### PRELIMINARY DRAFT

#### 2010 Survey of Public Health Workers: Findings

#### **Study Population:**

In 2010 the Council on Linkages Between Academia and Public Health Practice, which is staffed b the Public Health Foundation, and the University of Kentucky joined together on the National Pipeline Survey to ask governmental public health workers employing Training Finder Real-time Affiliate Integrated Network (TRAIN), an online training system developed by the Public Health Foundation (PHF) TRAIN currently serves as the most widely used online learning system in public health. Currently 22 states' public health departments use TRAIN with more than 300,000 individual users located in all 50 states and a number of other countries.

Sampled governmental public health workers responded online to the Council of Linkages National Pipeline Survey, a recruitment and retention survey conducted in the spring and summer of 2010 and focusing on factors influencing the workers' decision to join and remain in the public health field. Drawing upon over 300,000 past and present users of the TRAIN online learning and training system, the researchers applied a filter to extract 82,209 users who could be identified in the system as governmental public health workers. Survey invitations to 11,820 of these users' email addresses, however, proved to be undeliverable. This left a sampling frame made up of 70,315 U.S. governmental public health workers identified among TRAIN users. The researchers then approached each of the 22 states who use TRAIN to seek the states' participation in the survey.

Additionally, a systemic random sample of 3,000 users was drawn from the 70,389 users in the sampling frame. These 3,000 invited participants were tracked and sent a special web address to access the online survey. The goal of the sampling approach was to achieve a minimum of 400 completed responses so as to have a nationally representative sample with a confidence level of 95% with a margin of error no greater than +/-5%. The sample of 3,000 invited participants represents an over-sampling to account for low response rates and inactive email accounts. This cross-sectional study employed descriptive statistics and multivariate analyses using SPSS version 18.0. In total 11,637 individual participated in the survey with 7559 indicating themselves as governmental public health workers as indicated by Table 1. Generally there were no significant differences between the large group and random sample population.

Survey Deployed to	82,209
Survey Received by	70,315
Number of Respondents	11,637 <mark>(7559)</mark>
Target Response Rate	20%
Actual Response Rate	17%

#### **Table 1: Response Rate**

**Governmental Respondents** 

### Demographics of Survey and Governmental Respondents:

The most typical respondent of the Pipeline Survey consisted of a 48 year old, white, non-Hispanic, female, nurse who has worked a mean of 12.61 years as a public health professional including a mean of 11.06 years at her current public health agency. Thus, respondents' mean age are 47.27 years, and 78% of the respondents report being female. In terms of ethnicity, 7% of respondents selfidentify as Hispanic, Latino or of Spanish origin and, as shown in Table 5, almost 4 out of 5 respondents describe themselves as White. Respondents answered from 40 of the 50 states as well as the District of Columbia. The majority of respondents were registered via the 22 states which regularly utilize the TRAIN system. Of these respondents 55% were from the states of AR, KS, KY, OH, OK, TX, VA, WI.

Work Setting	N=11637
State Government	46% <mark>(55%)</mark> *
Local Government	27% <mark>(33%)</mark> *
Healthcare	26% <mark>(19%)</mark> *
Nonprofit Organization	10% <mark>(5%)</mark> *
Academia	7% <mark>(4%)</mark> *
Private Industry	3% <mark>(1%)</mark> *
Federal Government	3% <mark>(4%)</mark> *
Self Employed	2% <mark>(1%)</mark> *
Tribal or Territorial	1% (1%)*
Unemployed	3% <mark>(1%)</mark> *

Table 2: Current Work Setting

Governmental Respondents

Over half of governmental respondents work for a state public health agency. Another third works for a local public health agency. Almost a third of respondents (31.4%) reports working in an agency serving fewer than 50,000 people.

Table3: Current Professional Roles

Nurse	26%

Administrator/Director/Manager	21%
Administrative Support	15%
Health Educator	12%
Non-clinical Public Health Service Provider	12%
Emergency Responder/Planner	10%
Allied Health Professional	7%
Environmental Health Specialist	6%
Faculty/Educator	4%
Data Analyst	4%
Biostats/Epi, Lab Prof., Researcher	3% each
Physician, Student	2% each

Making up 26% of respondents, nursing represents the most common professional role held by surveyed workers with over a fifth (21%) of respondents also listing they serve as an administrator or manager. The mean length of service in public health is 12.61 years with respondents reporting they have worked a mean of 11.06 years for their current agency. Prior to taking their current position, respondents report being in a range of activities with higher education (26.4%) and healthcare services (20.0%) the most commonly listed. The most commonly reported setting prior to entering public health for governmental public health respondents included healthcare services (31%) and private sector organizations (23%).

Associate Program – 3% (5%)*
Undergraduate Program – 9% (14%)*
Graduate Program – 8% (12%)*
Doctoral/Advanced Program – 2% (4%)*
Healthcare – 20% (31%)*
Private Sector Org – 15% <mark>(23%)</mark> *
Governmental Agency – 7% (10%)*
Nonprofit Org – 7% <b>(10%)*</b>
Academic Org – 4% (6%)*
Self-Employed – 3% (4%)*
1% <b>(1%)*</b>
4% <b>(6%)*</b>

**Governmental Respondents** 

Sixty-five percent of workers report they had a bachelor's degree or higher when starting their careers in public health. By the time of the survey, 70% of workers report they have completed a bachelors degree or higher. In terms of a graduate degree, 26% of respondents began their public health careers with a masters degree or higher. At the time they answered the Pipeline survey, an additional 9% had completed a graduate degree. The highest increase in education was for those receiving a Master's degree (Table 5). These findings suggest that workers continue to pursue education during their careers in public health.

