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Abstract:
In the corporate world, Work Engagement has become a vital concept through which employees’ willingness to invest effort in their work is measured and organizational development initiatives are based. This session describes a pilot study which applied a proven methodology for corporate measurement of work engagement in an institution of higher learning. The presentation will include the definition of work engagement, methodology used in the pilot, findings from the pilot study, application of findings to institutional improvement and HLC self-study, the contribution of student research projects to the findings, and plans for ongoing research.

Detailed Session Content:

Introduction
In the corporate world, Work Engagement has become a vital concept through which employees’ willingness to invest effort in their work is measured and organizational development initiatives are based. This session describes a pilot study which applied proven methodology for corporate measurement of work engagement in an institution of higher learning. The objective of the study was to determine the efficacy of work engagement assessment and analysis as a valuable determinate of institutional health and as a guide for institutional improvement.

In order to fully understand the implications of this study the following are included:
- Definition of work engagement and review of work engagement measurement as used in corporate and public arenas
- Pilot study methodology
- Findings from the pilot study
- The application of those findings to institutional improvement
- The application of those findings to accreditation processes
- Related student learning projects
- Plans for ongoing research

Work Engagement Definition and Application
Work engagement is defined for the purposes of this study as what occurs when employees’ values, beliefs, and goals are aligned with those of the organization such that the employee is personally committed to contributing to accomplishment of the organization’s mission. When an individual is engaged, the individual deliberately chooses to do more work than is required. The person is making this choice because the work has purpose and is personally meaningful. Work engagement has been found to be important to organizations because engaged employees don’t just
meet their goals, they exceed them. Most organizations find that when they improve the overall level of engagement in the organization, just about every other positive change they are targeting will also improve.

The definition of work engagement varies between authors, but all of the definitions share this perspective – when an employee is engaged, his or her own personal goals are aligned with the organization’s goals. When an employee is engaged, the employee willingly does more than is absolutely required by the job. The individual does so because helping the organization achieve its goals simultaneously helps the individual achieve his or her own goals. The individual and the organization are connected.

The measurement of work engagement has become increasingly popular in the corporate world, having been introduced by Gallup organization studies first published in 2001. Work engagement measurement represents a new paradigm in measuring employee motivation and replaces older, less satisfactory assessment approaches. Likert, father of the popular Likert scales used in the survey measurement, argued at the turn of the century that if working conditions were improved, productivity would also improve. Unfortunately, his efforts to provide evidence of this relationship failed. Likert’s work resulted in the development of a wealth of commercial and organization-specific instruments for measuring staff or job satisfaction. Despite the interest and popularity of job satisfaction as a target for organizational change, no one has ever succeeded in providing the evidence that eluded Likert! Assessment of work engagement seeks to amend this disconnect since, per its definition, it goes beyond the measurement of attitude/satisfaction. Work engagement assessment includes measurement of a “willingness to act” as demonstrated by employee commitment to accomplish their own and correspondingly, the organization’s goals and is being increasingly used in place of employee job satisfaction or attitude measurements.

Corporate and public organizations have found that intentional and proactive strategies implemented to reduce barriers to engagement and to create positive change consistent with the culture of the organization can create a slow, but powerful upward spiral of work engagement improvement and, correspondingly, improved organizational results. This type of commitment to ongoing measurement and consistent action represents exactly the kind of continuous improvement espoused and required by the HLC Criterion Two, Core Component 2c. Because of the similarity in purpose of institutional improvement (as defined by HLC and C-RAC criteria) and the function of work engagement measurement and associated organizational improvement, this pilot study was conducted in 2009-2010 at William Jewell College, a prestigious mid-western liberal arts college, to evaluate the value of applying work engagement measurement and diagnostic methodologies in an institution of higher education.

