Staff Learning

Statement of Questions Addressed

Methodology

Findings, Interpretations, and Analysis

Discussion, Recommendations, and Conclusions

For questions regarding the WASC Self Study contact the WASC Coordinating Office

Foreword

As a part of Cal Poly's innovative WASC self-study, the members of the Staff Learning Subcommittee examined the quality of the university's intellectual environment from the point of view of the Cal Poly Staff Members. The Subcommittee started with the concept that Cal Poly is a **center of learning**, and the belief that this concept should shape activities and resources that would serve to unite the members of the university community.

Statement of Questions Addressed

The Subcommittee's research focused on three researchable questions:

1. Is Cal Poly's current approach to staff development adequate and appropriate?
2. How prepared and current are Cal Poly staff employees with respect to their support roles?
3. What steps should Cal Poly take to improve the climate for staff development?

In order to answer these questions, a discussion first needed to take place to determine if there is (or should be) a distinction made between work-related training and the broader concept of professional development and life-long learning. Although this might seem to be a subtle difference, there is an underlying distinction between the two that implies significantly different viewpoints. One is that work-related training is sufficient. The other is that there are broader implications to be considered within the context of life-long learning. The research conducted by the Staff Learning Subcommittee looked at both viewpoints.

To determine to what extent the university supports both work-related training and staff professional development, and promotes staff members' life-long learning, the subcommittee focused on existing policies, staff members' input regarding the current status of training and professional development opportunities on campus, the conflicts (if any) between the ideal and the reality, and recommendations for the future.

To focus their efforts, the subcommittee developed the following questions:

Is the university policy on staff work-related training and professional development:

- Known to the campus?
- Consistently applied across departments?
- Adequate to the needs of the campus community?
- Congruent with the campus vision for staff professional growth, achievement and life-long learning?

The significance of these questions to the campus is based on policies asserted in several essential documents.

The **WASC Steering Committee's self-study proposal orientation materials** presented to the campus and to the subcommittee and approved by Provost Paul Zingg and by Ralph Wolff, Executive Director of WASC, remark:

> *Staff development is central to student learning. By continuing to learn, staff members improve the quality of services for students, achieve productivities that free resources for student learning and demonstrate for students that life-long learning is essential for all work and all members of a community.*

The Cal Poly Strategic Plan was developed as a means to guide the university over the next several years (last amended in 1995). It established a direction for achieving the mission of the university by setting forth the goals and priorities that will direct its future planning, resource allocation and decision making. Section 3 of the Strategic Plan discusses the importance of and expectations for staff professional development. The following is the introduction to that section:

> *Excellence in support of students and faculty is the primary goal of Cal Poly's staff, and participation in activities that lead to professional growth and achievement is essential to meeting this goal. Professional growth and achievement includes continuing education related to a staff member's current position, as well as education and training for future careers. Professional growth and achievement may entail different activities for different staff members and may include opportunities to increase their awareness of, and participation in, projects locally, nationally, and internationally. In a university, it is appropriate for all members of the campus community to have the opportunity to seek further learning.*

The Strategic Plan further states that "Cal Poly's staff members shall have the opportunity to pursue additional education and training whether in pursuit of a degree, certification, or personal life-long learning" (Section 3.1) and, "Consistent with its expectations, Cal Poly shall encourage staff participation in the Scholarships of Discovery, Integration, and Application." (Section 3.6)

The Staff Handbook, last issued in 1997 by the Human Resources office of the university, notes

that employees are offered "various training and development opportunities to strengthen existing job skills, or acquire new skills needed to prepare for future work assignments." The Staff Handbook also outlines the basic elements of a Fee Waiver Program that is supposed to be available to all permanent and to some temporary employees (10).

All of the agreements signed by the various bargaining units represented at Cal Poly include language that requires the university provide and support "Training Opportunities," "Employee Development," "Fee Waivers," "Career Opportunities," Professional Development Leaves," and/or "Employee Education." This list is not complete, and the specific language may vary from agreement to agreement. However, the broad purpose in all of the agreements is eminently clear. The university is obligated by contract to create, to support, and to maintain opportunities for the continuing education and development of its Staff employees.

The campus Injury and Illness Prevention Program (IIPP) is mandated by the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Occupational Safety and Health (CAL/OSHA), and written by the university Office of Environmental Health and Safety. This document covers all aspects of safety for university employees and students and makes clear that responsibility for employee safety and training issues lies at the management level(s) within the university.

A careful review of the various documents that delineate the relationship between the university and its Staff employees made it obvious to the subcommittee that the official policies of the university support the concept that staff should be provided with work-related training and professional development opportunities. The subcommittee members certainly agreed on the importance of the availability of training and professional development opportunities for Staff employees. With the official documents and the researchable questions in hand, the subcommittee focused its research on the effort to determine the nature of the relationship between the published policies and actual practices in the university.

(Top)

Methodology and Preliminary Analysis

The subcommittee utilized the broadest available selection of data and information, only adding newly gathered resources and data when necessary. The subcommittee's conclusions are based on the in depth, expanded analysis of existing survey data, new statistical data, focus group responses, anecdotal information that suggested certain conclusions, and the advice and insight of campus staff members and members of the Staff Learning Subcommittee.

In August 1997, the ad hoc **Committee on Supporting and Sustaining Employee Performance** distributed a survey to all Cal Poly staff. This committee was charged by President Baker with devising an instrument to obtain feedback from support staff regarding concerns, issues and trends in the workplace. Thirty-two percent (336) of the approximately 1,000 staff members responded to the survey. The Staff Learning Subcommittee reviewed survey questions that specifically addressed work-related training and development or that supplied feedback on employee achievement and job satisfaction.

The subcommittee reviewed, also, the existing staff evaluation form used by employees and managers for the annual review of staff performance. The subcommittee specifically looked for

references to goals and accomplishments that included staff training and professional development.

WASC Campus Climate Staff Survey administered in February/March 1999

Two questions on this survey were designed by the Staff Learning Subcommittee to inquire of staff about their understanding of the availability of programs that enhance life-long learning. Four hundred and eleven staff members responded to this survey. In answer to the statement, "Cal Poly offers programs to staff that enhance lifelong learning," 47 percent of those responding "strongly agreed" or "agreed;" 24 percent "strongly disagreed" or "disagreed;" and 28 percent were neutral. In answer to the statement, "Cal Poly offers programs to staff that enhance lifelong learning through opportunities that expose me to diverse ideas and attitudes," 37 percent of those responding "strongly agreed" or "agreed;" 30 percent "strongly disagreed" or "disagreed;" and 33 percent were neutral.

Review and analysis of materials and responses from staff and management focus groups (discussions and questionnaires)

The Staff Learning Subcommittee decided (following the advice of campus professionals) that the responses from focus groups would be an appropriate supplement to the existing Human Resources survey data. The subcommittee asked professionals on campus to help us develop the correct size and make-up of the focus groups, and to assist with timing and question preparation (including the outcome questions, the open-ended questions (Appendix I.4.A) and the yes/no pre-discussion questionnaires (Appendix I.4.B)). The number of focus groups that could be conducted was limited by the timeframe of the study and the time available for subcommittee members to set-up and to facilitate the groups and to analyze the resulting data.