Table 5: Demographic Characteristics of Pipeline Survey Respondents

Race and Ethnicity	Percentage
American Indian or Alaska Native	2%
Asian	2%

Black or African American		8%			
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1%				
White		78%			
Hispanic/Latino/Spanish		7%			
Educational Level	Highest Level Completed When First Became a Public Health Professional	Highest Currently Completed			
High School	16% <mark>(13%)</mark>	13% <mark>(10%)</mark>			
Associate degree	20% (17%)	19% <mark>(15%)</mark>			
Bachelors degree in public health	4% (5%)	3% <mark>(4%)</mark>			
Other bachelors degree	36% (40%)	32% <mark>(34%)</mark>			
Masters degree in public health	5% (6%)	8% ( <mark>10%)</mark>			
Other masters degree	13% (13%)	18% <mark>(19%)</mark>			
Doctoral degree in public health	<1% (<1%)	1% <mark>(1%)</mark>			
Other doctoral degree	2% (2%)	2% <mark>(3%)</mark>			
Other advanced degree (e.g. MD, JD, etc.)	4% (4%)	5% <mark>(5%)</mark>			

**Governmental Respondents** 

#### **Recruitment:**

As shown in Table 6 of rank of mean respondent ratings, respondents list specific work function/activities involved in their current position as the highest rated reason behind initially taking their current job. Respondents' rate job security, competitive benefits, and identifying with the mission of the organization among the greatest influences on their decision to initially take their current job. The ability to telecommute rated least important in recruitment among total respondents, but this factor did rate higher among younger workers in their 20s. Factors external to the position and agency such as a desire to live in a particular climate or close to family also rated fairly high. Perhaps in part influenced by the timing of this survey's administration during a national recession, job security has the second highest mean for recruitment influences and the highest mean for retention factors. Interestingly, benefits also rate considerably higher than competitive salaries for public health workers. In fact, competitive salaries rate 12<sup>th</sup> out of 19 factors. Table 6: Factors Influencing Decision to Work with Current Employer

FACTORS	Entering	Remaining
Specific Work Functions or Activities Involved in Current Position	1	2
> Job Security	2	1
> Competitive Benefits	3	3
Identifying with the Mission of the Organization	4	4
> Enjoy living in the area (e.g. climate, amenities, culture)	5	6
> Personal commitment to public service	6	5
> Wanted to live close to family and friends	7	8
> Wanted a job in the public health field	8	9
> Future Opportunities for Training/Continuing Education	9	10
> Flexibility of Work Schedule	10	7
> Ability to Innovate	11	11
> Competitive Salary	12	14
> Future Opportunities for Promotion	13	15
> Autonomy/Employee empowerment	14	13
Needed a job, but it didn't matter if it was in public health	15	16
> Immediate Opportunity for Advancement/Promotion	16	17

Wanted to work with specific individual(s)	17	12
Family member/role model was/is working in public health	18	19
> Ability to Telecommute	19	18

#### Retention:

The same factors highly influencing recruitment remain highly rated in terms of influencing retention (Table 6). Of note, however, are several trends. First, the workers answering this survey have been retained in public health. This survey lacks information on those individuals who have left the public health field. Retained workers rate their personal commitment to public service higher compared to when they initially took their jobs. The data reveal a trend towards valuing stability in terms of other highly rated factors: a) job security, b) enjoying living in an area, and c) living near family. Perhaps because many of these respondents are mid-career, they now rate opportunities for advancement future and immediate- lower now compared to when they began work.

#### Gender Differences:

Analysis of the data using a Chi-square procedure finds several statistically significant differences between female and male respondents. Women rate opportunities for training (p= .013) significantly more important as a recruitment factor. Women likewise rate several retention factors as more important than male respondents: autonomy/employee empowerment (p= .047), specific work functions (p= .003), and wanting a job specifically in public health (p= 0.23). On the other hand, men rate living near family and friends (p= .024), working with a specific person (p= .033), and personal commitment to public service (p= 0.33) highly as retention factors.

### Age and Length of Employment Differences:

Younger workers rate several factors as more important to their recruitment and retention than older workers. The factors that were more important to those in their 20s and 30s included the ability to advance and job security. While older workers rate three factors –1) personal commitment to public service 2) identification with an agency's mission, and 3) specific duties related to job higher than their younger co-workers. These trends were also reflected in comparison in the factors influencing decision to work with current government employer by years spent as an employee of a governmental public health agency (Tables 7 and 8).

