

Departure Survey Report

For Fiscal Year 2010

IOWA EXECUTIVE BRANCH



**State of Iowa
January 2011**

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

- This project was initiated by the Department of Personnel, now the Department of Administrative Services (DAS)– Human Resources Enterprise (HRE), to assist executive branch agencies in determining why employees leave their employ or state government as well as provide insight into past employee perceptions of their employer. As the workforce continues to age and at the same time the available workforce declines, employers must have data to manage their turnover effectively.

Objectives

- The specific objectives for this research are to:
 - Determine the most prevalent reasons employees separate from state employment.
 - Determine if departments are utilizing exit interviews.
 - Determine past employee perceptions about compensation and benefit issues.
 - Determine past employee perceptions about employee autonomy issues.
 - Determine past employee perceptions about co-workers/supervisors.
 - Determine past employee perceptions about diversity issues.
 - Determine past employee perceptions about communication issues.

This Report

- The report that follows contains the methodology and key findings for the State of Iowa as an employer after the sixth year of data collection. **ALL TOTAL FIGURES INCLUDE 10 YEARS WORTH OF DATA.**

METHODOLOGY

Sample

- The population for this year's survey consisted of all those executive branch employees who left state employment or made an interagency transfer over the course of fiscal year 2010. The population surveyed included 2,052 past and current employees comprised of 30 transfers, 455 retirees and early retirees, and 121 voluntary separations.

Sample Contact

- Packets were mailed throughout FY' 10 after an approximate lag period of 60 days from the date of separation. Although additional surveys had to be sent out after the end of the fiscal year, since the data feed did not include SERIP retirees. Each packet included a survey and postage paid return envelope.
- As of November 30, 2010, the designated cut-off date (which was extended beyond the usual cut-off date of September 30th due to the data feed), the total return was as follows:

	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>Total Project</u>
Number Mailed	883	2,052	11,641
Returned Undeliverable	22	25	206
Net Delivered	861	2,027	11,435
Responses (n)	289	606	3,930
Response Rate	33.6%	29.9%	34.4%

Data Analysis

- The data collected in this study was edited, coded, entered and verified.
- Results have been generated to provide a total for the past 10 fiscal years.
- In addition, appropriate demographics have been provided and cross tabulations have been produced.
- The tabulated data have been thoroughly analyzed based on the purpose and objectives defined at the outset of the project.
- Frequencies have been calculated for all the questions on the survey.

KEY FINDINGS – DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF TOTAL SAMPLE

Characteristics

	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>Total Project</u>
<u>Sub-samples</u>			
Transfers	15.9%	5.0%	17.5%
Retirements	43.9%	75.1%	42.3%
Voluntary Separations	40.1%	20.0%	40.3%
<u>Gender</u>			
Male	40.3%	47.6%	41.7%
Female	59.7%	52.4%	58.3%
<u>Disability</u>			
Yes	2.8%	5.1%	5.6%
No	97.7%	94.9%	94.4%
<u>Age Group</u>			
18-29 years	14.2%	3.3%	10.8%
30-39 years	9.7%	7.6%	16.3%
40-49 years	19.4%	4.5%	16.2%
50-59 years	21.5%	31.2%	26.6%
60-69 years	32.6%	50.8%	28.5%
70+ years	2.4%	2.5%	1.6%
<u>Ethnicity</u>			
Caucasian	93.8%	96.7%	95.1%
African American	3.1%	0.8%	1.8%
Asian American	0.7%	0.7%	1.1%
Native American	0.7%	0.5%	0.6%
Latino	1.7%	1.3%	1.4%
<u>Supervisor</u>			
Yes	13.5%	15.3%	15.3%
No	86.5%	84.7%	84.7%

KEY FINDINGS – DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF TOTAL SAMPLE