A sub-group of the Staff Learning Subcommittee met to review staff lists provided by the Human Resources Office. Staff and managers were selected from different areas of the university. There was a mix of long-term and newer employees and a balance between males and females. The advising professionals urged the subcommittee not to use a random selection process with the limited number of focus groups that would be conducted. They suggested that a more controlled selection method would produce a better cross-section of staff members.

One management and three staff focus groups were conducted during February and March 1999. Twelve invitations were issued to each staff group and eleven invitations were issued to the management group. Twenty-one staff and six managers participated in the groups. Questionnaires were distributed at the beginning of each session and mailed to those invited group members who did not attend. Twenty-six staff questionnaires and eight management questionnaires were completed.

Analysis of data from Human Resources regarding campus fee waiver participation

The subcommittee also reviewed data on the Fee Waiver Program that included the number of participants by gender and unit, the total number of classes taken, the number and percent of career development classes, and the number and percentage of work related classes. This was considered to be a significant data set because in the period between 1986-87 and 1997-98, the number of fee waiver participants at Cal Poly dropped from 620 to 186, according to data

supplied by the Cal Poly Human Resources Office,

Analysis of participation in Information Technology Services (ITS) training programs

The Staff Learning Committee reviewed the campus participation in ITS computer training sessions to determine the types of training available and the attendance. For the 1998-99 Academic Year, 671 of the 1,011 people who attended ITS training classes were staff members. There were 191 "no-shows" (people who did not cancel enrollment). Courses covered the following: Microsoft Office Suite of programs (Word, Excel, PowerPoint); email; calendar management; ODIN; Web-oriented (e.g. creating web pages with Netscape Composer, Front Page Express); Operating Systems (IUNIX and Windows 95); Graphics (PhotoShop 5.0, Adobe Illustrator 8.0). In addition, there were classes dedicated to using on-campus resources (CBT and Intro to Reprographics).

Analysis of Cal Poly staffing patterns from 1990 to 1998

Since the early1990's, there have been significant reductions in the number of non-hourly staff at Cal Poly. Staff numbered 1,006 in 1990, dropped to a low of 766 in 1993, and recovered to number 892 in 1998. There have been corresponding fluctuations in faculty and management headcount and in student enrollments. The actual ratio of staff members to students has varied from 1:18 (1990, 1991, 1992 and 1998) to 1:21 (1996). The return to a I:18 ratio in 1998 may be signaling a return to a higher staff to student staffing level. There are, however, many other implications to consider over the 1990 to 1998 time period, including changes in the level of services provided, "efficiencies" created by technology, changes in the structure of departments and divisions, additional duties and expectations.

The subcommittee members believe that changes in staffing levels have led to difficulties in providing adequate office coverage when staff members need to be out of the office for training or development opportunities. However, they did not believe that collecting and analyzing data regarding this problem was possible within the limited timeframe of this WASC study. Further analysis and discussion of these issues are seen as important to overall staff satisfaction and should be initiated as soon as possible.

Benchmarking

The Cal Poly Human Resources Department is responsible for managing the staff training and development program for its 1000+ staff employees. In addition to administering the fee waiver program, Human Resources conducts a variety of workshops, including a seven-part supervisory training series, management development seminars, sexual harassment prevention training, effective performance appraisal workshops, and office ergonomics and back safety programs. The training function is assigned to a management position and comprises about 30% of that individual's overall duties.

Each year the Human Resources management projects its total operational costs – including projected campus training needs – and requests a budget allocation to cover these costs. Based on the amount received, after covering salaries and benefits for the HR staff, an allocation is made to the training budget to support campus wide training activities sponsored by Human Resources. The training budget has been approximately $5,000 for each of the past three years. A number of other campus departments, such as Information Technology Services, Risk

Management, and the Employee Assistance Program, also offer on-going training for staff.

In order to assess the adequacy and appropriateness of Cal Poly's current staff development and training programs, the subcommittee surveyed other colleges and universities known to have highly successful, comprehensive staff training and development programs. In fall 1998, the Sedgwick Public Entity Group was commissioned by the California State University through its Benchmarking Task Force to perform a process mapping and best practices study of the CSU human resources function.

Sedgwick examined a number of broad human resources areas, including management/staff development and training. The study revealed that CSU campuses have varying levels of staff training in place with no consistent pattern or set of programs being used at each campus. However, two campuses, CSU-Long Beach and San Diego State University, stood out as "best practices" institutions with comprehensive training and continuous learning programs. The Staff Learning Subcommittee contacted both universities to gather more specific information regarding their organizational structures, types of training programs offered, personnel and budgetary resources, and level of support by senior management for staff training and development opportunities.

The budget figures included below do not include the salaries/benefits of the Human Resources staff responsible for training; rather they represent monies that are available to cover all other costs associated with conducting staff training programs. Because the budget amounts do not represent personnel costs, the subcommittee included staffing numbers and organizational information (when available) in the report to provide a more complete picture of campus resources devoted to this area.

The CSU-Long Beach campus employs approximately 1300 staff and management employees. The Office of Personnel Services has established a successful training and development program that includes, in part, a Management and Supervisory Training series and a ten-part "Road to Success" certificate program that assists clerical and support staff in developing job skills needed to compete for on-campus administrative or managerial positions. Personnel Services also administers a Staff Development Grant program that provides financial support (up to $500) for staff employees who wish to pursue job-related training opportunities.

The university's training program is managed by a full-time analyst who works closely with the Director of Personnel Services in developing, implementing and/or coordinating training activities. A part-time personnel assistant provides clerical and technical support. Noteworthy is the significant level of budgetary support that this program receives from the president of CSU-Long Beach. During the 1998-99 fiscal year, this allocation was $75,000, used to fund the Staff Development Grant program and to cover costs for other Human Resources sponsored/supported training activities. The training manager described campus support for staff development and training as "very strong" and attributed this in great part to the president's leadership and high profile commitment to life-long learning.

San Diego State University also boasts a comprehensive training and development program for its 2000 staff employees. A review of the training catalog published by the Center for Human Resources shows a multitude of workshops, seminars, and short courses delineated by broad categories such as campus connectivity, organizational effectiveness, skill development,

personal development, and health and safety. Although the Center for Human Resources conducts a number of these staff training activities, it serves as the primary clearinghouse for numerous other campus departments and agencies that offer free training programs for employees. A full-time management position coordinates the campus training program and is responsible for personally conducting some training activities as well as soliciting training offerings from various campus departments. Human Resources' annual training budget is small ($2000) and essentially covers training materials and publication costs. The Training Manager reported that, despite the modest training budget, the campus training program is robust, a tribute to the generosity and talent of the staff and faculty who provide training each year without compensation.