**Table 7** - Average rating factors influencing decision to work with current government employer by years spent as

 an employee of a governmental public health agency

How much did these factors influence yourIn total, how many years have youdecision to take your first position with yourspent as an employee of acurrent employer decision to work with currentgovernmental public health agency						
employer	<5	5-9	10-19	20+	F	p- value
Job Security	6.69	6.81	6.94	6.85	2.176	0.089
Flexible work schedule	5.45	5.10	5.06	4.88	7.911	<0.001
Ability to work from home	1.51	1.33	1.13	0.85	21.524	<0.001
Autonomy/Employee empowerment	4.55	4.19	4.06	3.79	14.859	<0.001
Specific duties and responsibilities	6.99	6.89	6.91	6.88	0.519	0.669
Identifying with the mission of the organization	6.61	6.39	6.46	6.46	1.670	0.171
Ability to innovate	5.42	5.18	5.04	5.03	5.652	0.001
Immediate opportunity for advancement/promotion	3.80	3.50	3.61	3.44	4.364	0.004
Future opportunities for promotion	5.03	4.62	4.56	4.40	11.521	<0.001
Opportunities for training/continuing education	6.07	5.52	5.50	5.38	16.684	<0.001
Competitive salary	4.89	4.67	4.40	4.44	8.436	<0.001
Competitive benefits	6.78	6.76	6.93	6.83	1.204	0.307
Enjoy living in the area (e.g. climate, amenities, culture)	5.82	5.11	6.06	6.39	7.473	<0.001
Wanted to live close to family and friends	5.66	5.79	5.79	6.00	2.245	0.081
Wanted to work with specific individual(s)	3.13	3.13	3.07	2.93	1.316	0.267
Wanted a job in the public health field	5.88	5.70	5.97	6.16	4.526	0.004
Needed a job, but it didn't matter if it was in public health	3.99	3.94	3.77	3.87	1.236	0.295
Personal commitment to public service	6.23	6.10	6.17	6.14	0.404	0.750
Family member/role model was/is working in public health	1.51	1.51	1.58	1.73	2.199	0.86

**Table 8-**Average rating factors influencing decision to work with current government employer by yearsspent as an employee of a governmental public health agency

How much did these factors influence your decision to take your first position with your current employer decision to remain working with current employer	spent as	now many an employ MENTAL p	-			
	<5	5-9	10-19	20+	F	p- value
Job Security	7.20	7.31	7.60	7.80	15.001	<0.001
Flexible work schedule	6.12	5.92	6.15	6.00	1.512	0.209
Ability to work from home	1.98	2.01	1.80	1.60	6.124	<0.001
Autonomy/Employee empowerment	5.13	4.92	5.04	4.10	1.106	0.345
Specific duties and responsibilities	6.79	6.84	6.97	7.18	6.376	<0.001
Identifying with the mission of the organization	6.60	6.45	6.82	7.00	9.910	<0.001
Ability to innovate	5.53	5.50	5.53	5.77	2.496	0.058
Immediate opportunity for advancement/promotion	3.56	3.19	3.00	2.76	19.539	<0.001
Future opportunities for promotion	4.62	4.03	3.55	3.12	61.395	<0.001
Opportunities for training/continuing education	6.17	5.51	5.56	5.37	19.413	<0.001
Competitive salary	5.02	4.88	4.79	4.77	1.963	0.117
Competitive benefits	6.77	6.75	6.90	7.08	3.939	0.008
Enjoy living in the area (e.g. climate, amenities, culture)	6.14	6.47	6.60	6.93	14.691	<0.001
Wanted to live close to family and friends	5.94	6.09	6.33	6.48	6.930	<0.001
Wanted to work with specific individual(s)	5.10	4.91	5.14	5.09	1.264	0.285
Wanted a job in the public health field	5.99	5.88	6.40	6.67	17.934	<0.001
Needed a job, but it didn't matter if it was in public health	3.92	3.70	3.26	3.03	21.313	<0.001
Personal commitment to public service	6.47	6.48	6.88	7.17	19.411	<0.001

Family member/role model was/is working in	1.55	1.47	1.42	1.41	1.003	0.390
public health						

#### Differences by Race:

Analysis of the data by race also finds some statistically significant differences among workers, but these differences only emerge among retention factors. No differences by race emerge in terms of recruitment factors. Also, too few Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander workers responded to include in analyses.

African-American respondents significantly rate the ability to work from home as more important than Native American workers with Asian and White workers' responses. The other three statistically significant differences reflect higher ratings by Asian respondents than the other three racial groups. Asian workers rate immediate opportunities for promotion, future opportunities for promotion and living near family and friends significantly higher than other groups.

*Differences between Hispanic and non-Hispanic Respondents:* Analysis by a Chi-square procedure of the data found six statistically significant differences between respondents who report their ethnicity as Hispanic or not. Hispanic respondents report flexibility of work schedule the ability to work from home , and having a family member or role model working in public health, are more important recruitment factors than for their non-Hispanic peers. In terms of retention, Hispanic workers rate the ability to innovate wanting a job in public health and having a role model or family member in public health as more important.

#### **Other Findings:**

There were some differences in regional importance in recruitment and retention factors. The Midwest and Southeast rated flexibility of work schedule more important than any other region. The West had a significantly younger proportion of respondents than other regions and ranked competitive salary, ability to telecommute and opportunities for promotion and advancing professionally higher than any other region. Also, competitive salary seemed to be more important for respondents who worked in larger health departments. Further analyses including length of public health employment by professional and organizational leadership by current job settings are included in the appendices.

