W	fairness	-1	There doesn't seem to be an advocte for the employee when there is a problem between employee vs supervisor. HR rep takes the Supervisor side and doesn't listen to employees concern.
G	W	fairness	-1	In the IS division the culture is very poor. Employees work/live in fear. I don't understand this. Why are some employees "let go" and on the other hand new employees are hired without the "let go" employees ever getting a chance to re-train for the open positions?
G	W	Recognition	1	Human Resources suffers from years of separation from the academic culture. The current leadership has done wonders to reverse this behavior. However, it remains and HR spends as much time making a managers efforts to move unit mission, especially in the academic sector, difficult as it does easy. I wish to emphasize that this culture is a produce of previous leadership in HR and NOT the result of current leadership. That leadership has spent considerable effort trying to remedy these historic issues, much to his credit. This survey is clearly one of his efforts.
G	W	Suggestion	0	Graduate Teaching Assistants are also employees at KSU. Their needs seem oddly caught in the middle of Human Resources & Graduate Studies. They are students and instructors, carrying sometimes up to 3 classes.
G	W	Suggestion	0	I wish there were more programs to help non-manager employees increase their performance. The only events that are ever offered are for managers. Also I wish we could conduct searches for new employees in our department as opposed to just hiring people - it becomes frustrating when we settle for a candidate. I often find that HR is not connected with the HR needs of the advising staff. We work hard to increase student retention and are always blamed when things do not go right - we get little recognition for what we do.
G	W	Suggestion	0	As a six year employee of the university, I think the HR department should integrate into IS further. While statistically, some of the numbers appear appropriate, I don't see management being graded/measured with the criteria in the very survey I am working on. I think measurable, objective management team criteria should be defined and used as a guide to determining effectiveness and that personnel in leadership positions are living up to or meeting the expectations of the institution. To develop and maintain the KSU work culture, you have to reinforce, recognize and encourage the behaviors we want to see, and train away from behaviors we do not want to see.
G	W	Suggestion	0	dept head makes decision about not hiring needed staff so that remaining employees are not required to work overtime shifts to make up for less staff. hr should be another voice in this type of matter.
G	W	Suggestion	0	My main suggestion would be that there is a lack of a path for me to advance. I feel stuck at the level where I am currently working. I feel stifled because I can't see how to apply my strengths to my job. I feel that the job I've been working at for ten years has limited my ability to branch out within the university and apply my skills in a new area. I'd like to have more options, I guess.
LR	W	Effectiveness	-1	The top management of the Human Resources Division has significantly contributed to the horrific relations between management and AFSCME.
LR	W	fairness	-1	In the HR department, the Labor Relations are a joke. Labor Relations Staff are adversarial towards Labor and too friendly with Management. Decisions about grievences or other concerns are predetermined between LR and Management. Hearings on issues are a dog and pony show. In these hearings the Labor Relations Staff has shown that they are hostile towards Labor instead of being a neutral party in disputes. HR does Managements bidding. Regardless of the pettiness or importance of the dispute, HR and Management predetermine the outcome. HR should base their decisions on what is best for the University. Management is not the only representive body of the University. Labor is also a big part of the University. Managers make selfish decisions at times that are based on personal prejudice towards inivdual members of Labor. HR never questions the motives of Management and always sides with them, without ever hearing from Labor. The hearings that are used for disciplinary actions are a complete farce. In these hearings a Labor member has to prove innocence instead of Management proving guilt. It is really unfair and impossible to defend oneself under these conditions.
LR	W	fairness	-1	cannot get an answer to labor problems. Dept. head would not give yes or no answer. Felt like I got noting but C-Y-A answers. He would not commit, leaving me out to hang.