San Jose State University was not included in Sedgwick's study; however, the Staff Learning Subcommittee contacted the campus because of the university's well-known commitment to staff development and training for its 2500+ staff employees. The campus Human Resources office has devoted two full-time management positions and a full-time clerical/technical support position to the training function. Human Resources offers a variety of training programs under three major training tracks: management development, supervisory training, and general campus training which is open to all employees. Contracted professional trainers and organizational consultants present a large percentage of the training programs. The training budget for the 1998-99 year was $200,000 (this does not represent salaries of HR training staff), and is used exclusively for staff training and development activities. This amount includes a "roll over" of unused funds from the previous year, and while they do receive a "very generous" yearly allocation, this amount was unusually high.

The subcommittee also looked outside the CSU system for best-practices models. For example, the University of California, Santa Barbara, has a well-established, comprehensive staff development and training program that is managed by their Department of Human Resources. The training staff consists of one full-time Training Manager, two full-time analysts, and a full-time administrative support position. The Human Resources staff conducts some of the training; however, they rely heavily on a large and comprehensive community extension program to provide a variety of certificate programs and other training for staff as well as the general public. Information regarding the annual training budget was not available.

The subcommittee also met with representatives from Cuesta College, a local community college, which is known to have an outstanding training program for its 400+ employees. A review of Cuesta's 50-page **Staff Development Activities Booklet** reveals a multitude of training and development opportunities, including workshops on computer technology, writing skills, diversity, workplace safety, wellness, and a four-part "Great Workplace" program which provides skills training in communication, organizational behavior and team building. The training staff consists of a full-time Coordinator and two clerical support positions. A campus-wide Staff Development Committee assists the Coordinator in developing the yearly training calendar and in administering a Staff Development Fund ($40,000) which provides financial support for individual employee training requests. Noteworthy are designated "District Required Days" during which staff and faculty employees are released from work/classes to participate in development activities. In accordance with state law, Cuesta also requires its faculty employees to engage in the equivalent of 10 days a year of training activities that contribute to their teaching effectiveness and professional and personal development. The Training Coordinator noted that

the president of Cuesta College is a committed advocate of a learning-centered environment and strongly supports such efforts as a recent Staff Appreciation Day.

Other educational institutions in the United States were contacted, and responses came from Santa Clara University, Loyola Marymount University, Skidmore College, Illinois State University, Northern Virginia Community College, University of Louisville, Bucknell University, Colorado State University, and Brown University. All of these institutions have well-established training and development programs for their staff including some type of tuition reduction (fee waiver) program.

The subcommittee found three responses especially interesting. Bucknell University's Strategic Financial Plan identifies staff development as a critical component of the institution's success and allocates funding for staff training. Northern Virginia Community College requires that 2-1/2% of the college's operating budget be used for staff training programs, and Loyola Marymount's demonstrated commitment to staff learning includes liberal funding for staff training activities and designated Staff Development Days.

(Top)

Findings, Interpretations, and Analysis

A. Work-related training and professional development are not interchangeable concepts

It is the subcommittee's professional opinion that work-related training is perceived by the campus as more applicable and measurable than professional development. An example of this distinction is the wording of the Human Resources Staff Survey (8/97), which measures the availability of, and satisfaction with, **work-related training** designed to assist in the efficient completion of assigned duties. Staff professional development as a separate, more abstract concept, is not addressed by the survey. It is more difficult to measure the benefit of life-long learning.

The more subtle policy question then is, "Does the university support professional development as a separate component from skills training?" The Staff Learning Subcommittee, working with the Cal Poly Human Resources Office, developed the following definitions to clarify "work-related training" and "professional development:"

> **Work-related Training**—Specific skills training which has a direct link to the employee's job and is necessary in the performance of current duties.
>
> **Professional Development**—Learning activities which are not a requirement of the employee's current job but which may promote the employee's achieving professional growth and reaching personal goals.

Focus group participants and members of the subcommittee perceive a contradiction between the idealistic view of Cal Poly as a center of learning—supporting a concept of life-long learning for staff—and reality. For example, there is a lack of any overarching commitment to staff learning beyond specific job skills training. Reactions from the focus groups indicate that the

campus does not view staff professional development as a measurable benefit either to the individual employee or to the campus as a whole. Although some campus areas may be supportive of staff development efforts, the support seems dependent on the individual department and often on the immediate supervisor. While some written university policy exists, support for that policy and the concept of staff learning and development as an expressed, shared goal have not been institutionalized. It is evident that more is needed than a written policy; a commitment is required on the part of staff, management and administrators to verbalize, institutionalize and support a goal of life-long learning for staff.

B. Staff members and managers lack awareness and understanding of university policy regarding staff work-related training and professional development.

Much of the subcommittee discussion and focus group dialogue revolved around the lack of awareness of existing *official* campus policy, and inconsistent application of any policy (official or unofficial) for staff work-related training and professional development opportunities.

When staff and management were asked about their levels of knowledge about the university's policy on staff learning opportunities as stated in the **Strategic Plan** and other campus-wide documents, both groups were almost universally unaware of any university policy. It should also be noted that even members of the Staff Learning Subcommittee were initially unaware of many of the university's written policies.

Some focus group participants mentioned a basic understanding of fee waiver as a learning opportunity, but there was little knowledge of common procedures or guidelines. Other anecdotes from staff members illustrate the lack of understanding and uniformity regarding fee waiver and other training/professional development opportunities. A staff member was told that he/she could not use fee waiver because the classes requested were not directly related to his/her current position. Over a several year period, another employee was repeatedly denied a request for release time from work to attend a class using fee waiver. When the staff member appealed to the manager, the manager relented. Other staff members cite instances that suggest that within departments the criteria vary from employee to employee.

It should be noted, however, that neither the lack of knowledge of policy nor the absence of uniformity in implementation necessarily means that staff members are not aware of or do not attend learning opportunities. Results from the Human Resources Staff Survey indicate that training sessions are made available and many staff take advantage of the opportunities. According to the Survey data collected, 77 percent of the respondents felt they were provided reasonable time and support for necessary training. Eighty-six percent of staff responding had attended a work-related training session in the last three years (e.g., computer training, e-mail, calendaring, voice mail).

Some staff members do earn degrees. Staff members who work in departments that allow time for employees to pursue degree objectives, and/or staff members who are creative (and patient) about when and how they accomplish their educational objectives, can benefit from the opportunities available at their workplace. A twenty-year employee in Facilities Services is an example of a Cal Poly employee who has taken advantage of the fee waiver program in an interesting way. This staff member has worked as a part-time, permanent employee on a night

shift while he/she has pursued a degree during the day. For this particular employee, the off-shift method and participation in the fee waiver program has worked well. His/her degree was conferred in June 1999.

Data from the Cal Poly Human Resources Office suggest, however, that the number of employees seeking degrees through the provisions afforded by fee waiver is decreasing. In 1986-87 there were 620 fee waiver participants. That number has steadily declined with the last reported year, 1997-98, showing only 186 participants. The number of classes taken also declined from 896 (1986-87) to 250 (1997-98). No research has been undertaken to determine the reasons for this decrease.