#### Organizational Leadership, Management, Professional Development Characteristics:

Organizational leadership characteristics was determined by rating based off a 5 point Likert scale with the categories of strong agree, somewhat agree, neither agree or disagree, somewhat disagree, and strongly disagree. This was determined by rating of how strongly agree or disagree with the statements about their organization. While the majority of respondents rated that strongly agree or agree with all leadership characteristics as contained in table there was a over a third who did not agree that there is atmosphere of trust and mutual respect within their organization and that the management and staff have a shared vision (Table 9).

Table 9: Organizational Leadership Characteristics

	Strongly Agree or Agree	Strongly or Somewhat Disagree
Trust/Respect	56% <mark>(53%)</mark> *	33% <mark>(36%)</mark> *
High Professional Standards	65% <mark>(63%)</mark> *	22% <mark>(24%)</mark> *
Appropriate Performance Evaluations	53% <mark>(51%)</mark> *	28% <mark>(29%)</mark> *
Constructive Feedback	55% <mark>(52%)</mark> *	28% <mark>(29%)</mark> *
Shared Vision	56% <mark>(53%)</mark> *	31% (33%)*

#### **Governmental Respondents**

The majority of respondents rated that strongly agree or agree with all management characteristics to address employee concerns. However, there was over a third who did not agree that there is that management had properly addressed employee concerns about autonomy/employee empowerment and leadership issues (Table 10). Additionally, there was almost a third who did not feel like management properly addressed concerns about professional development which may be problematic in retaining employees.

Table 10 : Over the past 12 months, management in the organization has made a sustained effort to address employee concerns about:

	Strongly Agree or Agree	Strongly or Somewhat Disagree
Tools Needed to do Job	63% <mark>(60%)</mark> *	22% ( <mark>24%)</mark> *

Professional Development	60% <mark>(58%)</mark> *	24% (26%)*
Autonomy/Employee Empowerment	47% <mark>(45%)</mark> *	29% <mark>(31%)</mark> *
Leadership Issues	45% <mark>(44%)</mark> *	32% <mark>(34%)</mark> *
New Employee Support	48% <mark>(46%)</mark> *	23% <mark>(23%)</mark> *
Safety and Security	64% <mark>(62%)</mark> *	14% <mark>(15%)</mark> *

#### **Governmental Respondents**

Finally, when asked to rate the professional development of organization. There were only two areas where a majority of respondents agreed these included opportunities to learn from one another and provides employees with most needed knowledge and skills (table 11). An overwhelming majority felt that the organization did not have resources available for employees and over a third disagreed that there is adequate time provided and training to fully use technology for professional development. This suggests that even if an employee wants to pursue professional development opportunities for themselves there may neither resources or time.

Table 11: Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about professional development in your organization:

	Strongly Agree or Agree	Strongly or Somewhat Disagree
Resources Available for Employees	36% <mark>(33%)</mark> *	51% <mark>(55%)</mark> *
Adequate Time Provided	45% <mark>(43%)</mark> *	38% (41%)*

Training to Fully Use Technology	48% <mark>(45%)</mark> *	35% <mark>(39%)</mark> *
Opportunities to Learn from One Another	66% <mark>(65%)</mark> *	18% ( <mark>19%)</mark> *
Provides Employees with Most Needed Knowledge and Skills	60% ( <mark>58%)</mark> *	21% <mark>(23%)</mark> *

#### Governmental Respondents

#### Discussion:

The public health workforce represents a critical link in the nation's healthcare system. Like the American workforce as a whole, the public health workforce represents an aging group of employees with a deficit of trained professionals to fill roles vacated by retirements. Developing strategies to recruit and retain trained professionals who are eligible for retirement or who are attractive to potentially more lucrative private healthcare jobs offer important tools for public health agencies. The Council on Linkages and PHF are pursuing a second phase of the National Pipeline Survey among the 28 states that do not use TRAIN. This second survey will use the same questions but will employ a different methodology to reach workers.

While not generalizable to all public health workers nationally, the Pipeline Survey represents an important first step and the largest survey recruitment and retention survey of public health workers to date. Several potential strategies emerge from these data:

- 1. Linking the Individual Worker and the Public Health Mission: Respondents report the activities associated with a particular job rate the highest in job recruitment. Linked to these activities are other highly rated factors around identifying with the agency's mission, commitment to public service, and a desire to work in this field –factors which respondents rate higher actually now than when they began their job. Strategies which inculcate a stronger link between the agency's mission in improving public health and the personal commitment of the employee to this mission could help recruit and retain workers.
- 2. Benefits: Respondents consistently rate benefits higher than competitive salaries. With respondents rating job flexibility and proximity to family and friends higher in importance in retention, attractive benefits packages incorporating flex time, elder care, on-site daycare and similar benefits allowing workers greater flexibility to care for loved ones may be beneficial.
- 3. Training and Education: In terms of recruitment and retention, emphasizing training and educational opportunities may also offer attractive options for some workers. Five percent of workers who had not completed a bachelor's degree when they began their public health career did so by the time they answered the survey. Additionally, another 8.7% of respondents report they completed a graduate degree while working in public health. Respondents overall rate opportunities for training as moderately important (5.8 on a scale from 0 to 10) in their decisions to take and stay in a public health job. Offering workers trainings, tuition credits, and

scheduling flexibility to pursue more education is likely to be attractive to this segment of workers.