				I dont understand how the University can let the union call the shots ...I almost lost my job because the union did not want part time temps there...I have been at KSU for 10 years now and I am still not hired...I love my job and the people I work with... I would love to be a real KSU employee...dont understand why some of us can not be hired.
LR	W	fairness	-1	
TA	W	Effectiveness	-1	Kent State University's Human Resources Division, in conjunction with the department I work for, have failed a loyal, long-time employee, and ultimately, their responsibility to the students in the quality of staffing.
TA	W	Effectiveness	-1	Talent acquisitions is difficult to work with and change their policy (unwritten) at will.
TA	W	fairness	-1	Filling positions. In searches to fill positions, I have observed managers conduct phone interviews. I feel this is a method of exclusion for members of minority groups. Therefore, when interviews are conducted, the candidates look and talk like the interviewing managers.
TA	W	fairness	-1	I applied for a job on campus in a College where others in my unit just rolled out into newly created positions. I had to apply to this position and then wasn't given an interview. Other applicants on campus with less experience in the area were given interviews. On campus jobs are very skewed based on the committee members.
TA	W	fairness	-1	In my dept. their are to unfilled positions on the books for years making a chance for advancement impossible. 1.Paint Shop Superintendent 2.Paint Shop Supervisor
TA	W	Suggestion	0	I feel that when evaluating applications for employment, current staff should be considered first for the position, especially when they come highly recommended. Human Resources may not know how closely related the 2 positions are and therefore may be passing over a person with job related experience.
TA	W	timeliness	-1	Hiring at Kent State is cumbersome at best. The length of time and red tape to go through has you losing candidates. Ohio University does not seem to have the issues we have a Kent State in hiring faculty. The fact that I couldn't answer some of the services this division offers was telling to me--it should also be telling to you.
TA	W	timeliness	-1	Job searches take WAY too long. We lose great candidates because of our slow turnaround. Many jobs on campus already have an "heir apparent" but the process remains the same and wastes committee and candidates' time. More "Internal postings" or "Strong internal candidate" disclaimers need to be added to job descriptions. There was no question asking "how long does it take to get a preferred candidate approved through Affirmative Action." It seems to stop there. It should be a 1-2 day turnaround there and it's a bottleneck. Training is good but not plentiful for all levels of professionals. There are people on campus who'd like to move up and there's not a lot of support from HR to groom these people. Career tracks are desperately missing for administrative staff.
TA	W	website	0	We should have a better way for academic search committee to view applicant info on-line where all relevant info can be viewed. In most cases letters of recommendation and grade transcipts are still handled in paper form making the review of files partly electronic and partly paper based.

				HR needs to insert itself in our organizations more deeply. I think to manage the KSU culture, HR needs to integrate further into the organization at lower levels to get a better sense of their business and their needs. Unfortunately we are not necessarily the best arbiters of what's best for our teams. We tend to bring in the same kind of people, that share similiar thinking. That's a challenge we need coached out of.
TD	W	Suggestion	0	
TD	W	Suggestion	0	Need to better train managers about harrassement.
				There are major discrepancies between classified and unclassified "rights". Hourly employees in our department are treated like second class citizens. Educational/training opportunities are encouraged based on ethnic background not an employee's desire or ability. Hourly employee concerns regarding personnel issues have been squelched with "supervisor has the right to refuse to meet with ombudsman." Many new employees leave as soon as they can find other employment. If we were "allowed" to evaluate supervisors would someone in HR would get the message that there are problems.
ER	W/PP	fairness	-1	
				i am a skilled trade steam fitter and a certified welder. my job classification has been denied an inequity raise in pay grade through the audit program at ksu. my fellow tradesmen ie: electrician, hvac tech,energy mgmt.tech, stationary engineer, have been upgraded to pay grade 9 using article 37 of the contract with local153.please help us any way you can achieve equlity with our fellow skilled tradesmen. thank you ....jk
ER	W/PP	fairness	-1	
ER	W/PP	fairness	-1	I am not happy with the performance review system that is in place for unclassified administrator staff. It does not adequately recognize the very real differences in the work that we do. RC library directors should be evaluated as library faculty.
				My biggest complaints come from messages left and not returned. I am left to pursue other avenues to get the answers needed to move forward. Affirmative Action should pay all bills directly from their budget for services offered from Disability Services. I have been burned and never was reimbursed for Interpreters charged to my school for a faculty search. Not even the direct supervisor addressed the matter. Understood that all monies are university monies but the process is not a good one. Double bookkeeping in this institution is ridiculous and such a time waste. It is not a clean way to handle independent budgets. I have had problems all over this area to receive phone calls back, emails answered, etc. Job performance in this area should absolutely be addressed and those with authority made accountable.
G	W	timeliness	-1	