**Pilot Study Methodology**

One of the underlying assumptions of this study was that student success can be affected by interaction with employees outside of the faculty. Based on that assumption, data was solicited from all employees via an online survey. Employees were subdivided into the following subgroups for data collection and subsequent analysis:

- Faculty – Full-time: Faculty employed by Sample on a full-time basis
- Faculty – Adjuncts: Part-time faculty employed on a course-by-course basis
- Staff Professional / Office Work: Staff that serves in a professional/office role but not one needing specialized skills as defined below.
- Staff- Specialized Training: Staff with specialized skills including librarians, admissions counselors, financial aid counselors and student affairs leaders.
- Staff Non-professional: Staff that serves in areas of the college such as security, maintenance and food service.
- Coaches: all athletic coaches
- Administration: Members of the Cabinet

The questionnaire (hereafter referred to as the WEAT™, Work Engagement Assessment Tool) used in this pilot to evaluate work engagement was a 30-question instrument which has been successfully used in corporate and public institutions. Work engagement levels of the college faculty and staff were measured in the pilot study overall and per the following indicators:

- **Empowerment:**
  This refers to an individual's perception of control and influence over issues that affect his or her work. It is the degree of decision-making an individual experiences in the job. The acceptability of asking questions, the resources needed to do the job as well as the employee’s understanding of clear expectations are examples of the elements measured by this indicator.

- **Growth/Challenge:**
  This indicator reflects the degree to which an individual experiences challenge and opportunities to learn. This includes the degree to which the individual is able to use current skills in new ways, learn new skills or participate in new projects. The perceived reaction of management to mistakes as learning opportunities is also measured.

- **Relationships:**
  This indicates how supported the individual feels by other people in the work environment. It is the degree to which an individual’s social needs are met at work. Relationships with co-workers and the immediate supervisor are the focus of the questions associated with this indicator.

- **Job Match:**
  This is the degree to which an individual feels that the work uses his or her strengths and he or she enjoys the actual work. This indicator also reflects the employee’s belief that their work makes a difference and helps them live out their personal values.

- **Recognition:**
  This is the degree to which an individual believes the organization values his or her individual contribution. Questions associated with recognition measure feedback received and belief that senior management and supervisors value employee work.

- **Organizational Affinity:**
  This describes the degree to which an individual feels connected to, a part of, or loyal to the organization. It is a reflection of the degree of trust and sense of pride an individual feels toward the organization. This indicator also reflects employees’ awareness of the policies and vision/mission of the organization.

In addition to work engagement measurements, data was gathered via an additional 23 questions to guide institutional improvement initiatives. This data, as described below, included:

- Barriers to engagement
- Organizational culture analysis
- Mission alignment

**Barriers to Engagement**

Work Engagement is a powerful source of energy that provides benefit to both the employee and the employer. However, you cannot successfully build work engagement unless you deal with those factors in the environment which can get in the way of work engagement. Jim Collins, in *Good to Great* states that “If you have the right people, they will be self-motivated. The key is not to de-motivate them.”
Barriers to engagement are those factors in the workplace that de-motivate and can have an extremely negative effect on employee work engagement. Barriers to engagement are defined as anything occurring in the workplace that threatens a person's sense of value, purpose, comfort or safety. Such factors can be perceived threats from the emotional, physical, and/or financial perspectives. If these barriers are strong enough, they drain away existing engagement and make it difficult, if not impossible, to build any organizational momentum toward increasing engagement.

The environmental scan included in this study serves as an assessment of the causes of work engagement suppression. The top 10 barriers which most occur in organizations are assessed using the Barriers To Engagement (BTE)™ Tool and are defined as follows:

**Difficult Co-Worker**
- Co-workers who don't do their share of the work and have irritating habits, different values, incompetent, call in sick a lot, etc.

**Difficult Manager**
- Supervisory style does not match your needs; supervisor is unknowledgeable, unapproachable, unpredictable, etc.

**Fairness**
- The balance between the efforts you give your employer and the rewards you get in return or the sense that all employees are being treated equally for the same effort.

**Lack of Job Security**
- Concerns over potential lay-offs or re-assignments due to downsizing or re-organization.

**Access to Information about Change**
- Expectations are a moving target and change is unpredictable. Information about change does not adequately reduce the fear and anxiety associated with a turbulent environment.