Beyond the information on individual public health workers gathered by this study, it also offers an important first venture into using the TRAIN system to research public health workers. As the largest database of public health and emergency responders in the country, it offers researchers an imperfect but possibly best current mechanism for studying the national public health workforce at the individual worker level.

### Appendices:

Primary professional role by years spent as employee of governmental public health agency

Primary Professional Role				
	<5	5-9	10-19	20+
Administrative Support staff	281 (26.9%)	228 (21.9%)	301 (28.9%)	233 (22.3%)
Administrator/Director/Manager	282 (15.5%)	331 (18.2%)	612 (33.6%)	598 (32.8%)
Allied Health Professional	146 (27.4%)	93 (17.4%)	159 (29.8%)	135 (25.3%)
Biostatistician/Epidemiologist/Statistician	115 (32.2%)	98 (27.5%)	96 (26.9%)	48 (13.4%)
Data Analyst	86 (27.6%)	84 (26.9%)	85 (27.2%)	57 (18.3%)
Environmental Health Specialist	104 (15.8%)	133 (20.2%)	186 (28.2%)	236 (35.8%)
Emergency Responder/Planner	229 (29.8%)	179 (23.3%)	212 (27.6%)	148 (19.3%)
Faculty/Educator	70 (27.8%)	62 (24.6%)	68 (27.0%)	52 (20.6%)
Health Educator	300 (31.0%)	213 (22.0%)	291 (30.1%)	163 (16.9%)
Laboratory Professional	60 (25.5%)	45 (19.1%)	66 (28.1%)	64 (27.2%)
Nurse	446 (22.7%)	399 (20.3%)	616 (31.3%)	507 (25.8%)
Physician	49 (28.8%)	36 (21.2%)	49 (28.8%)	36 (21.2%)

Public Health Service Provider (non-clinical)	257 (29.3%)	160 (18.2%)	267	194
			(30.4%)	(22.1%)
Researcher	71 (38.0%)	47 (25.1%)	47	22 (11.8%)
			(25.1%)	
Student	57 (51.4%)	27 (24.3%)	18	9 (8.1%)
			(16.2%)	
Total	1884	1561	2181	1835

## Number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with positive statements about organization or leadership within their workplaces by primary professional role of respondent

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree or with the following statements about leadership in your organization:

Agree or Strong	Prin	nary Pi Ri	rofess ole	ional											
ly Agree with	Ad min Sup por t	Ad mi n	АН	Bios tat /Epi /Sta t	Dat a An aly st	Env iro n	Em erg Res po n	Fac ulty Edu cato r	Hea Ith Edu cato r	Lab Pro f	Nu rse	MD	PH Ser vice Pro vid er (no n- clini cal)	Rese arch er	Stu den t
There is an atmos phere of trust and mutua I respec t with the organi zation	918 (52. 9%)	145 5 (61 .1% )	469 (55 .9% )	200 (51. 9%)	194 (46 .8% )	384 (52 .6% )	686 (60 .4% )	280 (61. 1%)	825 (57. 7%)	194 (55 .4% )	171 9 (57 .4% )	153 (63 .0% )	762 (56. 2%)	165 (59.3 %)	903 (58. 3%)
Mana geme nt and staff have share d	903 (52. 1%)	148 5 (61 .9% )	467 (55 .6% )	193 (50. 3%)	196 (47 .4% )	354 (48 .7% )	643 (56 .7% )	282 (61. 6%)	815 (57. 2%)	175 (49 .8% )	178 5 (59 .6% )	146 (60 .6% )	725 (53. 5%)	155 (55.9 %)	141 (56. 2%)

vision															
Emplo	981	163	547	222	218	476	785	320	951	230	209	164	874	183	159
yees	(56.	0	(65	(57.	(52	(65	(69	(69.	(66.	(65	2	(68	(64.	(65.6	(63.
are	9%)	(68	.2%	6%)	.7%	.1%	.4%	9%)	7%)	.5%	(69	.0%	9%)	%)	6%)
held		.5%	)		)	)	)			)	.8%	)			
to		)									)				
high															
profes															
sional															
stand															
ards															
for															
the															
work															
they															
do															
Emplo	877	129	443	188	196	350	543	258	789	171	173	124	693	142	128
yee	(50.	8	(53	(48.	(47	(48	(47	(56.	(55.	(48	9	(51	(51.	(50.9	(51.
perfor	7%)	(60	.1%	8%)	.2%	.0%	.8%	5%)	3%)	.9%	(58	.2%	2%)	%)	0%)
manc		.4%	)		)	)	)			)	.1%	)			
e		)									)				
evalu															
ations															
are															
handl															
ed in															
an															
appro															
priate															
mann															
er															
The	852	124	432	197	178	351	516	248	764	169	165	123	669	138	125
proce	(49.	7	(51	(51.	(42	(48	(45	(54.	(53.	(48	9	(51	(49.	(49.9	(50.
dures	3%)	(52	.7%	2%)	.9%	.2%	.7%	4%)	8%)	.3%	(55	.2%	6%)	%)	0%)
for		.4%	)		)	)	)			)	.5%	)			
emplo		)									)				
yee															
perfor															
manc															

e evalu ations are consis tent															
Emplo yees receiv e constr uctive feedb ack that can help them impro ve their perfor manc e	882 (51. 0%)	140 5 (59 .0% )	453 (53 .9% )	198 (51. 5%)	196 (47 .2% )	360 (49 .2% )	611 (54 .0% )	276 (60. 3%)	816 (57. 3%)	174 (49 .7% )	173 3 (58 .0% )	123 (51 .0% )	709 (52. 4%)	141 (50.5 %)	140 (55. 8%)