The focus groups revealed that employees had a wide range of responses concerning training policies. Most associated *training* with computer or management skills, although trades and technical staff tended to view training more broadly, including training for use of equipment and materials or safety/health issues. The response of those in non-clerical roles varied from employees who felt that mandatory safety work-related training requirements were being met, to those who were unaware that any such provisions or policy regarding training existed. For example, because *mandatory* safety training at Cal Poly is provided at the discretion of the immediate supervisors, there is no uniform policy across the campus for safety training of employees.

The success of training programs in various departments relies solely on the ability of individual supervisors to create and to manage a system that meets all local, state, and federal regulations for the employees under their supervision. Such a decentralized system requires that many supervisors have not only an awareness and understanding of all pertinent legal requirements, but also the interest, time, and funds to implement a departmental training program. Therefore, a department in which training is highly valued and supported may have an excellent safety training program in place, while another, in which safety (and/or training) is assigned a lower priority, may have no program whatsoever to instruct its employees. Although Environmental Health and Safety (EH&S) offers a variety of safety training programs on a routine and request basis, supervisors and employees may be unaware of their offerings, resulting in various levels of training among employees with similar job descriptions.

Focus group responses included the following questions and/or observations that illustrate the many perceptions of campus policy:

- Is there a policy?
- There may be a policy, but it’s not "advertised"
- The opportunity is there in some departments, but there is no policy
- Participation is up to the supervisor, regardless of any fee waiver, training, or professional development policy
- Encouraged to attend
- If you need it you can go, very supportive if training is "work-related"
- Fee waiver is available under the jurisdiction of the department
- Required training is supported once a quarter
- Mandatory training is supported, other training or professional development is

not

- Policy stays at management level—does not filter down to staff
- Lots of support for professional development offered, but there are one-person office constraints (phone, front desk coverage).
- Campus mandatory training rules and regulations are also unknown to many staff members, even those for whom this type of training would seem to be critical to the efficient (or even safe) performance of their jobs.

C. Lack of Time and Lack of Funds

Changes in budget allocations and the method for allocating budgets (decentralizing budgets to the Colleges and sometimes to departments) has affected funding for staff training and staff professional development in some instances. Colleges and departments faced with many competing demands on their budgets may or may not allocate funds for staff learning opportunities. At one time, the Cal Poly Human Resources Department allocated approximately $10,000 annually to a specialized training fund that was used to support employee participation in off-campus workshops, seminars, professional conferences, or other development activities. The fund was abolished in 1994.

Comments from staff focus groups include:

- The reality of fewer staff in individual offices/areas along with the continuing university commitment to high quality service to students and the campus community causes staff to be unable to leave offices unattended. People stated that this situation often leaves staff with little time to participate in training and (especially) professional development opportunities.
- The constraints of an office with only one administrative support person (lack of phone and/or front desk coverage) create a hardship for other department staff and students.
- The dilemma created by new technology—tools may be better and faster—that require any available training time to be used keeping up with that technology and changes in equipment, etc., leaving less time available for professional development and/or personal learning opportunities.
- A change to a more corporate-like business culture (more emphasis on productivity and the bottom-line) can sometimes discourage professional development activities or learning just for the sake of learning.
- Staff members commented that there is just not enough time to participate in training and/or professional development and complete their job duties.
- Conflicts can occur in offices when a staff member is not at his/her desk, to provide needed coverage and to be available to students, faculty and other staff members. This can put additional pressure on remaining staff.
- Aging equipment and infrastructure can place significant additional time demands on staff members who are responsible for maintenance.
- According to management personnel focus group participants, the issues that hinder their support of their staff's professional development are cost, coverage demands, and the volume of work.

Staff qualitative responses on the Human Resources survey to the question, "If you have not attended campus training (within the last three years), why?" included "heavy workload/too busy;" "supervisor did not support/allow release time;" and "no coverage in office."

Mandatory safety training programs, or any safety program in general, can fail due to overworked staff and/or lack of funds as other programs often are viewed as more essential. At the college level, priority of funds is often given to academic programs rather than to training of personnel. Although the university has, with the acceptance of Injury and Illness Prevention Plan (IIPP), officially placed the legal responsibility to assure effective compliance for the education and training of employees and students with the college deans, directors, and department chairs/heads, the implementation of mandatory training is uneven across the campus. In departments/divisions where mandatory training is supported by management, employees are trained; where it is not, the employees often miss this important aspect of their jobs.

The Emergency Management Planner's position from the Environmental Health and Safety Office was eliminated. This position, among other duties, coordinated training activities and taught through a joint San Luis Obispo-Cal Poly program called Community Emergency Response Training (CERT). The goal of this training program is to teach people how to take care of themselves, their families and their community for the 72 hours immediately after a natural disaster, such as an earthquake or catastrophic fire, when emergency personnel are unable to respond adequately to all requests for assistance. At this time, Cal Poly is providing CERT on a limited basis to Cal Poly employees through the current EH&S office and the San Luis Obispo City Fire Department.

D. Uncertainty over Expectations

Staff members expressed uncertainty over whether or not they are expected to be *specialists* or *generalists.* As staff job duties are modified and evolve because of reduction in the number of staff positions and rapid changes in technology, some employees are experiencing pressure to become generalists. For some, the opportunity to be cross-trained and to be exposed to growth opportunities is a plus. For others, it is viewed as a frustrating situation in which there is no specific area in which they can excel. There often seems little reward for comprehensive knowledge. Anecdotal evidence also suggests that cross-training is perceived by staff to mean doing one's own job and absorbing additional duties of other vacant staff positions which are unfilled sometimes because of lack of funding.

E. Morale

While the availability or non-availability of staff training and professional development opportunities is only one factor contributing to staff morale, morale was mentioned often enough during the focus groups and in written responses to make it a viable issue for discussion in this report.

An unexpected outcome of the focus groups was a realization of the effect of training and professional development on employee morale. In each group there was at least one individual who worked in a supportive office that promoted training with a direct policy and/or yearly funds

earmarked specifically for employee training. Others in the group asked a number of questions of this individual to get specifics, and then invariably responded with, "WOW, I wish I could work there." The conversation then turned to issues of morale and how some employees do not feel supported by the university in the areas of training and professional development.

On the focus group pre-discussion questionnaire, all respondents "agreed or strongly agreed" that professional development enhances their (or their staff's) morale.

