

**2009 Smithsonian Employee Perspective Survey**  
**Office of Policy and Analysis**  
**Smithsonian Institution**  
**December 2009**

**1. Interpretation of Results**

The National Defense Authorization Act of 2004 mandated that all federal government agencies administer an annual survey of federal employee opinions with questions prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) (5 CFR Part 250). Every two years, in even years since 2002, OPM has administered the Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) to a sample of federal employees. The government-wide results of the FHCS surveys are reported by OPM. The 2008 FHCS results are used in this report as benchmarks to compare Smithsonian employee perspectives with federal employees working elsewhere. Beginning in 2010, OPM has mandated that a single survey, the “Federal Employee Viewpoint,” will be administered every year in February and March.<sup>1</sup>

While the Smithsonian Institution is a federal trust entity rather than a Federal agency, it complies with the law’s provisions in working on budget and personnel questions with the Office of Budget (OMB) and OPM. The Smithsonian chose in 2000 when the first Smithsonian Employee Survey (SEPS) was administered, to include Institutional Trust employees as well as federal employees. The 2009 Smithsonian Employee Perspective Survey (2009 SEPS) included employees of Smithsonian Enterprises and the Tropical Research Institute employees in Panama.

Table 1 presents the question wording and favorable score for each of the survey questions in the 2009 SEPS as well as comparisons with the 2008 SEPS and 2008 FHCS.

Interpretation of results of the 2009 SEPS is based on favorable responses to survey questions. The “Favorable Score” is the combined percentage of responding Smithsonian employees who responded that they “Strongly Agree” or “Agree” with a survey item. Employees who felt that they were not sure whether to agree or disagree were combined with those who disagreed in computing the favorable score.<sup>2</sup>

The Smithsonian Institution has moved through a transition in senior leadership during the past 18 months. Two months before the 2008 SEPS was administered, Secretary G.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Smithsonian will comply with the new time frame and administer the 2010 SEPS in March 2010, with the realization that the short time between the release of this report and the 2010 SEPS allows no time to develop and implement strategies to address areas requiring improvement.

<sup>2</sup> OPM includes “Do Not Know” and “Not Applicable” in the unfavorable category. The 2008 SEPS followed OPM’s lead except for excluding “Not Applicable.” 2009 SEPS followed general social science practice in restricting excluding “Do Not Know” and “Not Applicable” from the base used to calculate the favorable score.

Wayne Clough succeeded Acting Secretary Cristián Samper, who succeeded former Secretary Lawrence Small a year earlier. During the past year, the acting Under Secretaries (History, Art, and Culture; Finance and Administration) and the President of Smithsonian Enterprises had the Acting removed from their titles. In addition, a new Under Secretary for Science was designated, but onboard, immediately before 2009 SEPS. In 2008 SEPS, many employees who felt that they had insufficient information to evaluate leaders chose “Do Not Know” or not sure, which reduced the favorable scores for the leadership team.<sup>3</sup> Between 2008 and 2009, the nominal favorable scores for the leadership increased significantly as familiarity increased. Employees rated Smithsonian leaders more favorably than federal agency leadership in 2008.<sup>4</sup> In fact, a high level of respect for Secretary Clough was one of the most favorably rated survey questions (78% Favorable), higher even than the average rating for unit directors. Between 2008 and 2009, Smithsonian leadership turned from a weakness to strength due to the effect of increased familiarity producing fewer do not know responses.

### **Areas of Strong Favorable Scores in the 2009 SEPS**

Five areas in which the Smithsonian had its most favorable scores, also with high favorable scores in 2008, were:

- Intrinsic enjoyment of working at the Smithsonian

Overall employee job satisfaction remained very high with a marginal increase of one percent from 2008 SEPS; and well above the government-wide level in 2008. Employee responses regarding their satisfaction working at the Smithsonian were more favorable than opinions in 2008. Only two questions were not favorably rated by Smithsonian employees (satisfaction with compensation and satisfaction with opportunities to get a better job at the Smithsonian) although both increased slightly between 2008 and 2009.

- Alignment of work to Smithsonian and unit goals and priorities

Questions that related to employees understanding how their work fits into the goals and priorities of the Smithsonian and their units were amongst questions most favorably rated, as was feeling that the work that they do is important (a job satisfaction question with a 92% favorable score).