**Work Tasks**
- Aspects of the actual tasks are unpleasant.

**Resource Scarcity**
- Needed supplies, equipment, technology, information, labor or materials are not available to you do your work.

**Group Dynamics**
- The way the group works together as a team or a collaborative work group.

**Unpleasant Physical Environment**
- Temperature, noise, proximity to others, availability and type of light, comfort and utility of the furniture, and cleanliness of the workspace are some of the factors that can contribute to an unpleasant physical environment.

**Work Volume**
- The amount of work expected to be completed in the course of regular day.
Organizational Culture Analysis

In this pilot study, organizational culture was assessed through use of the Valued Behavior Assessment (VBA)™. The methodology of the Valued Behavior Assessment (VBA)™ is centered on the identification of those behaviors that members of a group reward and punish. When a group of people comes together for any length of time, a set of unwritten rules and expectations emerge. These rules and expectations make the functioning of the group more effective and define what behavior is acceptable and unacceptable. Members of the group comply and enforce these rules and expectations. New members are taught the rules through social rewards and punishments. Members of the group who do not honor the rules are at first gently punished with sarcastic comments, mild teasing or veiled reprimands. If this is not sufficient to correct the offending group member, more severe, overt methods are taken that will ultimately result in outright ostracism. Members of a work group who cannot or will not comply with the group’s unwritten rules and expectations for behavior will eventually, quit, transfer or get fired.

The assessment of valued behaviors serves as a valid method to determine prevalent group culture. Group culture is very strong and dictates what behavior is encouraged and what will be censored. When valued behaviors of a work group are understood, conflict with the group’s valued behaviors can be avoided. The behaviors valued by the group can then be used to help the group meet organizational goals. Changes introduced to the group that are consistent with the valued behaviors of the group will be accepted more readily than those changes that are inconsistent. Resistance to changes that conflict with group values will almost always occur.

By understanding values that are important to the work group, the organization can craft strategies to improve work engagement which honor those values. By doing so, the likelihood of successful implementation will be significantly enhanced. Motivational or work engagement building strategies that run afoul of group values are sure to be met with resistance. Conversely, if care is taken to move forward in ways that respect the values of the group, those strategies will usually be perceived as a win-win for the work group and the organization and will prove successful.

An understanding of valued behaviors also provides insights into the significance and severity of both work engagement indicators and work engagement detractors. Barriers to engagement and work engagement indicators that are in conflict with strongly held group values have a stronger impact on overall work engagement than others which are more closely aligned.

Valued Behavior Assessments (VBA)™ are determined by asking participants to submit descriptors (words or phrases) that describe their department/team. These are open-ended descriptors determined by the participant with no pre-determined list from which to choose. These words and phrases are then sorted into categories which represent the organization’s values.

Results are organized by category with percentages of both positive and negative values reported. Positive responses indicate behaviors or characteristics that are important to the group. Negative responses are also indicative of valued behaviors or characteristics, but when expressed in negative terms, respondents are indicating that the behavior or characteristic is lacking in the organizational behavior. The categories that emerge, the relative frequency of responses in each category and the distribution between positive and negative responses all provide valuable insights to organizational culture and health.
Mission Alignment

In order to obtain information about mission alignment, the following question was added:

**Question:** I believe the mission of Sample College informs the purpose of my work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completely disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree or disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat agree</td>
<td>Complete agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional comments:

This is an important issue but very difficult to measure. Even though this is self-reported data it gets at the heart of the issue as to whether people believe there is a tie between the work that they do and the organizational mission. When there is alignment between work and mission there tends to be more purpose seen in the work that is done and engagement would improve. This also helps organizations to ascertain if the mission is permeating the culture. This question, in and of itself, is not enough but it can help to assess the impact of the mission and point to additional steps that need to be taken.