Characteristics

	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>Total Project</u>
<u>Length of Employment</u>			
Less than 1 year	10.1%	2.2%	8.5%
1-5 years	32.6%	12.9%	26.9%
6-10 years	11.1%	8.8%	12.7%
11-15 years	7.3%	7.8%	8.6%
16-25 years	15.3%	17.7%	17.7%
25+ years	23.6%	50.6%	25.6%
<u>Location</u>			
Capitol Complex	18.4%	15.1%	23.2%
Regional	14.5%	14.2%	15.0%
Polk County	6.7%	5.0%	5.9%
DOT – Ames	4.9%	7.5%	3.5%
Institution	29.3%	33.1%	29.6%
Home Based	3.9%	1.7%	3.0%
Other	22.3%	23.4%	19.8%
<u>Past Dept Employer</u>			
Human Services	34.0%	30.6%	30.5%
Corrections	13.2%	17.8%	15.1%
Transportation*	7.3%	15.4%	7.0%
Workforce Development	3.5%	4.3%	4.9%
Education	3.1%	2.3%	4.1%
Natural Resources	5.9%	3.7%	4.0%
Public Safety	5.2%	1.8%	3.8%
Veteran's Home	4.2%	5.0%	3.8%
Public Health	1.7%	2.7%	3.3%
Administrative Services	3.1%	1.5%	2.7%
Inspections & Appeals	3.1%	3.0%	2.7%
Agriculture	2.4%	1.8%	2.4%
Revenue	1.0%	1.7%	1.9%
Public Defense	2.1%	2.0%	1.7%
Auditor	1.4%	0.0%	1.3%
All Others	8.7%	6.5%	10.9%

*Data feed from IT was incorrect until 2003.

KEY FINDINGS – TOTAL SAMPLE PROFILE

Top 5 reasons for Separating from State Employment

<u>Reason</u>	Percent of respondents listing this reason in 2009	Percent of respondents listing this reason in 2010	Total percent of respondents listing this reason*
1. Working Conditions	23.9%	18.5%	28.4%
2. Quality of Supervision	25.6%	16.5%	24.2%
3. Career Advancement Opportunity	20.4%	6.9%	21.7%
4. Organization Culture	14.9%	10.2%	16.2%
5. Co-Worker Relations	12.8%	9.9%	13.8%

*Respondent could select more than one. Omits those who left because of retirement.

Length of Job Search

	<u>FY 2009</u>	<u>FY 2010</u>	<u>Total Percent</u>
Started search within the last 90 days	37.8%	35.5%	35.0%
Started search within the last 6 months	26.4%	25.0%	27.7%
Started search within the last year	14.5%	20.5%	18.9%
Started search over a year ago	21.2%	19.0%	18.4%

Employing Agency asked employee to reconsider leaving.

- 29.4% of respondents said that their previous department encouraged them to reconsider leaving in 2009. This number decreased in 2010 to 17.9%.

Employing Agency encouraged employee to check other State employee career options.

- In 2009, 8.0% of respondents said that their previous department encouraged them to explore alternative state career options prior to leaving. This number decreased in 2010 to 3.2%.

Employee checked into other options that would have allowed him/her to stay.

- In 2009, 39.1% of respondents said they, in fact, did check into options that would have allowed them to stay with the State prior to leaving. This number decreased in 2010 to 26.9%.

Employing Agency conducted an Exit Interview.

- 36.3% of respondents said that their previous department conducted an exit interview prior to leaving in 2009, which decreased to 30.1% in 2010.



Strongly Disagree -2- -3- -4- -5- Strongly Agree

Individual Survey Items

I would apply for another position with the State of Iowa if I were looking for work (35).

2009	9.1%	3.1%	7.0%	16.1%	18.5%	46.2%
2010	15.7%	6.6%	7.8%	11.5%	23.6%	34.8%
Total	11.3%	5.7%	8.4%	14.9%	22.9%	36.9%

	25.3% disagreed to some degree	74.7% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Compensation & Rewards

I was recognized when I did exceptional work (1).

2009	15.2%	11.1%	16.3%	15.9%	20.4%	21.1%
2010	14.2%	17.0%	14.7%	18.5%	18.3%	17.3%
Total	15.8%	16.4%	16.6%	19.0%	17.7%	14.5%

	48.8% disagreed to some degree	51.2% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The benefits I received met my expectations (2).

2009	2.8%	2.8%	7.7%	11.9%	28.7%	46.2%
2010	2.3%	3.5%	7.3%	14.2%	38.7%	34.0%
Total	2.7%	4.0%	9.0%	17.4%	35.7%	31.2%

	15.7% disagreed to some degree	84.3% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

I was paid fairly for the work I did (3).

2009	10.5%	10.5%	7.7%	18.2%	30.1%	23.1%
2010	5.8%	8.1%	8.6%	18.3%	33.2%	25.9%
Total	7.6%	9.7%	12.7%	19.1%	30.2%	20.8%

	29.9% disagreed to some degree	70.1% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

My pay was similar to employees performing the same jobs in the private sector (4).

