

## **Employee engagement in higher education**

**Dr Saheb Gowda**

*Assistant Professor, Dept. of MBA Lingaraj Appa Engineering College, Bidar*

### **Abstract**

*Employee engagement is a critical issues of an across many industries, none more critical than in higher education. The examination here in is focused on these financial impacts of faculty & staff engagement can have on the higher education enterprise and beyond.*

*The purpose of this paper is to study employee engagement in higher education by examining full-time non-tenure track faculty members' perceptions at a North East US state public university.*

**Keywords:** *financial, engagement, perception, public, higher education*

### **Introduction**

Employee engagement is a critical issue of across many industry sectors. Engagement has shown to have dramatic impacts on these organizations. Demand for a skilled workforce continues to sharpen & the pool of quality candidates is shrinking. Talent management strategies will grow out of necessity to maintains a competitive workforce. The need for talent management is especially sharp in the higher educational arena. A Most often engagement in higher education focuses efforts on faculty & staff development. In the broader context of engagement involves a unified recruitment, on boarding, retention & succession strategy of staff & faculty. At present, employee engagement is measuring at dramatically low rates of both within the higher education arena & beyond. There are a number of factors that likes are impacted by employee engagement. The question here is around the a financial impact on engagement. Specifically, what are the financial implications of a staff/faculty engagement strategy for there higher education enterprise? In response to this query, we will look at the effect engagement has on the individual, the institution, the community & some broader more global impacts.

### **Materials & Methods :**

This part should be contains a sufficient details of that would enable all procedures to be repeated. It can be divided into a subsection of several methods are described.

### **Objectives Of The Study**

In the light of domain of the research, the study shall be undertaken to have an in-depth view to measures the following

1. To assess the level of employee engagement in the sample universities.
2. To study to what extent does an employee's years of service in an affect of the level of Engagement.
3. To study the extent to which Gender of the employees influence these level of engagement?

### **Results & Discussion:**

Employee engagement consistently affects key performance outcomes, and regardless of the organization, industry, or country as concluded by the Gallup organization's 8<sup>th</sup> iteration of its research on employee & engagement & productivity (Gallup, Inc, 2014). The Gallup research categorizes the workforce as being "engaged" "disengaged" & "actively disengaged". Research conducted by Gallup (2013), examined 49,928 business, or work units, and included about 1.6 million employees in 192 organizations, across 48 industries, and in 35 countries. This study makes clear that employee engagement strongly relates to key of organizational outcomes in any economic climate & across all verticals. Even such a during difficult economic times, employee engagement is an important competitive differentiator for the organizations, According to Price water house Cooper when companies align around a corporate talent strategy they deliver 86% stronger financial performance, 76% higher revenue growth and 75% better implementation of corporate vision as compared to many companies of without this focus on talent. Those at the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile have four times these success rate compared with those at the first percentile.

Employees who are engaged are in loyal & productive. They are passionate about there work & feel a connection to the company & mission. Those who aren't "engaged" or "disengaged" per Gallup, are employees who may be productive & satisfied with their jobs, but they aren't intellectually or emotionally connected to their in work & workplace. These employees are going through the motions of their respective roles but doing so without the passion & energy of the previous group. While this group may not perform at a level equal to the engaged employees, they aren't taking active steps to undermine there work. Here is where are employees that are "actively disengaged" can be founded. According to Gallup (2013), these groups of employees is physically at a work, but aren't connected to their work emotionally. Its essentially this group is unhappy with their work, share their unhappiness with coworkers & can jeopardize the performance of their teams.

Table 1

Employee Engagement Performance Difference between bottom-quartile & top quartile	Outcome
lower absenteeism	38%
lower turnover (in high turnover organizations)	24%
lower turnover (in low turnover organizations)	64%
higher customer metrics	11%
higher productivity	22%
higher profitability	21%

**Table 1: Employee engagement outcomes**

**Analysis** This group isn't just miserable in their work. This group is actively & enthusiastically sharing that misery with others.