19

### Number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with positive statements about organization or leadership within their workplaces by primary professional role of respondent

Over the past 12 months, management in the organization has made a sustained effort to address employee concerns about:

		Primar Y Profess ional Role													
Agree or Strongly Agree	Adm in Sup port	Admin	АН	Biost at /Epi/ Stat	Dat a Anal yst	Envi	Eme rg. Res pon	Facul ty Educ ator	Healt h Educ ator	Lab Prof	Nur se	MD	PH Servi ce Provi der (non - clinic	Resear cher	Stud ent
Tools needed to do my job	1042 (60. 3%)	1525 (64.1% )	526 (63. 0%)	220 (57.3 %)	216 (52. 7%)	439 (60. 1%)	754 (66. 5%)	306 (67.3 %)	911 (64.2 %)	196 (56. 0%)	193 2 (64. 6%)	143 (58. 9%)	al) 847 (62.8 %)	171 (61.2% )	160 (63. 5%)
Professional developmen t	923 (53. 7%)	1488 (62.6% )	507 (60. 7%)	218 (56.8 %)	216 (52. 5%)	414 (56. 8%)	721 (63. 7%)	289 (63.4 %)	933 (65.6 %)	166 (47. 7%)	189 2 (63. 4%)	148 (61. 4%)	794 (58.9 %)	171 (61.3% )	161 (63. 8%)
Autonomy/E mployee empowerme nt	656 (38. 2%)	1263 (53.1% )	391 (47. 1%)	154 (39.9 %)	155 (37. 9%)	306 (42. 0%)	574 (50. 7%)	248 (54.3 %)	727 (51.2 %)	125 (35. 9%)	158 5 (52. 9%)	111 (46. 2%)	594 (44.2 %)	135 (48.8% )	124 (49. 8%)
Leadership issues	702 (40. 9%)	1321 (55.5% )	366 (43. 9%)	135 (35.3 %)	149 (36. 3%)	277 (38. 2%)	566 (50. 1%)	237 (52.5 %)	670 (47.3 %)	130 (37. 4%)	147 1 (49. 2%)	128 (52. 6%)	570 (42.4 %)	117 (42.0% )	113 (44. 8%)
New employee support	492 (46. 3%)	1337 (56.2% )	385 (46. 3%)	160 (41.8 %)	158 (38. 5%)	295 (40. 5%)	593 (52. 6%)	222 (48.8 %)	689 (48.6 %)	148 (42. 4%)	155 3 (52. 0%)	117 (48. 5%)	619 (45.9 %)	128 (46.2% )	120 (48. 0%)
Safety and security	1116 (64. 9%)	1551 (65.3% )	528 (63. 3%)	217 (56.5 %)	239 (58. 3%)	400 (54. 7%)	734 (65. 2%)	274 (60.2 %)	920 (64.9 %)	234 (67. 0%)	199 4 (66. 7%)	152 (63. 0%)	849 (63.0 %)	158 (56.9% )	154 (61. 4%)

### Number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with positive statements about organization or leadership within their workplaces by primary professional role of respondent

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about professional development in your organization:

		Primary Profess ional Role (Questi on 19)													
Agree or Strongly Agree	Adm in Supp ort	Admin	АН	Biost at /Epi/ Stat	Data Anal yst	Envi	Eme rg. Res pon	Facul ty Educ ator	Healt h Educ ator	Lab Prof	Nurs e	MD	PH Servi ce Provi der (non- clinic al)	Resear cher	Stud ent
Sufficient fund/res ources	556 (32.2 %)	881 (37.1%)	337 (40. 3%)	130 (36.0 %)	135 (33. 0%)	232 (31. 7%)	481 (42. 5%)	190 (41.6 %)	622 (43.8 %)	79 (22. 6%)	113 1 (37. 8%)	89 (36.9 %)	529 (39.1 %)	107 (38.6% )	103 (41.0 %)
Adequate time	651 (37.7 %)	1097 (46.2%)	416 (49. 8%)	176 (45.8 %)	153 (37. 4%)	319 (43. 7%)	573 (50. 6%)	233 (50.9 %)	711 (49.9 %)	107 (30. 6%)	138 7 (46. 4%)	119 (49.4 %)	666 (49.1 %)	132 (47.7% )	130 (51.5 %)
Employe es have sufficient training to fully utilize technolo gy needed for work	742 (43.2 %)	1156 (48.8%)	443 (53. 0%)	151 (39.6 %)	152 (37. 3%)	331 (45. 4%)	593 (52. 4%)	245 (53.8 %)	712 (50.3 %)	178 (51. 4%)	151 9 (50. 9%)	120 (50.2 %)	672 (49.8 %)	132 (48.0% )	126 (50.2 %)
Employe es are provided with opportun ities to learn from one another	1078 (62.3 %)	1673 (70.5%)	555 (66. 4%)	250 (64.9 %)	252 (61. 5%)	477 (65. 5%)	799 (70. 4%)	316 (69.4 %)	951 (67.0 %)	220 (63. 1%)	208 1 (75. 5%)	157 (65.7 %)	867 (64.2 %)	191 (68.9% )	160 (63.5 %)
Professio nal develop	926 (53.8	1496 (63.1%)	533 (64.	225 (58.6)	205 (50.	437 (60.	731 (64.	288 (63.4	923 (65.0	192 (54.	188 8 (63.	136 (117.	837 (62.1	158 (57.1%	151 (60.0

ment	%)	0%)	0%)	0%)	9%)	%)	%)	9%)	2%)	1%)	%)	)	%)