Findings of Pilot Study

**Participation Levels**

Upon final collection of data, the rates of participation were calculated for the subgroups and with the exception of Adjunct Faculty, Non-Professional Staff and Coaches, the overall participation rate exceeded 72%. Further inspection revealed that the rates for Adjunct Faculty, Non-professional staff, and Coaches were 10.9%, 11.1%, and 41.2% (only 7 responses), respectively. Responses received from these groups showed that their work engagement levels were higher than all of the other subgroups with the exception of Administration. These findings in turn suggest that only those individuals within those groups who were highly engaged took the time to respond to the survey. In an effort to take a conservative approach and not interject bias into the overall results as well as the need to maintain anonymity, it was deemed appropriate to exclude these subgroups from the final analysis. Because of extremely low participation rates from three of these subgroups (Adjunct Faculty, Staff Non-professional, and Coaches), findings were reported for four subgroups as well as for the total employee response. Findings were compared to a population norm established on data from over 4,500 respondents from over 140 organizations (corporate and public institutions).

**Work Engagement Assessment Tool (WEAT™) Findings**

Corresponding to terminology originated by the Gallup organization in conjunction with their Q12 instrument, three overall categories of engagement were initially established in association with the WEAT instrument and referred to as Disengaged, Unengaged and Engaged. To minimize confusion and provide more detailed clarity based on feedback from corporate users and the participants in this pilot study, findings from the WEAT™ are reported with the Gallup three categories subdivided and renamed as described below:

**Actively Disengaged** *(Red and Orange Zones on graph)*

Actively Disengaged employees are shown in the Red and Orange Zones on the graph. These employees have very negative attitudes. Actively Disengaged employees do very little work and the work they do get done is poor. They are not an asset to the organization. Employees in the lower range of the Actively Disengage category are shown in the Red Zone. He or she actively works against the organization, spreading misinformation and distrust. They have already quit their jobs but for a variety of reasons, can’t or won’t leave.
These employees are committed to their negative perception of the organization so there is very little that can be done to improve their performance. The best thing that can happen for these folks is for them to find a way to leave the organization.

Employees in the higher range of the Actively Disengaged are shown in the Orange Zone. There is more hope that these employees can become Engaged if handled and motivated carefully. The Orange Zone employee would like for things to be different but doesn’t believe that they can. Most of the time, they are just as negative and unproductive as the Red Zone employee. Occasionally, if conditions are right, they can muster some energy and be productive for a short time. They cannot sustain it, however, and quickly slip back to their more negative attitude.

**Engaged** (Yellow and Green Zones on graph)

Engaged employees want to do a good job. They are valuable, contributing members of the organization. Engaged employees are shown in the Yellow and Green Zones on the graph. Yellow and Green Zone employees do, however, approach their jobs very differently.

Yellow Level employees are those in the lower range of Engaged. They want to do a good job but for a number of reasons, they feel disillusioned, frustrated or blocked. The Yellow Zone employee comes to work each day with one major objective and that is to get through the day unnoticed. This employee wants to know the rules and does what absolutely has to be done to keep his or her job. He or she does the work required by the job, but doesn’t do anything more. This employee finds it safest to do just what he or she is told.

Employees who are in the upper range of Engaged are shown in the Green Level. The Green Level employee wants to contribute, but doesn’t trust that the effort will be worth his or her effort. This employee is very capable and contributes to the organization at a satisfactory level, but is coasting. If conditions are right, however, the Green Level will shift his or her effort up for a short time. When this happens, his or her behavior is more typical of the Actively Engaged employee.

**Actively Engaged** (Blue and Purple Zone on graph)

Actively Engaged employees are shown in the Blue and Purple Zones. These employees are fully committed to the organization, are highly productive, and give their best. They judge the goals of the organization are valid and important and they are personally committed to doing all they can to help the organization achieve its goals. Actively Engaged employees go above and beyond what is required, not because they “have to” but because they “want to” and because that’s who they are.

Employees in the lower range of Actively Engaged are shown in the Blue Zone. They believe their contribution is valued and their personal goals are aligned with organizational goals. They are energized by their work and take risks by trying creative approaches to problems. The Blue Zone employee will question the status quo and advocate for changes they believe to be necessary. They may occasionally lag slightly and slip into Green Zone behavior, but for the most part, they perform as stars of the organization.