2. The research supports the processes related to employees engagement that will benefit organizations. A Business units in the top performing quartile deliver substantially higher

performance metrics than business units in the bottom quartile. For these purposes here, the question becomes, does employee engagement had a similar influence in the higher education field? In 2016, Gallup conducted research into the question of faculty engagement with a population of more than 22,600 faculty member in virtually every type of institutions. What Gallup (2016) found was that 36 percent of faculty members surveyed are engaged in their job, 52 percent are not engaged and 15 percent are actively disengaged. Engaged faculty are more involved & enthusiastic about their work. Among the engaged faculty members, full-time faculty members (38 percent) are only slightly more engaged in their jobs than are part-time faculty members (31 percent).

**Faculty Engagement by Employee Status**

Faculty Type	% Engaged
All	36
Faculty	38
Full Time	31
Faculty	% not engaged
Members	52
Part-Time	52
Faculty	53
Members	% Actively disengaged

**Table 2. Faculty engagement by employee status**

Analysis: Nearly all the jobs created in the recovery, 11.6 million out of 11.7 million, have gone to workers with at least some postsecondary education. In summary the engaged employee is a valuable resource for an organizations, but these employees face a daunting challenges beyond those presented by their positions. Employees who aren't engaged & those who are actively disengaged, offer obstacles to individual success & hamper the likelihood of success for the organizations overall. Similar trends can be found among some faculty members.

As a way to quantify the impact of engagement on the higher education institutions, we will look at economic impact that engagement can have on the individual students, the institutions itself, & the community. Finally, we will look at the impact of engagement from a broader or global, perspective to complete the review.

Table 3 shows the distribution of respondents' age and gender.

Out of the total 72 respondents, 45 were male (63.01%) and 27 were female (36.98%). The respondents belonged to three age groups, viz, 29-38 (N=17), 39-48(N=33) and 48 and above (N=27).

Table 3.

Demographic characteristics	Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male		45	63.01
Female		27	36.98
Age group (years)			
Frequency	Percent	28-38	16 21.91
		39-48	25 34.24
And above		32	43.83

Analysis: Sub-scale wise & Cumulative Mean scores of overall employee engagement & three sub scales of employee engagement are presented in

Table 4. Employee Engagement Analysis

S.no	Sub-scale	Item Numbers	Mean* (N=73) S.D
1	Vigor	1,4,8,12,15,17	3.65 . 44
2	Dedication	2,5,7,10,13	3.78 . 37
3	Absorption	3,6,9,11,14,16	3.75 54
4	Overall Engagement	1-17	3. 74

Note: \*Mean score of 1 signifies “never”, 2 represents employees “rarely” feel engaged, 3 represents “sometimes”, 4 represents “often” whereas mean response 5 represents employees “always” feel engaged at work. As is represented by the findings of

Analysis: mean score of overall employee engagement lies between 3 & 4, indicating that feelings of being engaged at work range between “sometimes” & “often” among the respondents. The mean scores of the three sub-scales also lie in the range of “sometimes” & “often”.

### **Financial impact of engagement on the institutions**

It is evident that an highly engaged faculty or staff an impacts productivity which can then equate to higher rates of completion among these of students. In turn, the financial & economic impact of is significant. Here we will look at the financial impacts on that engagement has on the institutionally itself. Specifically, in the form higher rates of retention among students & 3<sup>rd</sup> in higher rates of retention (& lower turnover) among the faculty staffs. It might be distasteful for those in academia to look at the value or revenue should be that is generated for an institutions by a students. The Institutions their are dependent on tuitions or students loan proceeds the state or federal grants, among other sources, to drive revenues to pay for faculty, staff /facilities & related operating costs to provide a better quality of educational. The disengaged & actively disengaged employees of any organizations have an impacts should be on organizational results. In the private sectors of about this impacts profits. In higher education’s, it could be argued that this bottom line of for student successful. If students are withdrawn from their studies, this has an impacts on the revenue streams on which the institutionals is dependent on to deliver the services. More than 56% of first full-time students who enroll in a bachelor’s degree program if don’t completes within 9years (Hackett, 2019). With a dropout rate of 51% institutionals must work extremely hard to replace these non-completers for each year. Here we will look at the revenue loss related to these students are dropouts.