During focus group discussions the following points were expressed:

- It was generally accepted that learning opportunities led staff members to a more positive feeling about themselves and their jobs.
- Many participants expressed the belief that a lack of professional development can result in lack of advancement or career development.
- Some staff members did not feel that there are adequate rewards beyond personal gratification available for degrees received through fee waiver, advanced training and professional/personal development. They cited specifically the failure to gain promotions, to be given additional/expanded duties in line with educational achievement, and/or to receive salary increases.
- Concern was expressed over the possible effects of low morale. Examples of signs of low morale that could prove expensive to the university include: excessive absenteeism or tardiness, high turnover, poor work quality, lack of enthusiasm about work and complaints from customers about service (examples from The SOHO Guidebook).
- There are discrepancies among different areas of the campus in regards to fee waivers. Some departments only allow staff to take a course if they do it on their own time. Others allow staff to use work time to take a course even if the course is not directly job related. While this speaks to policy issues, it also contributes to uncertainty about campus support for professional development and the lowering of workplace morale. Some expressed concern that "favorites are being played."
- Staff in every focus group felt that they are being pulled in too many different directions. If they were to take the time to participate in training or professional development, their assigned work would not get done and their stress levels would increase.
- A staff member expressed an illustration of the "zero-sum game" concept: "We're in a world that lives with scarcity in our minds---what would we lose vs. what would we gain if we supported more training and professional development?"
- In addition to the focus group and questionnaire responses, additional data from the Cal Poly Employee Assistance Program (EAP) points to campus staff morale problems. Over 65% of the clients seen at the EAP are seen for work-related problems that include employee/supervisor conflicts and frustration with an inability to "change the system."

The concern with staff morale is not a recent development. The Cal **Poly 1989 WASC**

Self-Study Report, comments that

> *Morale among staff at Cal Poly is low. This is partially a result of what staff members, in general, believe are insufficient staff positions at the academic levels, inadequate salaries, inequities in salaries and job classifications, and lack of significant involvement by staff members in the campus community.*

F. Value Added

"Knowledge gained by staff from training and professional development activities adds value to the university" is one of the underlying assumptions put forward by the subcommittee. If this is a valid assumption, and if Cal Poly is a ***center of learning***, then the rewards for learning should be more than just additional work-related skills; the reward should be more intrinsic and add value to each individual on a personal level. The subcommittee suggests that the campus climate should support the opportunities for skill development and learning. The university should respect the added expertise and knowledge such experiences bring to a department or division, to the students with whom the staff come in contact, and to the university as a whole.

Not all staff members feel that more tangible rewards should necessarily result from their training or professional development endeavors. However, those staff members who do desire professional advancement too often find that additional skills and knowledge attained through training and/or professional development result in additional job duties with few, if any, other rewards. This is caused, in part, by the restrictions inherent in the bureaucratic system, the "red-tape" involved in hiring, firing, permanency, promotion, job classification system, etc., but whatever the cause(s), the perception exists among staff that learning is not really as valued as it is professed to be. That perception creates a deep sense of frustration for staff members interested in advancement or other career changes.

The Human Resources Survey indicates that a total of 56 percent of the respondents are seeking some type of upward movement (26 percent of those responding are interested in advancement; 10 percent indicated interest in a career change; 3 percent seek a higher classification; 11 percent want increased skills; and 6 percent desire movement into a management position). It was evident from the focus groups that employees are interested in furthering their education and skills to advance in their careers, but they are frustrated by the lack of rewards in the current system.

On the focus group pre-discussion questionnaire, 88 percent of all respondents "agreed or strongly agreed" that professional development adds value beyond the immediate skills acquired. This feeling was strongly reiterated during the focus group discussions by both staff members and management personnel.

Focus group participants were asked, "Do you believe that taking training or fee waiver classes adds value beyond the immediate skills acquired and, if so, what is the impact on yourself as an individual and as an employee?" Selected responses included:

- There is value in being a student, in being in the classroom and seeing things from a student and also a faculty perspective. It can contribute to more

empathy for students.

- Staff development (especially fee waiver) gives added understanding of college and classroom processes, curriculum, etc.
- There is value in experiencing "learn by doing" in the classroom setting (in addition to on the job).
- Personal gain and added confidence can come from the opportunity to network and to problem solve with other employees during training classes and workshops.
- Staff gain better understanding of how processes work across the university.
- Non-participation in learning opportunities can result in loss of self-growth.
- The learning experience can add enthusiasm both personally and professionally.
- Managers expressed benefits such as renewed enthusiasm and more confidence among staff members who participate, and increased personal skills that support the university. Managers also expressed some negative impact including staff members that "pushed the envelope" of what was allowed and problems inherent in training people who then leave for a better situation.

(Top)

Discussion, Recommendations, and Conclusions

Recommendations

A. Revisions to Employee Evaluations

The staff evaluation form presently used at Cal Poly does not recognize training as a factor in staff performance. It is proposed by this committee that the form be changed to reflect the importance of training and professional growth in the career of staff in an institution of higher education. This is consistent with the expectations stated in the Cal Poly Strategic Plan:

> *Cal Poly shall institute revised performance evaluation standards that set fair and high standards for performance of staff members. These performance standards shall take into consideration the stated expectations for professional growth and achievement and recognize staff members who endeavor to meet those expectations (section 3.5).*

Suggested changes include:

- A designated section in the evaluation addressing training and professional development programs attended during the last evaluation period and,
- Revisions to the employee self-evaluation section format, prompting the employee for comments regarding training and professional development

programs attended and goals for the next evaluation period.

As part of their job performance evaluation, staff should be required to take training in their areas of responsibility. The decision as to the type of training to be undertaken should be made on the basis of its relevance to the job functions and whether it will improve the person's ability to perform in the position or take on additional responsibilities. The training should be considered an integral part of each person's job responsibilities and should be treated as such, with adequate time and funding provided.

B. Communications of Available Learning Opportunities

One outgrowth from the focus groups was the need for a more consistent form of communication regarding workshops and classes available for staff to attend. It is recommended that this information be disseminated in a variety of ways. These include:

Cal Poly Report

- A monthly listing of the classes and workshops being conducted on campus
- A class or workshop could be featured each week

The World Wide Web

- There is a need to create a systematic listing of all training opportunities offered to staff on campus. This could be accomplished most effectively via the Web.
- The goal should be to create a Web-accessible database that contains all classes and workshops available to staff. A search engine would allow users to search by name, date, time and subject. There would also be a web-based administration section where any department offering classes could enter its own information into the database. This would eliminate any need for those maintaining the data to have in-depth knowledge of the technology.

The Cal Poly Intranet

- Once the Cal Poly Intranet has been implemented information about classes and workshops being offered could be advertised there

The New Staff Handbook

- The handbook should include general information about on-campus classes and workshops available to staff.

In order to assess the effectiveness of the workshops, a standardized assessment tool would be filled out by the attendees of the workshops. This information would then be evaluated by a department charged with overseeing staff training, learning objectives and implementation. Coordination of the communication efforts and the assessment would be placed with the proposed Department of Employee Training and Development (see recommendation F).

C. Work-Related Training, Including Mandatory Training

n order to better serve the needs of all employees, as well as comply with the University's own

Illness and Injury Prevention Plan (IIPP), a system must be created to ensure that all employees are given appropriate and timely safety training. The current system where each individual department creates their own training program is inefficient and ineffective. Simply providing written documents to key administrators does not ensure adequate training to all employees. The University's Environmental Health & Safety office has taken a lead to provide campus wide programs for Asbestos, Lead Abatement, and Respiratory Protection. Similar programs to cover other topics such as Blood Borne Pathogens, Chemical Use Safety, Heavy Equipment Safety, Pesticide and Herbicide Safety, or Machine Shop Safety should be an integral portion of an effective campus wide program. Beyond mandatory training, a proactive series of training on topics such as first aid, CPR, CERT, fire extinguisher use, would be beneficial not only for the health and well-being of the individual employee but provide an additional level of safety for students, other staff and visitors as well. While, according to the Environmental Health & Safety Manager many of these programs do exist, the persistent problem of staff attendance limits participation and thus effectiveness. As with many of the on-campus training programs, an improved system of "advertising" such as is recommended in section B, Communication of Available Learning Opportunities, should assist EH&S.