Being completely and Actively Engaged all the time -- no matter what is characteristic of employees in the upper range of Actively Engaged – the Purple Zone. Purple Zone categorization means that the individual is committed to the organization and despite setbacks, does not get discouraged. They take risks, are creative problem-solvers and will advocate for changes. Like the Blue Zone Employees, they are highly productive and demand excellence of themselves. Purple Zone employees are the super stars of the organization because they always give their best and contribute “110% or more”.

As shown in the graph below, the overall WEAT™ score for William Jewell College is in the upper third of the Engaged category (Green Zone). This score is consistent with above average, but not necessarily excellent performance. This result can be interpreted as meaning that small changes can make a big difference in the overall morale and productivity of employees. In general, William Jewell College employees care enough about their work to produce good quality output and reasonable levels of productivity. There are barriers that prevent employees from fully committing themselves to their work, but since this is an overall score, it can be said that employees at William Jewell College are strongly committed to the college and the services it provides. Findings reflect Job Match and Relationships as areas of greatest strength at William Jewell College.
Barriers to Engagement Findings

The Barriers To Engagement (BTE™) measures the level of work engagement energy that is being drained by a work environment factor. As such, the bigger the barrier, the bigger the problem. Barriers are assessed and reported per the following zones:

None:
The issue doesn’t exist at a level that is causing a significant erosion of work engagement energy.

Issue Zone:
The issue occurs but it is only brief. It is more of a nuisance, like a buzzing fly, and does not interfere with work. Productivity and morale are affected only briefly, if at all. If there are no power drains with higher scores, it may be advantageous to address these issues, but power drains in the Concern and Danger Zones take higher priority.

Concern Zone:
The issue occurs for longer periods than in the previous zone and when it does, it is harder to stay focused on work, but it is possible to continue working. When a power drain occurs in the concern zone it is temporary and usually doesn’t last very long. Power drains in this zone require attention but, provided they are infrequent, they are not urgent. Negative emotions of fear, anger and frustration are aroused by this level of power drain. Both productivity and morale are decreased while dealing with the power drain. It takes some effort to bounce back to previous levels after contact with power drains in this zone. Morale may return to previous levels if given enough time away from the power drain.

Danger Zone:
When the work engagement detractor occurs in the Danger Zone level of severity, it affects everything and it is very difficult to get anything done. It is extremely distracting and upsetting. Feelings of fear, anger or frustration dominate. The need to avoid or escape the situation is urgent. Morale is at a low point and only the most engaged of employees can remain productive in this environment.
Barriers to engagement reported by William Jewell College varied widely by subgroup. As an example, barriers to engagement for William Jewell College total, for the full-time faculty and for the specialized staff are shown in Charts 2 - 4.

As seen in the preceding graphs, barriers to engagement can vary widely between subgroups. In developing strategies to address barriers to engagement, care must be taken to discern whether action is more appropriate at the organizational level or the group level.
Cultural Assessment Findings

Valued Behavior Assessments (VBA)™ are reported via graphs which indicate those values that are most important to the work group and provide quantification of their relative importance. Additionally, VBA™ graphs show the balance of positive and negative responses for those values. Clearly, positive responses indicate a positive attitude toward a given valued behavior. Negative responses also indicate that the valued behavior is important, but reflect concerns about the absence of that behavior in the workplace. Both responses combined provide a view of the importance of the valued behavior, but a higher balance of positive responses indicates a more harmonious work environment.

Mission Alignment Findings

The following question was used to evaluate employee understanding and use of the William Jewell mission statement:

I believe the mission of William Jewell College informs the purpose of my work.

Responses to the question are shown below:
Application of Survey Findings to Institutional Improvement and Accreditation Processes

The pilot institution has found information provided by the study useful in ongoing efforts for institutional improvement. Institutional improvement steps undertaken have included dissemination of the findings to all organizational members and infusion of the concept of engagement into managerial decision-making at multiple levels of the organization.

Utilization of information such as that provided to William Jewell College can be seen as a way to base institutional improvement strategies and decisions on a richer mix of considerations as depicted in this diagram.