2009	16.9%	9.9%	16.2%	21.1%	23.2%	12.7%
2010	10.5%	12.4%	18.0%	23.2%	21.5%	14.4%
Total	14.4%	15.4%	18.4%	21.4%	19.0%	11.4%

	48.2% disagreed to some degree	51.8% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------



Strongly Disagree

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

Strongly Agree

I was asked to do an appropriate amount of work for the amount I was paid (19).

2009	18.1%	13.2%	9.7%	18.1%	21.5%	19.4%
2010	7.3%	9.8%	12.3%	23.7%	25.8%	21.0%
Total	10.6%	12.5%	12.5%	20.6%	26.9%	16.9%

35.6% disagreed to some degree

64.4% agreed to some degree

Work Tools

My office environment helped me provide quality products and services (5).

2009	16.9%	14.8%	20.4%	19.0%	19.7%	9.2%
2010	11.8%	16.2%	19.4%	21.1%	20.1%	11.3%
Total	13.7%	15.9%	19.8%	22.1%	19.0%	9.5%

49.3% disagreed to some degree

50.7% agreed to some degree

The training I received permitted me to update and expand my skills (6).

2009	11.9%	17.5%	11.9%	25.2%	17.5%	16.1%
2010	9.8%	13.6%	18.9%	21.8%	22.9%	13.0%
Total	12.4%	14.3%	16.3%	23.2%	22.7%	11.1%

42.9% disagreed to some degree

57.1% agreed to some degree

The technology I was provided was sufficient to accomplish my work (7).

2009	8.4%	8.4%	17.5%	19.6%	28.7%	17.5%
2010	5.1%	7.4%	15.3%	23.9%	33.5%	14.8%
Total	6.4%	8.4%	15.6%	24.4%	31.4%	13.8%

30.4% disagreed to some degree

69.6% agreed to some degree

I was provided the necessary orientation and training to successfully carry out my job duties (9).

2009	11.9%	11.9%	20.3%	14.7%	22.4%	18.9%
2010	5.6%	10.6%	16.9%	25.1%	26.7%	15.0%
Total	9.5%	12.4%	17.2%	22.8%	24.9%	13.2%

39.1% disagreed to some degree

60.9% agreed to some degree



Strongly Disagree -2- -3- -4- -5- Strongly Agree

I was given complete and accurate information regarding my job duties prior to accepting the job I recently vacated (17).

2009	10.5%	11.2%	11.9%	21.0%	22.4%	23.1%
2010	6.3%	11.2%	13.9%	23.6%	26.4%	18.5%
Total	9.4%	10.9%	15.6%	23.1%	25.2%	15.8%

	35.9% disagreed to some degree	64.1% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Policies and procedures were clear and aided me in performing my job (24).

2009	18.1%	8.3%	16.0%	13.9%	26.4%	17.4%
2010	8.3%	10.8%	15.8%	24.5%	25.5%	15.0%
Total	11.1%	11.5%	16.9%	21.9%	25.1%	13.5%

	39.4% disagreed to some degree	60.6% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Communication

Communication was open and informative within my work unit (13).

2009	22.9%	15.3%	15.3%	10.4%	16.7%	19.4%
2010	18.4%	15.8%	16.7%	15.9%	19.4%	13.8%
Total	20.1%	15.8%	16.3%	16.7%	18.6%	12.6%

	52.2% disagreed to some degree	47.8% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

My department's vision, mission, and goals were communicated to me (14).

2009	9.0%	10.4%	13.9%	21.5%	19.4%	25.7%
2010	8.3%	6.8%	16.5%	20.3%	28.0%	20.0%
Total	9.2%	8.5%	16.0%	21.5%	26.6%	18.2%

	33.7% disagreed to some degree	66.3% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

I had a clear understanding of how I contributed to the mission of my department (15).

2009	9.0%	8.3%	16.0%	21.5%	22.2%	22.9%
2010	7.3%	8.6%	14.4%	18.7%	30.3%	20.6%
Total	8.6%	10.3%	15.0%	20.3%	27.4%	18.3%

	34.0% disagreed to some degree	66.0% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------



Strongly Disagree
-2-
-3-
-4-
-5-
Strongly Agree

I received timely and effective feedback about my performance (16).