# Number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with positive statements about organization or leadership within their workplaces by work setting

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about leadership in your organization:

Agree or	Curr	ent Wo	rk Setti	ng							
Strongly		(Questio	on 17)								
Agree	Acade	Gov'	Gov'	Gov'	Gov't	Gov'	Health	Non-	Priva	Self-	Unempl
with	mic	t	t	t	0001	t	care	Profi	te	emplo	oyed
	Institu				Territ			t		yed	
	tion	Fede	Stat	ocal	ory	Trib	Service		Indus	-	
		ral	е			al	S		try		
There is	489	178	2431	1809	9	21	1684	669	177	62	6
an	(66.0%	(56.0	(10.1	161 1	(60.0			161 1	(50.2	/	(16 20/)
atmosph	)	%)	(48.1	(61.1 %)	(60.0 %)	(55.3 %)	(59.5%	(64.1	(59.2	(55.4%	(46.2%)
ere of			%)	%)	%)	%)	)	%)	%)	)	
trust and											
mutual											
respect											
with the											
organiza											
tion											
Manage	489	164	2442	1763	7	21	1691	663	170	62	9 (60.0-
ment	(66.1%	(51.9	(48.3		(73.3	(55.3	(59.9%	(63.6	(57.5	(55.4%	%)
and staff	)	%)	%)	(59.6	%)	%)	)	%)	%)	)	
have				%)							
shared											
vision											
Employe	549	202	2941	2083	9	19	1940	750	209	74	10
es are	(73.9%	(63.7	(58.3	(70.5	(64.3	(50.0	(68.8%	(72.2	(69.7	(66.1%	(71.4%)
held to	)	%)	%)	%)	%)	%)	)	、 %)	%)	)	
high			,								
professi											
onal											
standard											
s for the											
work											
they do											

Employe e perform ance evaluati ons are handled in an appropri ate manner	415 (56.0% )	158 (50.1 %)	2488 (49.3 %)	1605 (54.4 %)	5 (33.3 %)	21 (55.2 %)	1643 (58.2% )	601 (57.9 %)	159 (53.4 %)	47 (41.9% )	5 (35.7%)
The procedur es for employe e perform ance evaluati ons are consiste nt	407 (55.2% )	150 (47.9 %)	2452 (48.6 %)	1537 (52.1 %)	6 (40.0 %)	19 (50.0 %)	1594 (56.5% )	569 (54.8 %)	150 (50.2 %)	49 (43.7% )	7 (50.0%)
Employe es receive construc tive feedback that can help them improve their perform ance	442 (59.7% )	154 (48.9 %)	2523 (50.0 %)	1700 (57.4 %)	7 (46.7 %)	21 (55.3 %)	1659 (58.8% )	6331 (60.8 %)	168 (56.4 %)	60 (53.5% )	6 (42.9%)

# Number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with positive statements about organization or leadership within their workplaces by work setting

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about leadership in your organization:

Agree or Strongly Agree with	Curre nt Work Settin g (Ques tion 17)										
	Acade mic	Gov'	Gov'	Gov'	Gov't	Gov'	Health	Non	Priva te	Self- empl	Unempl
	Institu	t	t	t	Territ	t	care	- Prof	le	oyed	oyed
	tion	Fed	Stat	local	ory	Trib	Servic	it	Indu		
		eral	е			al	es		stry		
Tools needed	515	188	283	2041	`12	22	1833	708	191	59	10
to do my job	(70.1	(59.	5	(69.3	(80.0	(59.	(65.4%	(68.	(65.2	(54.1	(62.6%)
	%)	7%)	(56.	%)	%)	4%)	)	6%)	%)	%)	
			3%)								
Professional	517	192	264	1965	7	23	1725	684	179	64	12
development	(70.5	(61.	1	(66.8	(46.6	(63.	(61.6%	(66.	(61.3	(58.2	(75.1%)
	%)	3%)	(52.	%)	%)	9%)	)	1%)	%)	%)	
			6%)								
Autonomy/E	430	145	193	1583	6	18	1385	568	150	50	8
mployee	(58.6	(46.	4	(53.8	(40.0	(48.	(49.5%	(55.	(51.0	(45.9	(50.0%)
empowerme	%)	4%)	(38.	%)	%)	6%)	)	2%)	%)	%)	
nt			5%)								
Leadership	393	145	194	1512	8	12	1344	548	143	41	8
issues	(53.8	(46.	3	(51.5	(53.3	(33.	(48.0%	(53.	(48.7	(37.6	(50.0%)
	%)	2%)	(38.	%)	%)	3%)	)	0%)	%)	%)	
			8%)								
New	378	140	221	1539	5	17	1472	545	147	45	7
employee	(51.7	(45.	6	(52.4	(33.3	(45.	(52.7%	(52.	(50.0	(41.3	(43.8%)
			(44.								