---

<sup>3</sup> Employees only rated Senior Leaders and Multi-Unit Leaders to whom their unit reports. Therefore, the number of employees rating different Leaders varied greatly.

<sup>4</sup> High respect for only one leader was rated slightly lower than the 2008 FHCS who was appointed shortly before the survey was administered, thereby increasing the number of “Do Not Know” responses. Comparisons between 2009 SEPS and 2008 SEPS are based on calculating 2009 scores using the same methodology as 2008, i.e., including “Do Not Know” and excluding “Not Applicable.”

- Relationships with supervisors
- Immediate work unit, performance appraisals, and working physical conditions

The performance appraisal system is an area in which employee scores showed some of the largest gains between 2008 and 2009.

- Support for a diverse workforce at the Smithsonian and protection from health and safety risks on the job.

In addition, 2009 SEPS showed highly favorable scores related to Smithsonian Senior Leadership with double digit increases over comparable scores in 2008 SEPS.

### **Areas of Weak Favorable Scores in the 2009 SEPS**

- Rewards and recognition for excellence and customer orientation

As in earlier SEPS, questions related to rewards for providing good customer service and performance remained among the survey questions with the least favorable scores. On the other hand, the scores in 2009 were generally somewhat higher in 2009 than in 2008. Resources to get the job done were also less favorably rated, although again the 2009 score was higher.

- Communication and coordination

Communication and coordination have been identified as areas of concern in previous SEPS surveys. Again, they were amongst the weakest areas in 2009 SEPS, although 2009 SEPS shows positive shifts in communication at both the Institution and unit levels.

Using the 2008 FHCS scores, The Partnership for Public Service (PPS) calculated “Best Places to Work” (BPTW) rankings for federal agencies. PPS based its rankings on three questions: (a) I recommend my organization as a good place to work; (b) Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your job; and (c) Considering everything, how satisfied are you with your organization? While the Smithsonian did not participate in the 2008 FHCS, these three questions (or modifications of them) were included in the 2009 SEPS. The Smithsonian would rank among the five “Best Places to Work” based on full-time, permanent federal employee responses in 2009 SEPS. If Trust employees were included in the calculation, the Smithsonian would have an even higher BPTW score.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> BPTW scores are based on three general job satisfaction questions rather than factors that managers can affect directly. Thus, changes instituted by Smithsonian managers may not be reflected in changes in BPTW scores.

## **2. How the survey was conducted:**

The 2008 SEPS was administered online with web-based software to all Smithsonian employees with Smithsonian issued email accounts.

Some Smithsonian employees do not have Institution-issued email accounts, including a few security officers below the rank of corporal and Smithsonian enterprises retail staff. Paper questionnaires were provided to these employees. Some facilities maintenance employees also do not have Smithsonian issued email addresses. These employees were provided an opportunity to participate online at an Office of Facilities Maintenance and Renovation training site.

The survey period began on September 11, 2009, and ended on September 30, 2009.

## **3. Description of sample:**

All federal, trust, and Smithsonian Enterprises employees who were employed as of the last pay period in June, 2009, were given an opportunity to participate in the 2008 survey (contractors, research associates, fellows, and other non-employees were not included). The results reported in this report do not include employees at the Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute (STRI) who work under Panamanian law or employees of the Friends of the National Zoo (FONZ), an independent non-profit organization that supports the Smithsonian National Zoo.

## **4. Survey items and response choices:**

The survey questions are presented in the accompanying tables. Respondents could choose one of six choices from the web survey: (1) Not applicable; (2) Strongly disagree; (3) Disagree; (4) Not sure whether to disagree or agree; (5) Agree; and (6) Strongly disagree, and (7) Do not know. Some respondents did not answer some questions. These responses were considered “Non responses.” Non responses and not applicable responses were deleted in calculating scores.

All respondents were asked two questions regarding Secretary Clough: (A) “I have a high level of respect for Secretary Clough”; and “The Secretary generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce.” The same two questions were asked in reference to the employee’s unit director. Many Smithsonian units report to an Under Secretary or another multi-unit leader responsible for several units. Employees were asked the same two questions about these leaders, based on their unit reporting relationships. The appropriate leaders were identified by name and position.