Policy

Dept	Area	Target	Type	COMMENTS
B	PP	Awareness	0	I have not had very much contact with the Human Resource Dept. I do expect to be in contact in the near furture, I expect to be signing up for classes for fall 2010. There was one question I was concerned about, I was sure or told what the policy is for funeral leave. I took the days off for my Dad's funeral but really didn't know what I was legally allowed. At that time I was to upset to really check it out, but was told by a co-worker that I could have taken 5 days. Is that true?
C	PP	Effectiveness	-1	I am amazed at the LOW salary offered by Kent State. I did some research into a similar position at Tri-C and was dumbfounded to find that a COMMUNITY COLLEGE pays about 30% more for the same exact job I am doing at Kent State. That's really inexcusable.
C	PP	Effectiveness	-1	My particular position has been asked to reclassified several times--it sat for a year with absolutely no resolution and was never processed to a higher grade. My department needs my skills in order to function, but since HR never reclassified my job, I am unable to perform numerous duties that would better serve the students, faculty and administration although in other departments jobs magically get upgraded without ever being reposted etc. I think this is ridiculous that my skills could serve the university better but cannot be utilitized because of HR never processing my reclassification several times.
C	PP	Effectiveness	-1	The process for rewarding outstanding effort and skills through pay increases seems designed to avoid doing so. Supervisors and managers should be able to increase salaries through a less cumbersome process than the PDQ.
C	PP	fairness	-1	Certain positions here at kent state in the bargaining unit have not been updated since 1994. I disagree with the stores clerk pay grade as compared to the delivery worker position as I do delivery workers duties also.
C	PP	fairness	-1	HR does an adequate job of conveying KSU's organizational ideals, the work culture of the org generally falls short of stated ideals. Org change will not happen w/out real changes in fundamental policies and philosophies. Wide disparities exist in how policies are administered between depts, with regard to hiring processes, accountability and performance expectations. True incentives are scarce; some pockets of KSU have made some progress, but existing incentives are inconsistent, and truly significant job perf rewards are reserved for upper mgmt. Top execs should be eligible for such incentives, but extending such programs selectively is discouraging and inequitable for the majority of frontline employees working just as hard on the org's behalf. Accountability is a major issue. Key positions are often arbitrarily filled, while responsible managers are often required to jump through hoops to justify their frontline hiring decisions. HR lacks sufficient personnel resources to make real progress changing the work culture of an org of ~4,500 employees. Rank and file hears the President's msg ("year of yes")and tries to embrace it, but frequently face administrative obstacles when they try to implement real change ("not how we do things here"). Mid and upper mgmt need to accept that real org change requires their commitment vs lip service.
C	PP	fairness	-1	However, I feel that position titles and pay rates unfairly disadvantage regional campus employees. There are some job titles that are not allowed to be used on regional campuses even though employees are fulfilling the requirements of that job and more.
C	PP	fairness	-1	Some of my concerns may not have answers: 1) there is a perception that what we are paid by KSU is much lower than the private market. It would be interesting to know what some of us would make in the private market - we might be surprised at what we are "not" worth; yet if it is true, why can we not work to increase pay levels to fair market? 2) I sometimes feel frustrated because I feel pidgeon holed in my position with no career ladder available and don't know what to do to be considered for promotions. How does one get noticed? 3) Get frustrated when you see the beginning, middle and high end of pay ranges - why can we not be better compensated within the positions we work in so we don't have to move or leave to make better pay?
C	PP	Suggestion	0	I believe it should be easier for classified staff to be re-classified so that they may be compensated fairly for all they do.