2009	16.0%	15.3%	16.7%	19.4%	14.6%	18.1%
2010	13.5%	16.5%	17.3%	19.0%	21.5%	12.3%
Total	16.3%	17.1%	18.1%	19.3%	17.9%	11.3%

51.5% disagreed to some degree	48.5% agreed to some degree
--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Intrinsic Value & Autonomy

There were career advancement opportunities for me if I had chosen to stay (8).

2009	31.0%	23.9%	16.2%	9.2%	10.6%	9.2%
2010	38.2%	22.4%	13.1%	12.1%	8.8%	5.4%
Total	40.2%	22.2%	14.0%	11.2%	7.6%	4.7%

76.4% disagreed to some degree	23.6% agreed to some degree
--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The work I was required to do was meaningful (18).

2009	4.2%	6.3%	7.6%	19.4%	30.6%	31.9%
2010	3.3%	3.8%	9.1%	16.1%	27.5%	40.1%
Total	3.2%	4.7%	9.4%	17.6%	31.1%	34.0%

17.4% disagreed to some degree	82.6% agreed to some degree
--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The work I was required to do was enjoyable (20).

2009	6.3%	11.1%	12.5%	27.1%	25.7%	17.4%
2010	4.0%	8.4%	12.4%	22.1%	30.3%	22.9%
Total	5.8%	8.7%	13.4%	23.8%	28.3%	20.0%

27.9% disagreed to some degree	72.1% agreed to some degree
--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The work I performed was consistent with my career interests (21).

2009	7.6%	9.7%	16.0%	16.7%	30.6%	19.4%
2010	4.2%	7.1%	10.6%	20.2%	31.9%	26.1%
Total	5.3%	7.6%	13.2%	20.9%	31.0%	21.9%

26.2% disagreed to some degree	73.8% agreed to some degree
--------------------------------	-----------------------------



Strongly Disagree -2- -3- -4- -5- **Strongly Agree**

My job gave me opportunities to serve the citizens of Iowa and “make a difference” (29).

2009	10.4%	3.5%	5.6%	20.1%	24.3%	36.1%
2010	3.3%	3.3%	8.4%	15.9%	31.8%	37.3%
Total	4.7%	4.9%	9.3%	17.7%	29.2%	34.2%

18.9% disagreed to some degree	81.1% agreed to some degree
--------------------------------	-----------------------------

My job met my personal expectations and was in line with my personal goals (30).

2009	9.7%	11.1%	16.0%	22.2%	21.5%	19.4%
2010	4.2%	5.5%	14.5%	20.4%	31.3%	24.1%
Total	7.2%	9.6%	15.1%	22.3%	27.5%	18.3%

31.9% disagreed to some degree	68.1% agreed to some degree
--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The work I performed was consistent with my skill level (32).

2009	12.6%	6.3%	9.8%	9.1%	34.3%	28.0%
2010	5.8%	6.5%	6.7%	15.5%	35.3%	30.2%
Total	7.7%	7.2%	9.2%	16.0%	34.5%	25.5%

24.0% disagreed to some degree	76.0% agreed to some degree
--------------------------------	-----------------------------

I was encouraged to develop to my maximum potential (33).

2009	17.4%	10.4%	12.5%	15.3%	20.8%	23.6%
2010	14.7%	12.2%	11.8%	20.3%	23.2%	17.8%
Total	15.1%	12.5%	14.7%	19.1%	21.8%	16.7%

42.4% disagreed to some degree	57.6% agreed to some degree
--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Organizational Culture

I was never harassed or treated poorly at work (10).

2009	23.6%	14.6%	7.6%	5.6%	22.2%	26.4%
2010	23.7%	12.5%	11.7%	12.5%	19.2%	20.5%
Total	21.5%	11.6%	11.7%	12.3%	20.4%	22.5%

44.8% disagreed to some degree	55.2% agreed to some degree
--------------------------------	-----------------------------



Strongly Disagree

-2-

-3-

-4-

-5-

Strongly Agree

All employees in my department were treated fairly (11).

2009	26.4%	18.8%	13.9%	13.2%	13.9%	13.9%
2010	23.8%	17.3%	13.8%	15.3%	17.5%	12.2%
Total	24.8%	17.1%	14.7%	15.5%	15.9%	12.0%

	56.6% disagreed to some degree	43.4% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

My department was accepting of diverse individuals and groups (12).