## **5. Employee cooperation rate:**

Of the 6077 Smithsonian employees invited to participate, 2573 began the survey (43%). 155 employees answered fewer than 9 questions and were excluded from the analysis. Thus, the final cooperation rate was 40 percent, substantially lower than the 59 percent cooperation in the 2007 SEPS or 45 percent in 2008. One factor that may have reduced the response rate, in addition to a shorter response period, was another Institution-wide survey about training that was also due on September 30. Several employees commented that they felt that they had already completed SEPS when they completed the training survey.

## **6. Response weighting:**

The set of respondents displayed response biases when compared with a profile of all Smithsonian employees provided by the Office of Human Resources. Among those biases were proportionately fewer black respondents, fewer males, fewer federal employees, and more higher pay grade employees than shown in the profile. Consequently, the survey respondents were post-weighted so that the analysis data set accurately reflects the relative proportions of demographic categories. All percentages (except cooperation rates) were calculated using weighted data. All “counts” in the accompanying tables present unweighted data to show the distribution of responses across answer choices.

**Table 1**

**Comparison of 2009 Smithsonian-wide Employee Perspective Survey Favorable Scores with  
2008 SEPS and 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) Scores  
(Questions ordered from highest 2008 SEPS Favorable Scores to Lowest)  
(Unfamiliarity reduces the Favorable Score)**

2009 SEPS Question	2009 Favorable Score (2009 Formulation)	2009 Favorable Score (2008 Formulation)	2009 SEPS Favorable Score Minus 2008 SEPS Favorable Score	2009 SEPS minus 2008 FHCS	2008 SEPS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)	2008 FHCS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)
The work I do is important to the Smithsonian. (Job Satisfaction 4 ) (2008 FHCS # 20)	92%	92%	1.1%	1.1%	91%	91%
I like the kind of work I do. (Job Satisfaction 3) (2008 FHCS # 6)	90%	90%	3.7%	6.1%	86%	84%
I know how my work relates to my Unit's goals and priorities. (Unit 22) (2008 FHCS # 19)	85%	85%	2.9%	1.2%	82%	84%
I know how my immediate work unit's work relates to my Unit's goals and priorities. (Immediate Work Environment 12)	85%	84%	1.2%	n.a.	83%	n.a.
I know how my work relates to the Smithsonian's goals and priorities. (SI-wide Work Environment 5) (2008 FHCS # 19)	85%	83%	2.8%	-0.6%	80%	84%
My supervisor respects and values differences among individuals (for example, gender, race, national origin, religion, age, cultural background, disability). (Supervisor 9)	82%	80%	1.1%	n.a.	79%	n.a.
I am encouraged to achieve positive results. (Immediate Work Environment 8) (2008 FHCS # 33)	82%	82%	3.0%	-0.1%	79%	82%
My immediate work unit has the job-relevant knowledge and skills necessary to accomplish organizational goals. (Immediate Work Environment 10) (2008 FHCS # 11)	82%	82%	-0.3%	7.9%	82%	74%
Considering everything, I am satisfied with working for the Smithsonian. (Job Satisfaction 9) (2008 FHCS # 63)	81%	81%	n.a.	23.2%	n.a.	58%
My supervisor supports my need to balance work and family issues. (Supervisor 11) (2008 FHCS # 12)	81%	80%	0.5%	4.6%	79%	75%
In my Unit, employees are protected from health and safety hazards on the job. (Unit 13) (2008 FHCS #42)	81%	79%	-1.1%	3.2%	80%	76%
My work gives me a feeling of personal accomplishment. (Job Satisfaction 2) (2008 FHCS # 5)	80%	80%	2.6%	6.4%	77%	73%
Overall, I am satisfied with my job. (Job Satisfaction 1) (2008 FHCS # 61)	80%	80%	1.9%	11.1%	78%	69%
I have enough information to do my job well. (Immediate Work Environment 14) (2008 FHCS # 3)	79%	79%	n.a.	5.8%	n.a.	73%
In my most recent performance appraisal, I understood what I had to do to be rated at different performance levels (e.g., Fully successful, Outstanding, etc.). (Immediate Work Environment 2) (2008 FHCS # 32)	79%	78%	4.6%	13.3%	73%	64%
The people in my immediate work unit cooperate to get the job done. (Immediate Work Environment 9) (2008 FHCS # 1)	79%	79%	-0.8%	-5.3%	79%	84%
I have a high level of respect for the Director of Communications. (Multi-Level Reports 15)	79%	72%	-0.1%	n.a.	72%	n.a.