				The processes for reclassification/pay rate changes are extremely difficult and take a long period of time. It is ridiculous that it takes over a year for a reclassification to be processed. In addition, it is nearly impossible to get promoted within the organization. The employees that do a good job and try to advance are put through a rigorous interviewing & application process and should be rewarded for past performance.
C	PP	timeliness	-1	
G	PP	Effectiveness	0	As all too often at the University, there appears to be an across the board answer for all divisions, departments and their respective employees. A minimal amount of latitude and customization is provided for the diversity of them.
G	PP	fairness	-1	I find it riduclous that there are different classifications (and pay grades) for regional staff vs Kent campus staff. As a regional staff person, I am made to feel like a lesser skilled or valued employee because I CHOOSE to work at a regional campus vs the Kent campus. My education level and skill set are on par with my Kent campus colleagues if not exceed where they stand, yet I am classified differently even though I do the same job. The discrimination due to location is riduclous! It took months for a much overdo reclassification to take effect. I view HR as being a barrier rather than a partner in job success.
G	PP	Suggestion	0	It seems that the Independent Contractor Determination Forms add an awful lot of work and time when it comes to routine services. Is there a way they could be implemented categorically rather than individually--e.g., one form for an entire year that covers the service that all of the individuals provide?
G	PP	Suggestion	0	A minor comment only- I suggest that HR revise the standard position posting for "12 month contract" positions. This term is confusing to people coming from the private sector. Many assume the job is a 12 month TERM position and so don't apply thinking the job will be eliminated in 12 months. I have to clarify this in nearly every interview I do. I wonder how many solid candidates do not even apply to KSU because they think these positions are temporary.
G	PP	Suggestion	0	Classified staff should be required to fill-out the comment sectionof the performance evaluation. At this time that is not required and does not help managers understand underlying issues as there are not comments on what the employee's views are.

I would like to see HR make it easier at the end-of-the-year when Benefits are renewed. If there is no change in benefits, it should not be necessary for the domestic partnership certification be completed again and again, if there is no change in the partnership. It clearly states in the certification that false declaration or failure to notify the University in a timely manner of a dissolution constitutes fraud and can result in damages and/or termination. I find it invasive that I have to give property tax, checking and beneficiary information to HR every year and I don't like the fact that when I renew that the former information that I provided is not returned to me. I have not idea where you are putting this information, who is accessing it and how it will be disposed of when you get 10-15 years of the same documents. |
| TA | PP | Suggestion | -1 | I feel that civil service positions should be offered FIRST to current employees. Too many jobs are filled by outside employees. Current employees have little chance for promotion. It is very, very discouraging. More emphasis should be put on promotions within. It is hard to watch higher level positions being filled from "outside.

A better support system is needed for employees who are having difficulties with co-workers/employers. The current Ombudsman is totally worthless. My experience has not been good and I have heard numerous complaints from many others. The program should be seriously reviewed. |

Information Systems

Dept	Area	Target	Type	COMMENTS
G	IS	website	-1	The FlashLine interface is disastrously bad and the process for signing up for benefits is both painful from an interface perspective and far too onerous to try to figure out the best benefits package.
G	IS	website	-1	The time reporting web app is worse than trash. It is a pain to use.
G	IS	website	-1	It is difficult to find information on the website/flashline. It's hard to know whether information will be on the myHR page or on Flashline.

Payroll

Dept	Area	Target	Type	COMMENTS
C	P	Effectiveness	-1	payroll needs to be more efficient so less mistakes to employee checks are made
C	P	timeliness	-1	The PAYROLL SECTION is IMPOSSIBLE to get hold of by phone (or e-mail) and when questions are posed there is never sufficient follow-up. They hide behind unanswered phones and a web interface that cannot ever answer specific answers for an individual's pay questions. This is a problem area within what is, I think, a gem of a Human Resources Network at KSU. Try this test .. call PAYROLL from OUTSIDE the university without using your knowledge of specific people's extensions. You'll NEVER even get to a person to be able to pose a question and unless you pull rank with a title/name that is instantly recognized at KSU your message will go unanswered. It's entirely unclear why they're so unresponsive.
				The PAYROLL SECTION is IMPOSSIBLE to get hold of by phone (or e-mail) and when questions are posed there is never sufficient follow-up. They hide behind unanswered phones and a web interface that cannot ever answer specific answers for an individual's pay questions. This is a problem area within **what is, I think, a gem of a Human Resurces Network at KSU**. Try this test .. call PAYROLL from OUTSIDE the university without using your knowledge of specific people's extensions. You'll NEVER even get to a person to be able to pose a question and unless you pull rank with a title/name that is instantly recognized at KSU your message will go unanswered. It's entirely unclear why they're so unresponsive.
G	P	Recognition	1	