Discussion of the work engagement findings has provided a common language that can be used at all levels of the organization to discuss institutional improvement. This has brought together a cross-functional and cross-departmental approach to finding solutions to employee related issues. The move away from measuring and thinking about job satisfaction towards assessing workforce engagement has provided a better understanding of how to find solutions that can move employees towards organizational goals.

This has allowed for mission driven decision making. Mission driven decision making is characterized by a lens to discuss employee involvement (the concept of engagement) and the deepened understanding of what involvement means (components in the WEAT analysis). This allows managers at all levels to be able to break down the components that are barriers for their specific work group so they can address them in a way that aligns with organizational mission and goals. This heightened awareness of the mission and relevant tool to assess progress allows for a framework that defines what the institutional priorities for change should be.

Application of Survey Findings to the Accreditation Processes

Research was also done on the applicability of study findings to the accreditation process. A matrix correlating study findings to HLC accreditation criteria was developed and as a result, the institution included study findings as authentic data in various sections of their HLC self-study report. (See pages 14 and 15 for full correlation matrix.) Among others, data on hard-to-assess components, such as connection to mission, were provided by this study. The mission related question provided the initial look into how the college was doing in aligning individuals with the collective goal. By highlighting this strength of the organization, the college was able to utilize that data to expand upon what they had observed but did not have numbers to back up – the strong mission focus. This survey validated quantitative data with qualitative data to further enforce the nature of the mission in the culture of the organization.

This tool is uniquely poised to look at organizational culture and the barriers in place to move that culture towards organizational outcomes. This is something that is lacking in most assessment processes and is very difficult to measure. By utilizing a comprehensive engagement study the self-study was able to get into a dialogue about organizational culture, workplace effectiveness, human resource deployment and motivation and mission that was much richer than would have otherwise been possible.
The full work engagement study report was included in the college’s evidence room in preparation for the North Central accreditation team visit. The report assisted the self-study by affirming many of the themes that emerged in the college’s assessment process.

Further analysis following completion of the pilot study was completed to evaluate use of this instrument in the AQIP accreditation system being adopted by the Higher Learning Commission. The type of primary data provided by the methodology used in the pilot study should prove a reasonable basis for action-based projects. Further, AQIP criteria categories two, four, five, six seven and eight are all candidates for enhancement by using data derived from these instruments. These conclusions represent preliminary correlation findings. Research is ongoing to correlate data to the other five regional accreditation bodies.

**Student Research Projects**

One additional and exciting facet of this pilot study was the development of student research and analysis based on the findings and study methodology used. Student effort consisted of two research and analysis projects conducted, to date, in five upper level human resource courses. As research indicates over and over this generation of students learn best through experience. By allowing the students to engage in the data collection and analysis process we were able to create a student learning outcome that nicely complemented organizational learning goals and assist in institutional learning and change. This allowed for learning at all levels combining student, faculty and staff in an effective and exciting endeavor.

In the Work Engagement Data Analysis project, students were given instruction on the concept of work engagement and the measurement methodology used in the pilot survey. Students also read extensively on the concept. With this foundational knowledge students were then grouped into teams, provided aggregate data from the four components of the study and asked to utilize statistical analysis techniques to assess the data, prepare presentations on the findings and use the findings to make recommendations for change. Students then presented their findings to faculty and campus consultants to determine effectiveness of arguments and quality of presentations. The best team was selected to present to the President’s cabinet to display findings and offer recommendations for change. This allowed students to not only enhance their learning regarding statistics, employment data and effective workplace change initiatives, they were also able to observe and develop quality presentations and communicate results in a professional environment.

In the Work Engagement / Campus Hero Project students were asked to take the results to the next level. Students engaged in interviews and discussions with other student groups to identify employees on campus who were making a difference in student success. Once employees were identified students were asked to use hypothesis testing to further their understanding of engagement data, data-driven organizational decision making and the impact of employee engagement on student success. Identified employees were asked to take the WEAT portion of the survey to assess what engagement looks like from those who are making a difference in the lives of students. Students will then test their hypothesis of engagement results with actual results to see if engaged workers are those who make a difference in the lives of students.