According to the State Higher Education Finance, in 2019, the public, full-time equivalent, educational appropriation & net tuition revenues there is a wider ranges of funding levels across the states. The average U.S institution receives \$13,908per student, with roughly 64% (\$7,966) from state & local appropriation (“State Higher Education Finance FY19 SHEEO,” n.d.). With this revenue figure in mind, considers the revenue that is in jeopardy when a student makes in the decisions to drop out.

### **Cost of retention calculator Employee Retention Calculation**

As evidenced by this review of the substantive data provided in the 11 studies, of Boushey and Glynn (2015) provides an compelling case to calculate the cost of replacing employees in education at 24% of the employees annual salary. Further & often critical importance is the rate (19 percent) of the estimated number of employees in educational that leave voluntarily. This turnover rate is roughly 3<sup>rd</sup> times the turnover rate in the estimates outlined above in Table 2 & a sobering costs to institutions that are clamoring for any savings or revenue sources & require, in many cases, a highly skilled workers to filled faculty or administrative positions. In 2006,

Academic & Physician Scientist reported that, based on the research conducted in 2 institutions, the recruiting costs for clinical faculty members were \$115,000 per faculty for a Southern, public institutions. This compared favorably to the costs of an recruiting clinical faculty in a Northern, private institution which cost more than \$360,000 (Wenger, 2007). This compared by favorably to recruiting costs for a basic sciences faculty members which ran \$278,000 and \$377,000 respectively (2007). In a report from the University of Idaho, a budget committees found that the search process is included: search costs & moving expenses of \$13,800, committee member times of \$13,000, startup costs of \$2,400-\$600,000 (lab, equipment, computer resources, studio space or membership to associations etc..) depending on the faculty/department (“Cost of Hiring New Faculty, University Budget & Finance Committee, University of Idaho,” 2019). What is more difficult to quantify is the opportunity costs of when a new faculty member comes to an institutionals. According to the report (2019), it takes as many as 3 to 5 years for a new faculty member to be productive & contributing to the institutions.

The lost opportunity for the students & colleagues as new faculty members come online would be very it’s difficult to an quantify. Knowing that any employees, in virtually any capacity takes time to onboard & becomes a contributing members of these team, this on-boarding process is amplified in situations where the interactions were as personally as a relationship between faculty & the student. Engagement, it as noted in the Gallup research can positively influencing turnover by reducing turnover & associated with costs. Engagement programs in might including learning communities, professional development programs/career pathways, or mentoring programs. For example, the University of Louisville Medical School ran as faculty mentoring programs, the University saw a decrease in faculty turnover from 18% to 8% proving the investment in a faculty development/retention effort (Wenger, 2007).

Employee engagement is a very real benefits & very real costs. It’s looking for that at the higher education enterprise, the costs of employee’s engagement should be seen in the cost of turnover & real costs to recruit the students. The impact of faculty & staff engagement can affects these students retention. The lost revenue in stemming from these an students who leaves college us is significant for the students but when taken its total, can be damaging to the institutions. Naturally, the inversely as is equally a propounded. When faculty & staffs are engaged in their work, the positive impacts on students can providing a pathway with very real financial benefits & as we have seen, can be very beneficial to the enterprises in terms of revenue & cost savings related to the reductions offer turnover. There remains, two additional areas worthy of explorations where we can see the reverberation of engagement. These concentric circles started within the student & then flowed to the institutionalized. What lies further out where the engagement reverberates is in the community & the global/macro or micro effect of engagement.