2009	11.9%	8.4%	11.9%	15.4%	28.7%	23.8%
2010	8.7%	6.5%	13.4%	19.4%	28.9%	23.1%
Total	10.0%	7.9%	13.4%	19.9%	28.5%	20.2%

	31.4% disagreed to some degree	68.6% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Teamwork and cooperation were encouraged in my work unit (27).

2009	12.5%	11.1%	11.8%	13.2%	29.9%	21.5%
2010	10.6%	9.4%	12.8%	17.5%	28.1%	21.7%
Total	11.9%	10.4%	11.6%	17.4%	26.5%	22.2%

	33.9% disagreed to some degree	66.1% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Employee complaints and problems were appropriately handled in a timely manner (28).

2009	21.7%	18.9%	14.7%	20.3%	14.0%	10.5%
2010	22.5%	16.2%	13.4%	16.4%	20.9%	10.7%
Total	24.0%	16.1%	15.4%	18.4%	16.9%	9.2%

	55.5% disagreed to some degree	44.5% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Taking initiative was encouraged in my work unit (31).

2009	15.3%	9.0%	9.0%	19.4%	25.0%	22.2%
2010	12.6%	10.8%	10.3%	17.5%	28.3%	20.5%
Total	12.9%	10.7%	11.8%	17.6%	26.2%	20.8%

	35.4% disagreed to some degree	64.6% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------



Strongly Disagree
-2-
-3-
-4-
-5-
Strongly Agree

Supervisor Perceptions

I had a good working relationship with my immediate supervisor (22).

2009	17.5%	8.4%	8.4%	15.4%	19.6%	30.8%
2010	16.8%	8.8%	10.3%	12.0%	23.7%	28.3%
Total	14.6%	9.0%	9.6%	13.4%	23.5%	29.9%

	33.2% disagreed to some degree	66.8% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The supervision provided to me was effective (23).

2009	21.5%	11.8%	12.5%	13.2%	16.7%	24.3%
2010	19.4%	12.7%	10.9%	16.8%	20.4%	19.8%
Total	19.2%	11.8%	11.9%	15.5%	22.2%	19.3%

	42.9% disagreed to some degree	57.1% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

My supervisor let me know that he/she valued my contributions (25).

2009	22.9%	12.5%	8.3%	11.1%	18.8%	26.4%
2010	17.0%	11.8%	10.1%	15.6%	21.8%	23.6%
Total	18.1%	11.7%	10.5%	14.8%	21.8%	23.2%

	40.3% disagreed to some degree	59.7% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Co-worker Perceptions

I had a good working relationship with my co-workers (26).

2009	6.9%	1.4%	5.6%	15.3%	33.3%	37.5%
2010	3.8%	4.2%	8.4%	12.5%	33.9%	37.1%
Total	3.9%	3.9%	6.6%	14.5%	34.5%	36.6%

	14.4% disagreed to some degree	85.6% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

The State employees I knew were hard-working and took pride in the work they did (34).

2009	11.3%	10.6%	12.7%	18.3%	21.8%	25.4%
2010	6.8%	6.3%	10.6%	23.4%	26.7%	26.2%
Total	7.0%	8.8%	13.1%	22.1%	27.5%	21.4%

	28.9% disagreed to some degree	71.1% agreed to some degree
--	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Preference Ratings

Top 5 things past employees liked about their employment with the State

<u>Liked Most</u>	Percent of respondents in 2009	Percent of respondents in 2010	Total percent of respondents *
1. Made Multiple Choices*	12.2%	10.8%	31.4%
2. Benefits	35.3%	31.8%	22.0%
3. Retirement Benefits	14.0%	22.7%	13.1%
4. Co-Worker Relations	9.4%	10.4%	11.6%
5. Rate of Pay	8.4%	8.4%	7.8%

*Respondent was only supposed to select one. Change in form reduced multiple choices for FY08.

Top 5 things attracting past employees to their current jobs

<u>Attracting Feature</u>	Percent of respondents in 2009	Percent of respondents in 2010	Total percent of respondents *
1. Career Advancement Opportunity	25.3%	9.2%	24.1%
2. Working Conditions	22.1%	9.4%	22.5%
3. Rate of Pay	19.4%	8.4%	17.9%
4. Organizational Culture	17.0%	7.9%	13.9%
5. Opportunity for Training	14.2%	5.3%	11.5%

*Respondent could select more than one.