**Table 1  
(continued)**

**Comparison of 2009 Smithsonian-wide Employee Perspective Survey Favorable Scores with  
2008 SEPS and 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) Scores  
(Questions ordered from highest 2008 SEPS Favorable Scores to Lowest)  
(Unfamiliarity reduces the Favorable Score)**

2009 SEPS Question	2009 Favorable Score (2009 Formulation)	2009 Favorable Score (2008 Formulation)	2009 SEPS Favorable Score Minus 2008 SEPS Favorable Score	2009 SEPS minus 2008 FHCS	2008 SEPS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)	2008 FHCS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)
I have a high level of respect for the Director of External Affairs. (Multi-Level Reports 13)	79%	79%	-8.9%	n.a.	88%	n.a.
I have a high level of respect for the Smithsonian's Secretary. (SI Senior Leadership 1) (2008 FHCS # 37)	78%	70%	18.8%	18.3%	51%	52%
My supervisor recognizes and acknowledges my positive work contributions. (Supervisor 12) (2008 FHCS # 57)	78%	77%	0.3%	27.0%	77%	50%
Employees in my immediate work unit share job knowledge with each other. (Immediate Work Environment 17) (2008 FHCS # 53)	78%	77%	n.a.	1.9%	n.a.	75%
My supervisor works well with employees of diverse backgrounds. (Supervisor 8) (2008 FHCS # 36)	78%	76%	-3.8%	10.4%	79%	65%
Differences among individuals (for example, gender, race, national origin, religion, age, cultural background, disability) are respected and valued by employees within my Unit. (Unit 21)	76%	75%	1.7%	n.a.	73%	n.a.
I am fully satisfied with my opportunity to participate in preparing my annual performance plan. (Immediate Work Environment 1)	75%	74%	6.1%	n.a.	67%	n.a.
The Director of Communications generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Multi-Level Reports 16)	75%	57%	7.5%	n.a.	50%	n.a.
I can be honest and talk freely to my supervisor. (Supervisor 1)	75%	74%	-3.1%	n.a.	77%	n.a.
I would recommend the Smithsonian as a good place to work. (Job Satisfaction 8) (2008 FHCS # 8)	74%	74%	n.a.	8.2%	n.a.	66%
My job makes good use of my knowledge and abilities. (Job Satisfaction 6) (2008 FHCS # 18)	74%	73%	3.1%	11.2%	70%	62%
I am satisfied that I have received appropriate information, or can access appropriate information, about new policies and procedures of the Smithsonian. (SI Senior Leadership 5)	74%	72%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
My supervisor is committed to a workforce representative of all segments of society. (Supervisor 10) (2008 FHCS # 34)	74%	69%	2.7%	11.8%	66%	57%
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Smithsonian Institution Libraries (SIL). (SI-wide Work Environment 21)	73%	62%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
My performance appraisal is a fair reflection of my performance. (Immediate Work Environment 3) (2008 FHCS # 30)	73%	71%	6.8%	7.6%	64%	63%
Physical conditions (such as, noise level, temperature, lighting, cleanliness in the workplace) allow employees to perform their jobs well. (Immediate Work Environment 13) (2008 FHCS # 21)	73%	73%	2.9%	5.3%	70%	67%

**Table 1  
(continued)**

**Comparison of 2009 Smithsonian-wide Employee Perspective Survey Favorable Scores with  
2008 SEPS and 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) Scores  
(Questions ordered from highest 2008 SEPS Favorable Scores to Lowest)  
(Unfamiliarity reduces the Favorable Score)**