Because mandatory training at Cal Poly is done at the discretion of the immediate supervisors, there is no uniformity across the campus. Supervisors are left to implement training programs for their department often with little understanding of what is being done in other departments. Time and funds to implement a departmental training program may be limited. Again, this needs to be placed in the context of the overarching problems faced by staff members when they request training opportunities. Without a mandate from upper management that such opportunities are necessary to the well-being of the individual, the department and the University, supervisors faced with many competing demands may choose to downplay the importance of training.

Mandatory Training

To ensure that all employees across the campus uniformly receive appropriate, timely health and safety training, a central office must be made responsible for all mandatory training programs. This same office must also oversee the record keeping of training as required by University policies and CAL/OSHA.

Participation in mandatory training by coordinating the scheduling, placement and participation of employees must also be in the realm of this office. Although participation of all employees may be difficult to achieve, participation will be enhanced if the program is given full support from all levels of upper management combined with clear expectations and guidelines to all employees and supervisors.

Direct supervisors need support and guidance in ensuring that all employees receive training that is timely and specific to the job duties of the individual. With a central office overseeing all aspects of mandatory training, definitive guidelines may be created for supervisors to identify, with the assistance of the central office, appropriate training and refresher courses for each employee. With the implementation of a centralized web-based campus training schedule, both supervisors and employees will benefit by advanced scheduling of training sessions. According to EH&S, a supervisory safety training curriculum is being developed to address this issue, but questions about supervisor attendance at such programs remain.

Employees need to be made aware of what mandatory training is required for their position, how often the class must be repeated/refreshed, and given a schedule of upcoming sessions.

Funding at the University level will be the only way to ensure that adequate safety training reaches all individuals equally and is not subject to the "lack of funds" syndrome.

Funding must be allocated from a central office to cover training costs for all campus employees. Under current guidelines, departments are responsible for the costs incurred for employee training. To prevent the reallocation of funds to other programs, a central system of training funds must be budgeted by and provided to, a separate entity that can administer these funds solely for training. By consolidating all training to one central location, any additional costs caused by the redundancy in multiple departments identifying, budgeting, and locating of specific training will be reduced while participation, uniformity, and equality of employee training will increase.

D. Manager Training

Responses from both Staff and Management Focus Groups make clear there is little knowledge of the existence of a formal campus policy related to staff training. As a result, there is no uniform campus-wide implementation of policies and procedures related to staff training and development.

It is recommended that Human Resources implement a mandatory quarterly orientation for new managers that will introduce them to campus policies and procedures. In addition, there should be an annual mandatory workshop for all managers to provide an overview of policies and procedures that they need to be aware of, and what their responsibilities are, regarding staff training and professional development programs and opportunities. Managers should be given the support, the tools and the information so that they can, in turn, support staff.

The development of a comprehensive Human Resources Management Handbook to be distributed to all managers, with annual updates, is also recommended.

Colleges, departments and divisions should develop annual training plans (following university-wide, established guidelines) which include funding estimates. Evaluation of managers should reflect their implementation of these plans.

E. Office Coverage for Work-Related and Professional Development Opportunities

Staff and management focus group participants indicated that hindrances to staff attending work-related training and professional development opportunities include office coverage demands and the volume of work. The constraints of one-person offices and offices with direct student contact (e.g., window hours and front desk coverage) were frequently mentioned.

The subcommittee recommends that the General Office Pool be reinstated with a new focus. The General Office Pool would provide relief staffing for professional development activities, vacation, sick leave, and jury duty. It would be staffed with full-time employees who would be used as floaters. A student assistant pool would be used to supplement the staff pool during

times of high demand or for short time period coverage (e.g., answering phones for one to two hours). In the event of high demand, priority would be given to single person offices.

As one example, the CMS Project (**PeopleSoft** system implementation) will require extensive campus-wide training for staff members. The General Office Pool could be used to provide office coverage during this ongoing training The General Office Pool would reside in the Administration and Finance Division. Funding would be shared by Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, Student Affairs and University Advancement proportionally depending on the percentage of current staff in each division. By budgeting funds up front, rather than on a charge back basis, managers might be more inclined to use the service.

Addressing the Comprehensive Need Associated with Staff Work-Related Training and Professional Development - A Model for Success.

In order to create a truly learning centered environment at Cal Poly, the value of staff learning (including work-related training and professional and personal development) needs to be actively supported by both administration and staff with a commitment of time, budgeted funds and personnel.

The subcommittee recommends that the office of Cal Poly Human Resources create a department responsible for Employee Training and Development. This department needs to be staffed with a director and clerical support, and it requires its own budget. A new department within the Human Resources Office (as opposed to just adding this function to someone's existing responsibilities) would make the position more visible and more autonomous. It would also add credibility to the official policy declarations about the importance of staff learning and staff's support role. It would give emphasis to staff's essential place within this **center of learning**.

The Department of Employee Training and Development (ET&D) would address the subcommittee's outcome questions in the following ways:

1. Is the university policy on staff work-related training and professional development known to the campus?

As noted in the "Findings" section of this report, there is a lack of awareness of university policy regarding staff training and/or professional development among both staff members and managers. Written policies that do exist are not well publicized.

One charge to the Department of Employee Training and Development would be to gather all existing Cal Poly policy statements regarding training and staff development, consolidate those policies into an accessible format, and initiate various ways to disburse the information across the campus.

A second charge would be to develop a more consistent form of communication regarding workshops, classes, training sessions, seminars, etc. available for staff to attend (see Recommendation 2, Communication of Available Learning Opportunities). ET&D would

consolidate this type of information, creating a "one-stop-shop." Ideally, this information site would contain the majority of programs available though out the year early enough to allow staff and managers to do planning for work-related and professional development goals for the coming year (in conjunction with the yearly evaluation/goal-setting cycle).

2. Is the university policy on staff work-related training and professional development consistently applied across departments?

This is one of the most critical issues to be addressed by Cal Poly and clearly illustrates that **policy alone is not sufficient.** High level policy, such as the policy stated in the Strategic Plan (and noted in the discussion of "essential documents" above), does not set down processes for implementation of that policy. One of the most frequent responses from focus group participants was the observation that **there is no consistency in the administration of staff training and development policies.** People expressed frustration because they do not know where to go for definitive information about what types of programs/classes are *acceptable*. There is confusion about who is in charge of making decisions and where or to whom staff can appeal a management decision that denies them release time and/or funding for training or development.