Top 5 things past employees liked least about their employment with the State

<u>Liked Least</u>	Percent of respondents in 2009	Percent of respondents in 2010	Total percent of respondents *
1. Made Multiple Choices*	10.0%	7.3%	24.5%
2. Quality of Supervision	18.7%	24.8%	15.5%
3. Career Advancement Opportunity	14.9%	15.0%	12.7%
4. Organizational Culture	12.1%	14.0%	12.0%
5. Working Conditions	17.0%	12.0%	11.3%

*Respondent was only supposed to select one. Change in form reduced multiple choices for FY08.

Revisit of Objectives

Determine the most prevalent reasons employees separate from state employment.

Based on the 10-year aggregate sample, respondents list the top reason for leaving to be, “Working Conditions” followed closely by “Quality of Supervision” and “Career Advancement Opportunity”. These three reasons were also three of the top five things listed as aspects of state employment least liked by respondents. Further, perceptions of “Career Advancement Opportunity” and “Working Conditions” provided by other employers were the top two attracting features to the respondents.

Determine if departments are utilizing exit interviews.

Unfortunately, slightly more than 30% of respondents stated that their previous state employer conducted an exit interview. There has been an overall decrease since this survey was implemented in 2001. In 2001, 34.4% of respondents stated in the affirmative their previous State employer performed this important step. In 2010, this number has dropped to 30.1%. This is a window from which a department can ascertain and provide feedback about their particular operation.

Determine past employee perceptions about compensation and benefit issues.

Based on the 10-year aggregate sample, respondents perceived their benefits in a very positive light. Over 84% of respondents felt the benefits offered met their expectations (2), and it was the single most often cited aspect of working for the State that respondents liked. On the other hand, just under half of the respondents felt they earned less than people working the same jobs in the private sector (4). Interestingly, “Rate of Pay” was not a major reason listed for leaving but it was the third highest attracting feature perceived to be offered by other employers. Most employees felt they were paid fairly (3) and asked to do an appropriate amount of work for what they were paid (19).

Determine past employee perceptions about employee autonomy and intrinsic value.

Although most respondents believe the work they performed as a state employee was meaningful (18), enjoyable (20), consistent with their career interests (21) and perceived skill levels (32), and allowed them to serve Iowa citizens and “make a difference” (29), over three-fourths of these same respondents did not believe that there were career opportunities if they had chosen to stay (8), over 76% answered negatively on item 8. This last perception is especially dangerous to the State due to the fact that perceived career advancement opportunities appear to be a major reason for leaving and a major attracting feature of other employers.

Determine past employee perceptions about co-workers/supervisors.

Respondents as a group did not provide overly negative responses to any of the questions regarding supervision (22, 23, and 25). However, it was cited as the second highest reason for leaving and one of the top five factors cited as “liked least” about employment with the State.

Determine past employee perceptions about co-workers/supervisors.

The two items dealing with co-worker perceptions (26 & 34) were two of the most positive items responded to on the survey and perceptions about co-workers was listed as one of the top 5 things liked most about state employment.

Determine past employee perceptions about diversity issues.

In the future, as more data is collected comparisons will be possible between ethnic groups on all items and especially those items falling under the heading of Organizational Culture in this report. Unfortunately, all that can be said on this topic now is that two-thirds of respondents felt their past department was accepting of diverse individuals (12). A majority of the respondents, however, did not feel that all employees in their past department were treated fairly (11). Unfortunately, because the numbers do not allow it, race cannot be tested as a factor in this perception.

Determine past employee perceptions about communication issues.

Over half of the respondents disagreed that communication was open and informative within their past work unit (13) and that feedback was timely and effective regarding performance (16).

Conclusion

Based on the 10-year aggregate sample, it appears that out of the 35 individual items on the survey, only 14 items could be said to have received very positive responses (over 2/3rds agreement with an item). This is not too surprising as this is an exit survey and respondents are likely to be somewhat more negative/honest in their responses. Regardless, there are many positives to be found. Only five items have over 50% of the respondents disagreeing with a specific item, so in most cases the majority of respondents are answering positively to the questions. More importantly 74.7% of the respondents agreed to some degree that they would likely apply for another position with the State if they were looking.

After reviewing this report the reader should realize that all the objectives for this project have been met to some degree. The nature of this type of survey is dependent on the population of interest and as such the usefulness will grow over time as more data becomes available. At some later date, differences between specific departments and groups will be made. The response rate is promising and over time the different subgroups will reach a level where group comparison and more significance testing will be possible.