2009 SEPS Question	2009 Favorable Score (2009 Formulation)	2009 Favorable Score (2008 Formulation)	2009 SEPS Favorable Score Minus 2008 SEPS Favorable Score	2009 SEPS minus 2008 FHCS	2008 SEPS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)	2008 FHCS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)
My supervisor supports employee development. (Supervisor 19) (2008 FHCS # 49)	73%	71%	n.a.	6.7%	n.a.	65%
I feel encouraged to come up with new and better ways of doing things. (Immediate Work Environment 15) (2008 FHCS # 4)	71%	71%	n.a.	10.1%	n.a.	61%
My supervisor communicates plans and work assignments clearly. (Supervisor 15)	70%	70%	0.2%	n.a.	70%	n.a.
I have a high level of respect for the Under Secretary for History, Art, and Culture. (Multi-Level Reports 1)	70%	63%	12.3%	n.a.	51%	n.a.
My supervisor gives me ample time and encourages me to participate in job enrichment opportunities (seminars, on- and off-site training opportunities. (Supervisor 4)	70%	69%	2.8%	n.a.	66%	n.a.
I am satisfied with the information I receive from the Smithsonian's senior leaders on what's going on in the Institution. (SI Senior Leadership 3) (2008 FHCS # 56)	69%	67%	8.7%	18.6%	58%	48%
I am satisfied with work-life programs (for example, health and wellness, employee assistance, and support groups). (SI-wide Work Environment 6) (2008 FHCS # 72)	68%	64%	n.a.	35.9%	n.a.	29%
My supervisor provides employee with opportunities to demonstrate their leadership skills. (Supervisor 17) (2008 FHCS # 13)	68%	67%	n.a.	6.1%	n.a.	61%
I have a high level of respect for my Unit's Director. (Unit 1)	68%	67%	2.5%	n.a.	64%	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Visitor Information and Associates' Reception Center (VIARC). (SI-wide Work Environment 18)	68%	57%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Protection Services (OPS). (SI-wide Work Environment 9)	68%	64%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
My supervisor treats all employees fairly in making work assignments. (Supervisor 13)	68%	66%	-1.0%	n.a.	67%	n.a.
My supervisor provides constructive suggestions to improve my job performance. (Supervisor 16) (2008 FHCS # 48)	68%	67%	2.4%	9.1%	65%	58%
My Unit's Director communicates the goals and priorities of the Smithsonian. (Unit 4) (2008 FHCS #40)	67%	65%	1.9%	5.2%	63%	60%
Overall, my immediate supervisor is an effective supervisor. (Supervisor 3) (2008 FHCS # 9)	67%	67%	-1.2%	0.6%	68%	66%
My workload is reasonable. (Immediate Work Environment 4) (2008 FHCS # 17)	67%	67%	2.6%	7.0%	64%	60%
My Unit's Director reviews and evaluates the Unit's progress toward meeting its goals and objectives. (Unit 3) (2008 FHCS # 41)	67%	63%	3.2%	5.4%	60%	58%
Discussions with my supervisor about my performance are worthwhile. (Supervisor 7) (2008 FHCS # 31)	67%	66%	-0.4%	9.8%	66%	56%

**Table 1  
(continued)**

**Comparison of 2009 Smithsonian-wide Employee Perspective Survey Favorable Scores with  
2008 SEPS and 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) Scores  
(Questions ordered from highest 2008 SEPS Favorable Scores to Lowest)  
(Unfamiliarity reduces the Favorable Score)**