The Department of Employee Training & Development would be vested with the authority to develop campus wide guidelines, processes and procedures for departments to follow. Departmental training plans could be developed within those guidelines. ET&D would be the clearinghouse for questions of policy and process implementation, and serve as a facilitator in such instances. The Director of ET&D should be comfortable with, and have experience in, win-win methods of dispute resolution. The office requires a person who can facilitate joint decisions that are acceptable to both staff member and managers. The director also needs the authority to assure compliance with policy decisions.

The Staff Learning Subcommittee recommends that staff members be required to obtain a minimum of sixteen hours per year of work-related training and/or professional development. A variety of programs need to be offered at different times throughout the year and could include an "in-service" day as well as a list of "flex" activities. The Department of Staff Training & Development would be in charge of proposing, developing and monitoring these activities.

3. Is the university policy on staff work-related training and professional development adequate to the needs of the campus community?

The Employee Training and Development Department would review existing policies with interested constituencies (staff, administration and faculty), to determine if the current policies adequately reflect current and

future campus needs. With input from all the campus constituencies and guidance from a campus wide advisory committee, the department could modify and/or develop policies that benefit the campus.

While data indicates that staff work-related training needs are being met (or at least, training is being made available), it is unclear how well staff needs for professional and personal development are being met. As discussed earlier in this report, quantifiable data is available from the Human Resources Survey regarding work-related training, but data on other, less measurable, types of staff development and learning opportunities have not been systematically collected. To collect such data would be a first step in identifying what types of programs would be beneficial both to staff and the campus as a whole. Following the example of another local educational institution, ET&D would survey staff yearly to determine staff learning wants and needs, ascertain what is already available and what can/should be added, and then assemble a program that meets those needs.

4. Is the university policy on staff work-related training and professional development congruent with the campus vision for staff professional growth and achievement and life-long learning?

The Department of Employee Training & Development would be responsible for ensuring that, once the campus vision of a learning centered environment is embraced and becomes a cultural norm, this congruence is maintained. This means close communications must be sustained between ET&D and staff, administration and faculty. The benefits of life-long learning for all constituents of Cal Poly must be discussed, shared and promoted.

(Top)

Conclusions

After several months of investigation, discussion and thought the Staff Learning Subcommittee again asked itself:

1. Is Cal Poly's current approach to staff development adequate and appropriate?
2. How prepared and current is Cal Poly staff with respect to their support roles?
3. What steps should Cal Poly take to improve the climate for staff development?"

In order to answer the first question, the Subcommittee had to re-examine the distinction between work-related training and professional/personal development that had been identified by the group and the inconsistencies in policy and policy interpretation that occur across the campus.

If a staff member works in a department that values technical skills and/or safety training, and if a staff member investigates the available training opportunities on a regular basis and takes the

time to read and to interpret the various policies, then that person will probably find the available technical training opportunities to be adequate. On the other hand, if an employee works in an area in which neither funding nor time has been allotted for training opportunities, or if safety training is not part of the departmental function and management does not feel that training is a priority, that employee will probably not find the training opportunities adequate. This divergence is indicative of the range of departmental policies and interpretations of university wide policies that frustrate many staff members in their attempts to obtain training.

The definition of work-related training itself also needs to be clarified. In one department this can mean technical training that is directly related to a staff member's current position (e.g., Excel training if the staff member does the departmental budget or Word training if that person writes memos). In other departments, training can mean learning new skills that will enable the employee to advance or move to another position within the department or university, or safety training that can be directly work-related or make the employee more valuable to the university in case of a natural disaster.

In the case of professional/personal development, the subcommittee found it even more difficult to measure whether or not the opportunities are adequate. This difficulty rests, to a large extent, on how professional/personal development is interpreted as separate from work-related training. The question really is about how appropriate staff learning is to the mission of the university. Is the staff valued as part of the learning centered community (i.e., "It is appropriate for all members of the campus community to have the opportunity to seek further learning," Strategic Plan, section 3 Introduction)? Or is the staff function to support the university by "enhancing skill in their current field" (Strategic Plan 3.1)

The subcommittee found no clear-cut answers to these questions. The inconsistencies in both the policies and the interpretation of those policies between and within divisions, colleges and departments, made it difficult to come to any conclusion regarding *appropriateness*. University policies state that both work-related training and professional development are important for staff learning. The reality is somewhat different.

In answer to the second question, Cal Poly staff is generally technically prepared and current with respect to their support roles. Technical training sessions are made available and, as was shown by the Human Resources survey and expressed in focus groups, many staff members do take advantage of training classes. How strictly and/or broadly "support" is interpreted, however, determines the value to the university of staff in their support role. According to the Cal Poly Strategic Plan, "Excellence in support of students and faculty is the primary goal of Cal Poly's staff, and participation in activities that lead to professional growth and achievement is essential to meeting this goal." This implies that a broad range of knowledge and skills would allow employees to provide better support to other members of the campus community---students, faculty and other staff members.

As a partial answer to the third question regarding improvement in the campus climate, the subcommittee offers recommendations to improve the climate for staff development. These action items will enable staff to take advantage of learning opportunities, and creation of the Employee Training and Development Department provides a means to implement many of the recommendations.

Underlying all of these recommendations, however, is the need for change in the university culture that must take place before staff can truly become part of the learning community and feel that their growth in knowledge is valued as well as their current skills. This culture change includes the recognition that staff knowledge contributes both to student success and to the success of Cal Poly as a **center of learning**.

In order to bring about any change in campus culture, it is imperative that the university creates a climate that embraces the concept that staff life-long learning is of value to the entire campus community. Experience has shown that written policy alone will do little to advance such an organizational transformation. Support for staff development activities must be communicated and demonstrated as a priority by the President and senior management. Indeed, the subcommittee's benchmarking studies confirmed that the institutions with the most successful and comprehensive staff development programs are those with Presidents who are strong advocates of a learning-centered environment. Their demonstrated leadership has strengthened a view that staff members are valued and contributing members of the campus community. Likewise, development opportunities for staff must be supported and made available by department heads/chairs, managers, and supervisors in a fair and consistent manner. And last, staff must view development as part of their commitment to the university and be encouraged to actively seek opportunities to learn and share their knowledge.

(Top)

For questions regarding the WASC Self Study contact the WASC Coordinating Office

---

Appendix I.4.A

(Back to report)

Staff Focus Groups

Outcome Question:

Is the university policy on staff training and professional development

- Known to the campus
- Consistently applied across departments
- Adequate to the needs of the campus community
- Congruent with the campus vision (as specified in the Cal Poly Strategic Plan) for staff professional growth and achievement?

Training—Specific skills training which has a direct link to the employee's job and is necessary to perform current duties.

Professional Development—Learning activities which are not a requirement of the employee's current job but which may assist the employee in reaching professional growth and achievement

goals.

Focus Group Discussion Questions:

1. Tell me what you know about the University's policies on staff professional development?

2. In what ways are you supported (or not supported) by Cal Poly for staff training to increase job knowledge relevant to your responsibilities?