This project allows students to understand some statistical analysis in the context of decision making. It utilizes theories they are using in the classroom to analyze organizational culture, work process and recommendations for change. By utilizing real data students are more intent on their learning because they realize that the outcomes are relevant to others and can impact real change. This enhances the learning at both the student and organizational level.
Plans for Ongoing Research

Normative data helps one gain perspective on how the organization has scored relative to general work environment populations. Population norms on general engagement data and the six Work Engagement indicators provide the organization with a frame of reference that adds another level of information to consider when planning organizational responses to the data.

While it is clear that results that score further to the right are more positive, there may be more issues within the organization surrounding an indicator score that is higher in absolute terms, but much lower than average scores on the same indicator from the full database (drawn from many organizations) of respondents.

That said, findings documented in this pilot study were compared to a population norm in order to provide the reader with perspective on the findings for this organization. The population norm reported is not specific to academic institutions, but is reported here as a way to add clarity to the relative importance of indicator findings since longitudinal data is not available in this first study.

Plans are underway to conduct a national study of institutions of higher learning to establish WEAT™ norms specific to this target population. The establishment of an Academic Institution Population Norm on general engagement and all six indicators will be the primary purpose of this study. Institutional findings will be published to each participating institution and will include the overall institutional work engagement level, levels of the six indicators and corresponding academic population norms for those same data points. Full analysis of BTE™, VBA™, Mission questions and subgroup data will not be included in findings published to individual institutions although for research purposes, data associated with these tools will be collected.

Plans associated with the national study also include gathering data on institutional performance in an attempt to determine if there is a correlation between institutional performance and work engagement. Participants in the national study will be eligible to conduct student research projects on work engagement and to request additional analysis of data to support institutional improvement and accreditation efforts.

Conclusion
The result of this pilot study is that work engagement assessment via the methodology utilized in this pilot does provide value to institutions of higher education. Value was provided by informing decisions associated with institutional improvement, especially through identification of barriers to engagement and enhanced understanding of organizational culture. The delivery of authentic data proved useful in documentation efforts associated with the accreditation process. The use of affiliated student projects in the classroom allowed for an applied learning opportunity that enhanced the educational experience and introduced students to state-of-the art human resource management concepts. Finally, the mission of the institution was served by enriching learning at all levels...administration, faculty, staff and students.
NCA/HLC Self-Study Related Findings

This section is a summary of findings (organized by assessment tool) from the William Jewell College pilot study that was developed for use in preparation of the HLC Self-study Report. This information is organized per Self-Study Criteria. The matrix shown on this page and the following page provides a reference overview of the correlation between study findings and each NCA/ HLC criterion. An abbreviated version of this matrix is included in presentation slides.

Note: this matrix includes a study category called “Faculty Questions”. These were included in the pilot study at the request of William Jewell College and would not normally be a part of this type of engagement survey.

**HLC Criteria / Engagement Study Correlation Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion One: Mission and Integrity. The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff and students.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future. The organization’s allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued on next page
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEAT™ Overall</th>
<th>WEAT™ Indicators</th>
<th>BTE™</th>
<th>VBA</th>
<th>Supplemental Questions</th>
<th>Faculty Questions</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching.</strong> The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Faculty Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Faculty Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Faculty – Job Match, Relationships – Overall and Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>Faculty – Growth &amp; Challenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4a | Growth & Challenge – Overall, Staff and Faculty | | | | | | |
| 4b | | | | N/A | | | |
| 4c | | | | | | | |
| 4d | | | | | | | |

| **Criterion Four: Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge.** The organization promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission. |
| 4a | | | | | | | |
| 4b | | | | | | | |
| 4c | | | | | | | |
| 4d | | | | | | | |

| **Criterion Five: Engagement and Service.** As called for by its mission, the organization identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value. |
| 5a | | | | EdDGE™ Study | | | |
| 5b | | | | | N/A | | |
| 5c | | | | | | | |
| 5d | Overall Engagement | Organizational Affinity | | | | | |

Follow-on strategies for improvement
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