2009 SEPS Question	2009 Favorable Score (2009 Formulation)	2009 Favorable Score (2008 Formulation)	2009 SEPS Favorable Score Minus 2008 SEPS Favorable Score	2009 SEPS minus 2008 FHCS	2008 SEPS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)	2008 FHCS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)
I have trust and confidence in my supervisor. (Supervisor 2) (2008 FHCS # 7)	67%	66%	-1.7%	2.3%	68%	64%
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Safety, Health Environmental Management (OSHEM). (SI-wide Work Environment 10)	67%	61%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I would recommend my unit as a good place to work. (Unit 23) (2008 FHCS # 8)	67%	66%	n.a.	0.8%	n.a.	66%
My Unit's Director communicates the goals and priorities of our Unit. (Unit 5) (2008 FHCS #40)	67%	65%	0.9%	5.1%	64%	60%
Smithsonian policies and programs promote diversity in the workplace. (SI-wide Work Environment 4) (2008 FHCS # 35)	66%	64%	n.a.	3.9%	n.a.	60%
I am satisfied with my involvement in decisions that affect my work. (Immediate Work Environment 5)	66%	66%	3.1%	12.3%	63%	53%
My supervisor resolves complaints, disputes, or grievances fairly. (Supervisor 18) (2008 FHCS # 44)	65%	60%	n.a.	20.9%	n.a.	39%
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO). (SI-wide Work Environment 7)	64%	58%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
My supervisor resolves problems and follows up to make sure that solutions are working. (Supervisor 14)	64%	63%	-0.9%	n.a.	64%	n.a.
My immediate work unit is able to recruit people with the right skills. (Immediate Work Environment 11) (2008 FHCS # 14)	63%	61%	5.7%	16.4%	56%	45%
The Smithsonian's Secretary generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (SI Senior Leadership 2) (2008 FHCS # 38)	62%	56%	19.1%	15.9%	37%	40%
I have a high level of respect for the President of Smithsonian Enterprises. (Multi-Level Reports 7)	62%	56%	7.6%	n.a.	48%	n.a.
My Unit has prepared employees for potential security threats. (Unit 15) (2008 FHCS #43)	62%	58%	-2.1%	-15.8%	60%	74%
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of the Facilities Management and Reliability (OFMR). (SI-wide Work Environment 8)	61%	56%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I am given a real opportunity to improve my skills in my Unit. (Unit 18) (2008 FHCS # 2)	61%	61%	3.5%	-2.8%	58%	64%
I am satisfied with the information I receive from my Unit's Director on what's going on in the Unit. (Unit 6) (2008 FHCS # 56)	61%	60%	4.5%	12.1%	56%	48%
I am satisfied with the policies and practices enacted by the Smithsonian's senior leaders. (SI Senior Leadership 4) (2008 FHCS # 58)	60%	56%	11.9%	13.8%	44%	42%
I am satisfied with the quality of Smithsonian provided training to improve my performance in my present job. (Immediate Work Environment 7) (2008 FHCS # 64)	59%	57%	8.5%	1.3%	48%	55%

**Table 1  
(continued)**

**Comparison of 2009 Smithsonian-wide Employee Perspective Survey Favorable Scores with  
2008 SEPS and 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) Scores  
(Questions ordered from highest 2008 SEPS Favorable Scores to Lowest)  
(Unfamiliarity reduces the Favorable Score)**

2009 SEPS Question	2009 Favorable Score (2009 Formulation)	2009 Favorable Score (2008 Formulation)	2009 SEPS Favorable Score Minus 2008 SEPS Favorable Score	2009 SEPS minus 2008 FHCS	2008 SEPS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)	2008 FHCS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)
Overall, I am satisfied with my compensation. (Job Satisfaction 5) (2008 FHCS # 62)	59%	58%	5.8%	-2.1%	52%	60%
I have a high level of respect for the Chief Financial Officer. (Multi-Level Reports 9)	59%	59%	10.5%	n.a.	48%	n.a.
I have a high level of respect for the Under Secretary for Finance and Administration. (Multi-Level Reports 5)	58%	49%	12.0%	n.a.	37%	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of General Counsel (OGC). (SI-wide Work Environment 22)	58%	47%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I am satisfied with the policies and practices enacted by my Unit's Director (as distinguished from SI and Federal policies and practices). (Unit 7) (2008 FHCS # 58)	57%	55%	3.4%	12.6%	52%	42%
I am satisfied with my choices of Smithsonian provided training to improve my performance in my present job. (Immediate Work Environment 6) (2008 FHCS # 64)	57%	55%	3.0%	-0.2%	52%	55%
My Unit's Director generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Unit 2)	57%	55%	2.3%	n.a.	53%	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Human Resources (OHR). (SI-wide Work Environment 13)	56%	54%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Special Events and Protocol (OSEP). (SI-wide Work Environment 12)	56%	46%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I have a high level of respect for the Acting Under Secretary for Science. (Multi-Level Reports 3)	55%	42%	10.8%	n.a.	31%	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Equal Employment and Minority Affairs (OEEMA). (SI-wide Work Environment 19)	55%	45%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
My supervisor regularly evaluates my training needs for my present job. (Supervisor 5) (2008 FHCS # 51)	55%	54%	1.8%	0.7%	52%	53%
The Under Secretary of History, Art and Culture generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Multi-Level Reports 2)	55%	48%	11.7%	n.a.	36%	n.a.
I am satisfied with the information that I received about the strategic planning process during 2009. (SI Senior Leadership 8)	55%	51%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Managers promote communication among different work units (for example, about projects, goals, and needed resources). (Unit 19) (2008 FHCS # 52)	54%	53%	3.4%	-1.2%	50%	55%
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Public Affairs (OPA). (SI-wide Work Environment 11)	54%	46%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