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Lockwood (2007), states that employee engagement is a key business driver for organizational success. High levels of employee engagement within an organization lead to retention of talent, foster customer loyalty and enhance organizational performance. It is also a key connect to customer satisfaction, company reputation & overall stakeholder value. Research suggests that a fully engaged workforce is more needs, delivers higher levels of customer satisfaction, attains higher productivity levels, & ensures lower turnover rates, which all translated into improved overall performance (Buhler, 2007). The most comprehensive study to date of employee engagement has come from The Gallup Organization’s research using the Q12 instrument. According to Coffman and Gonzalez-Molina (2004), results of Gallup research have shown that

business units in which employees score in the top half on employee engagement have, on average, a 57% higher success rate with customer loyalty, a 43% higher success rate on staff turnover, a 50% higher success rate on productivity outcomes, and a 34% higher success rate on profitability outcomes. Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2003) completed a meta-analysis of prior studies on employee engagement that were conducted by the Gallup Organization. The researchers examined the relationship between employee satisfaction-engagement & the business-unit outcomes of customer satisfaction, productivity, profit, employee turnover, & accidents. Harter et al. (2002) noted that one of the defining in an elements of employee engagement is the actionable quality of the measured concepts.

### **Conclusions**

There is a clear evidence of that the global workforce is aging & those coming into the workforce will require a higher levels of skills to meet the demands of the positions in the future things. The shortage of skilled workers isn't unique to one of industry but may be more intense in some areas. Education isn't immune to these global trends in the actions. An Employee engagement has significant impacts on the organizational success. For Addressing employee engagement within the higher educational institutions can offer substantial benefits to institutions & the broader communities. With the considerable amount of funding that supports faculty & staffs, It is an critically for institutions to glean the very best from their workforce. A strong talent strategy is driving an engaged workforce within the institutions can have long-lasting effects that benefit the economy for years to come. Employee engagement is a critical issue across many industry sectors. Engagement has shown to have dramatic impacts on organizations. Demand for a skilled workforce continues to sharpen and the pool of quality candidates is shrinking. Talent management strategies will grow out of necessity to maintain a competitive workforce. The need for talent management is especially sharp in the higher education arena.

### **Implications**

Here we will review the key points & apply these to a hypothetical institutional. The intent is to derive to some comparative data points & providing additionally understandings of the impact of engagement.

What we know:

1. The demand for its high-skilled workers will continue to impact the labor force & competition for the highest performers;
2. It is an turnover cost is significant;
3. The cost of replacements of faculty or staff is significant
4. The employee engagement has abysmal;
5. Improving the engagement can have significant impacts on production & in the case of higher education/ production means student engagement/success.
6. If an student's succeed there individual wealth increases dramatically but also these state or local income tax revenue is dramatically impacted here as well. What might happen for these institutions if an employees engagement about the strategies were employed.

## References

1. American Association of State Colleges & Universities, W.DC. (1976), the Value of a College Education.
2. Baldoni, J. (2013, July 4). Employee Engagement Does More than Boost Productivity. Retrieved July 25, 2016,
3. Boushey, H., & Glynn, S. J. (2012, November 16) there Are Significant Business Costs to Replacing Employees.
4. Management by principles, Himalaya publication. 2010.
5. Employee engagement, thakur publication. 2012
6. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2015). Earnings and unemployment rates by educational attainment [Government]. Retrieved August 1, 2016, from [http://www.bls.gov/emp/ep\\_chart\\_001.htm](http://www.bls.gov/emp/ep_chart_001.htm)
5. and Carnevale, A. P., Jayasundera, T., & Gulish, A. (2016). America's Divided Recovery (p. 44). Washington D.C: Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce. Retrieved from <https://cew.georgetown.edu/wp-content/uploads/Americas-Divided-Recovery-web.pdf>
7. Carnevale, A., Smith, N., & Strohl, J. (2010). Help Wanted: Projections of Jobs and Education Requirements Through 2018 (p. 111). Washington D.C: Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce.
8. Carnevale, A., Strohl, J., & Melton, M. (2013). What is it worth: The Economic Value of College Majors (p. 182). Washington D.C: Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce.
9. Cost of Hiring New Faculty, University Budget and Finance Committee, University of Idaho. (2015, January 28).