support	%)	0%)	2%)	%0	%)	9%)	)	7%)	%)	%)	
Safety and	479	196	301	1984	12	23	1902	696	187	57	11
security	(65.2	(62.	3	(67.7	(80.0	(62.	(68.0%	(67.	(63.8	(52.3	(68.8%)
	%)	4%)	(59.	%)	%)	1%)	)	5%)	%)	%)	
			9%)								

## Number of respondents who agreed or strongly agreed with positive statements about organization or leadership within their workplaces by work setting

Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about professional development in your organization

Agree or Strongly Agree with	Curren t Work Settin g (Quest ion 17) Acade mic Institu tion	Gov' t Fede ral	Gov' t Stat e	Gov' t local	Gov't Territ ory	Gov' t Trib al	Health care Service s	Non- Profi t	Priva te Indus try	Self- emplo yed	Unempl oyed
Sufficient fund/reso urces	351 (48.1% )	137 (44.4 %)	1436 (28.6 %)	1201 (41.0 %)	4 (28.5 %)	20 (55.6 %)	1098 (39.5% )	481 (46.9 %)	138 (47.7 %)	39 (35.8 %)	5 (31.3%)
Adequate time	409 (56.2% )	149 (48.9 %)	1865 (37.3 %)	1502 (51.4 %)	7 (46.7 %)	18 (50.0 %)	1275 (45.9% )	556 (54.2 %)	140 (48.3 %)	47 (43.5 %)	7 (43.8%)
Employee s have sufficient training to fully utilize technolog y needed for work	428 (59.1% )	154 (50.4 %)	2052 (41.1 %)	1525 (52.3 %)	10 (73.3 %)	20 (55.5 %)	1465 (52.8% )	594 (58.0 %)	164 (56.8 %)	45 (41.3 %)	7 (43.8%)
Employee s are provided with opportuni ties to learn	508 (69.8% )	203 (66.6 %)	3052 (61.0 %)	2104 (72.0 %)	11 (73.3 %)	21 (58.3 %)	1913 (69.0% )	734 (71.5 %)	217 (74.8 %)	72 (66.1 %)	9 (56.3%)

from one											
another											
Professio	496	190	2642	1934	9	23	1750	684	186	66	8
nal	(68.4%	(62.1	(52.9	(66.4	(60.0	(63.9	(63.2%	(66.9	(64.4	(60.0	(50.0%)
developm	)	%)	%)	%)	%)	%)	)	%)	%)	%)	
ent											

Positions held by public health workers immediately prior to entering your current governmental public health position

Wher e	Curi		rofess ole	ional											
were you before enteri ng your curren t gover nment al PH positi on?	Ad mi Sup por t	Ad mi n	Alli ed Hea Ith 	Bios tat /Epi /Sta t	Da ta An aly st	Env iro n	Eme rgen cy Resp onde r	Fac ulty Edu cat or	Hea Ith Edu cat or	L a b P r o f	N ur se		PH Servi ce Provi der (non - clinic al	Res ear che r	Stu de nt
High School	75	47	14	5	9	24	48	10	32	7	38	3	32	4	4
Associ ate Degre e	72	68	32	4	14	13	61	10	40	1 2	14 3	1	44	6	11
Under grad PH progra m.	9	59	18	12	6	82	26	7	58	6	26	1	29	3	7
Other Under grad progra m	65	22 4	68	30	37	12 4	88	18	124	5 0	16 0	2	79	28	19
Gradu ate	19	12 0	21	140	39	33	57	32	92	1 2	29	22	55	36	14

Draft: July 20, 2011

progra m in public health															
Other gradu ate progra m	27	13 3	66	23	27	49	48	19	70	2 0	66	2	58	21	7
Docto ral progra m in public health	0	8	2	15	4	1	0	9	3	2	1	0	2	11	1
Other doctor al progra m	6	33	17	5	7	8	7	12	6	5	1	33	9	7	2
Other advan ced degre e progra m (eg MD, JD, etc)	5	39	11	14	3	7	5	17	6	3	9	44	9	10	4
Other gover nment al agenc y	173	23 9	42	19	49	84	107	19	85	1 5	79	8	111	19	8

30

Healt hcare Servic es	147	54 9	191	65	32	51	224	77	300	7 2	13 56	73	256	30	28
Nonpr ofit Organ izatio n	72	23 2	84	36	26	23	98	27	175	1 4	14 7	11	135	26	11
Privat e Indust ry	405	38 5	82	46	89	25 3	202	34	169	6 3	30 9	14	225	29	38
Acade mic emplo yment	30	12 5	33	60	34	33	45	41	104	2 0	68	22	68	30	10
Retire d	12	25	5	0	3	11	17	1	5	4	12	4	13	2	0
Self Emplo yed	52	71	27	11	13	36	56	16	54	6	40	21	59	11	5
Unem ploye d	125	62	24	20	28	45	32	7	50	1 5	63	3	43	11	8
Total	129 4	24 19	737	189 1	41 7	86 1	1121	356	137 3	3 2 6	25 47	264	1227	284	177