**Table 1  
(continued)**

**Comparison of 2009 Smithsonian-wide Employee Perspective Survey Favorable Scores with  
2008 SEPS and 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) Scores  
(Questions ordered from highest 2008 SEPS Favorable Scores to Lowest)  
(Unfamiliarity reduces the Favorable Score)**

2009 SEPS Question	2009 Favorable Score (2009 Formulation)	2009 Favorable Score (2008 Formulation)	2009 SEPS Favorable Score Minus 2008 SEPS Favorable Score	2009 SEPS minus 2008 FHCS	2008 SEPS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)	2008 FHCS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)
The Regents are more open and transparent than they were before 2007. (SI Senior Leadership 6)	53%	43%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I am satisfied that the strategic planning process will identify specific initiatives to strengthen the Smithsonian in the future. (SI Senior Leadership 9)	53%	48%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I have sufficient resources to get my job done (for example, people, materials, budget, etc.). (Immediate Work Environment 16) (2008 FHCS # 16)	53%	53%	n.a.	1.7%	n.a.	51%
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Fellowships (OF). (SI-wide Work Environment 23)	53%	40%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
My supervisor takes steps to address a poor performer who cannot or will not improve. (Supervisor 6) (2008 FHCS # 23)	53%	47%	-0.6%	17.8%	48%	30%
The Director of External Affairs generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Multi-Level Reports 14)	53%	50%	-24.9%	n.a.	75%	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Contracting (OCON). (SI-wide Work Environment 14)	51%	43%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
The Under Secretary for Finance and Administration generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Multi-Level Reports 6)	50%	41%	11.6%	n.a.	30%	n.a.
My Unit's employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes. (Unit 14) (2008 FHCS # 24)	50%	48%	-0.4%	3.7%	48%	44%
Recognition and awards (monetary or non-monetary) in my Unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs. (Unit 17) (2008 FHCS # 28)	50%	47%	4.1%	5.2%	42%	41%
I am satisfied with my opportunities to participate in the Smithsonian strategic planning process. (SI Senior Leadership 7)	49%	45%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Inspector General (OIG). (SI-wide Work Environment 24)	49%	37%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
The President of Smithsonian Enterprises generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Multi-Level Reports 8)	48%	45%	8.4%	n.a.	36%	n.a.
I have a high level of respect for the Director of OFEO. (Multi-Level Reports 11)	48%	38%	-13.9%	n.a.	51%	n.a.
Creativity and innovation are generally rewarded in my Unit. (Unit 9) (2008 FHCS # 26)	48%	46%	5.9%	5.7%	40%	40%
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Policy and Analysis (OP&A). (SI-wide Work Environment 20)	47%	35%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of the Comptroller (OC). (SI-wide Work Environment 16)	46%	35%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

**Table 1  
(continued)**

**Comparison of 2009 Smithsonian-wide Employee Perspective Survey Favorable Scores with  
2008 SEPS and 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) Scores  
(Questions ordered from highest 2008 SEPS Favorable Scores to Lowest)  
(Unfamiliarity reduces the Favorable Score)**

2009 SEPS Question	2009 Favorable Score (2009 Formulation)	2009 Favorable Score (2008 Formulation)	2009 SEPS Favorable Score Minus 2008 SEPS Favorable Score	2009 SEPS minus 2008 FHCS	2008 SEPS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)	2008 FHCS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)
I am satisfied that the strategic planning process will identify specific initiatives to strengthen the Smithsonian in the future. (SI Senior Leadership 9)	53%	48%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I have sufficient resources to get my job done (for example, people, materials, budget, etc.). (Immediate Work Environment 16) (2008 FHCS # 16)	53%	53%	n.a.	1.7%	n.a.	51%
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Fellowships (OF). (SI-wide Work Environment 23)	53%	40%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
My supervisor takes steps to address a poor performer who cannot or will not improve. (Supervisor 6) (2008 FHCS # 23)	53%	47%	-0.6%	17.8%	48%	30%
The Director of External Affairs generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Multi-Level Reports 14)	53%	50%	-24.9%	n.a.	75%	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Contracting (OCON). (SI-wide Work Environment 14)	51%	43%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
The Under Secretary for Finance and Administration generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Multi-Level Reports 6)	50%	41%	11.6%	n.a.	30%	n.a.
My Unit's employees have a feeling of personal empowerment with respect to work processes. (Unit 14) (2008 FHCS # 24)	50%	48%	-0.4%	3.7%	48%	44%
Recognition and awards (monetary or non-monetary) in my Unit depend on how well employees perform their jobs. (Unit 17) (2008 FHCS # 28)	50%	47%	4.1%	5.2%	42%	41%
I am satisfied with my opportunities to participate in the Smithsonian strategic planning process. (SI Senior Leadership 7)	49%	45%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Inspector General (OIG). (SI-wide Work Environment 24)	49%	37%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
The President of Smithsonian Enterprises generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Multi-Level Reports 8)	48%	45%	8.4%	n.a.	36%	n.a.
I have a high level of respect for the Director of OFEO. (Multi-Level Reports 11)	48%	38%	-13.9%	n.a.	51%	n.a.
Creativity and innovation are generally rewarded in my Unit. (Unit 9) (2008 FHCS # 26)	48%	46%	5.9%	5.7%	40%	40%
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Policy and Analysis (OP&A). (SI-wide Work Environment 20)	47%	35%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