3. What is your understanding of your department's staff development policy?

4. To what degree have you been supported (or not supported) in your staff professional development efforts?

5. How many of you have increased your participation in staff development (including fee waiver and other professional development opportunities) over the last five years? How many of you have decreased your participation over the last five years. Data shows that participation in fee waiver has decreased dramatically over the last ten years and the subcommittee is interested in why this has occurred

6. What changes, if any, should Cal Poly take to modify the climate for staff development?

7. Is there anything about staff development that we haven't talked about/covered?

Management Focus Groups

Outcome Question:

Is the university policy on staff training and professional development

- Known to the campus
- Consistently applied across departments
- Adequate to the needs of the campus community
- Congruent with the campus vision (as specified in the Cal Poly Strategic Plan) for staff professional growth and achievement?

Training—Specific skills training which has a direct link to the employee's job and is necessary to perform current duties.

Professional Development—Learning activities which are not a requirement of the employee's current job but which may assist the employee in reaching professional growth and achievement goals.

Focus Group Discussion Questions:

8. What is your understanding of the University's policies on staff professional development?

9. What is your understanding of your department's policy on staff training and professional development?

10. In what ways are you supported by Cal Poly to provide training for your staff to increase job knowledge relevant to their responsibilities?

11. In what ways are you not supported by Cal Poly to provide training for your staff to increase job knowledge relevant to their responsibilities?

12. In what ways to you support your staff's professional development efforts?

13. Are there issues that hinder your support of your staff's professional development efforts?

14. Over the past five years have you noticed a change in attitude within the University or your department concerning the Fee Waiver Program?

15. Do we, as a University, have an obligation to ensure that employees are provided training outside of typical or mandated training (safety issues, computer skills) for classes covering such topics as addiction, stress management , conflict resolution or people skills?

16. The learning process can be a far reaching experience. Do you believe that taking training, professional development or fee waiver classes adds value beyond the immediate skills acquired? If so, what are the impacts on your staff who have participated in such programs and/or your department as a whole?

17. What recommendations would you make to the University to address the problem of staff who have too many demands and do not have time to attend professional development programs?

18. Is there anything about training and professional development that we haven't talked about or covered?

19. What changes, if any, should Cal Poly take to modify the climate for staff development?

Appendix I.4.B

(Back to report)

Staff Focus Group Pre-Discussion Questionnaire

Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions. **Circle the most appropriate answer to each question using that question's scale.**

Do not sign the form. **Your answers will be kept strictly confidential**. Your input and cooperation are greatly appreciated.

1. How interested are you in attending job related training classes (for example, computer training, safety training) related to your current position?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Interested		Neutral		Very Interested

2. How interested are you in attending professional development workshops/seminars that are for your personal/professional benefit?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Interested		Neutral		Very Interested

3. How interested are you in participating in the fee waiver program?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Interested		Neutral		Very Interested

4. How familiar are you with Cal Poly's current university policy regarding staff development?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Familiar		Neutral		Extremely Familiar

5.How often do you ask for release time to attend job-related training?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once a Year	Twice a Year	Three Times a Year	Every Quarter

6. If you do request time to attend job-related training, how often are you granted release time to participate in the training?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once a Year	Twice a Year	Three Times a Year	Every Quarter

7. How often do you ask for release time to attend professional development workshops/seminars?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once a Year	Twice a Year	Three Times a Year	Every Quarter

8. If you do request time to attend professional development workshops/seminars, how often are you granted release time to attend those professional development workshops/seminars?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once a Year	Twice a Year	Three Times a Year	Every Quarter

9. How often do you ask for release time to participate in the fee waiver program?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once a Year	Twice a Year	Three Times a Year	Every Quarter

10. If you do request fee waiver, how often are you granted release time to participate in the fee waiver program?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once a Year	Twice a Year	Three Times a Year	Every Quarter

11. My co-workers support release time for attending professional development activities.

1	2	3	4	5
Not Supportive		Neutral		Extremely Supportive

12. My supervisor supports release time for attending professional development activities.

1	2	3	4	5
Not Supportive		Neutral		Extremely Supportive

13. I believe that professional development enhances my job performance.

1	2	3	4	5
Not Supportive		Neutral		Extremely Supportive

14. I believe that taking training or fee waiver classes adds value beyond the immediate skills acquired.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

15. I believe that professional development enhances my ability to relate and be a role model to students that I work or come in contact with.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

16. I believe that professional development enhances my morale.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

17. I believe that professional development enhances my personal development.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

18. My department has a policy regarding staff development that I am made aware of.

Yes No

If yes, I review that policy with my supervisor periodically.

Yes No

Management Focus Group Pre-Discussion Questionnaire

Please take a few minutes to answer the following questions. **Circle the most appropriate answer to each question using that question's scale.**

Do not sign the form. **Your answers will be kept strictly confidential**. Your input and cooperation are greatly appreciated.

1. Do you personally participate in job related training?

Yes No

2. Do you personally participate in professional development workshops/seminars?

Yes No

3. Do you personally participate in the fee waiver program?

Yes	No

4. If yes, how often do you participate in job-related training, professional development opportunities and/or the fee waiver program?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once a Year	Twice a Year	Three Times a Year	Every Quarter

5. How familiar are you with Cal Poly's current university policy regarding staff development?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Familiar		Neutral		Extremely Familiar

6. My department has a policy regarding staff development.

Yes	No

7. If yes, I review that policy with my staff members yearly.

Yes	No

8. Do you encourage your staff member's participation in job related training classes (for example, computer training, safety training) related to his/her current position?

1	2	3	4	5
Do Not Encourage		Neutral		Strongly Encourage

9. Do you encourage your staff member's participation in professional development workshops/seminars that are for his/her personal/professional benefit?

1	2	3	4	5
Do Not Encourage		Neutral		Strongly Encourage

10. Do you encourage your staff members to participate in the fee waiver program?

1	2	3	4	5
Do Not Encourage		Neutral		Strongly Encourage

11. If a staff member requests time to attend job-related training, how often are they granted release time to participate in the training?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once a Year	Twice a Year	Three Times a Year	Every Quarter

12. If a staff member requests time to attend professional development workshops/seminars, how often are they granted release time to attend those professional development workshops/seminars?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once a Year	Twice a Year	Three Times a Year	Every Quarter

13. If a staff member requests release time to attend a class on fee waiver, how often are they granted that time?

1	2	3	4	5
Never	Once a Year	Twice a Year	Three Times a Year	Every Quarter

14. In your department, do co-workers support release time for other departmental employees to attend professional development activities?

1	2	3	4	5
Not Supportive		Neutral		Extremely Supportive

15. As a supervisor, I support release time for my staff to attend professional development activities.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

16. I believe that professional development enhances the job performance of my staff.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

17. I believe that taking training or fee waiver classes adds value beyond the immediate skills acquired.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

18. I believe that professional development enhances my staffs' ability to relate and be a role model to students that they work or come in contact with.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

19. I believe that professional development enhances my staffs' morale.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree

20. I believe that professional development enhances my staffs' personal development.

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Disagree		Neutral		Strongly Agree