**Table 1  
(continued)**

**Comparison of 2009 Smithsonian-wide Employee Perspective Survey Favorable Scores with  
2008 SEPS and 2008 Federal Human Capital Survey (FHCS) Scores  
(Questions ordered from highest 2008 SEPS Favorable Scores to Lowest)  
(Unfamiliarity reduces the Favorable Score)**

2009 SEPS Question	2009 Favorable Score (2009 Formulation)	2009 Favorable Score (2008 Formulation)	2009 SEPS Favorable Score Minus 2008 SEPS Favorable Score	2009 SEPS minus 2008 FHCS	2008 SEPS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)	2008 FHCS Favorable Score (Includes % Don't Know)
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of the Comptroller (OC). (SI-wide Work Environment 16)	46%	35%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
The Chief Financial Officer generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Multi-Level Reports 10)	45%	44%	14.7%	n.a.	29%	n.a.
In my Unit, positive and negative individual performances are recognized in a meaningful way. (Unit 10) (2008 FHCS # 29)	43%	40%	2.2%	8.7%	38%	31%
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Planning Management and the Budget (OPMB). (SI-wide Work Environment 15)	42%	32%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I am satisfied with my opportunity to get a better job in the Smithsonian. (Job Satisfaction 7) (2008 FHCS # 59)	41%	40%	2.0%	1.2%	38%	39%
The Director of OFEO generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Multi-Level Reports 12)	41%	34%	-10.1%	n.a.	44%	n.a.
Grade promotions in my Unit are based on merit. (Unit 8) (2008 FHCS # 22)	41%	36%	2.0%	0.8%	34%	35%
Employees who provide high quality services and products to customers (visitors, researchers, funding sources, other employees, etc.) are rewarded in meaningful ways. (Unit 12) (2008 FHCS # 25)	41%	37%	6.7%	-9.1%	30%	46%
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Smithsonian Enterprises (SE). (SI-wide Work Environment 25)	40%	33%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
I am satisfied with the services provided by the Office of Development (OD). (SI-wide Work Environment 17)	38%	30%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Individual pay raises (excluding cost of living adjustments (COLA)) depend on how well individual employees perform their jobs. (Unit 11) (2008 FHCS # 27)	37%	33%	3.8%	7.4%	29%	26%
The Acting Under Secretary for Science generates high levels of motivation and commitment in the workforce. (Multi-Level Reports 4)	36%	27%	7.5%	n.a.	19%	n.a.
Smithsonian leaders and managers promote communication and cooperation across units in the Smithsonian. (SI-wide Work Environment 3) (2008 FHCS # 52)	34%	32%	2.7%	-22.5%	29%	55%
There is adequate communication across units in the Smithsonian. (SI-wide Work Environment 1)	30%	29%	3.3%	n.a.	26%	n.a.
There is adequate cooperation across units in the Smithsonian. (SI-wide Work Environment 2)	30%	29%	2.9%	n.a.	26%	n.a.

**Notes:** (1) The 2008 formulation included "Do Not Know" as a valid response while the 2009 formulation excludes them as missing or unknown data.  
(2) n.a. designates questions that were not asked on the 2008 SEPS and/or 2008 FHCS surveys as well as differences derived from them.