

Engagement Diagnostics and a “3+1” Prioritization Model for Site IT team During a Large-Scale Business Unit Separation

RakWon Lee ^{1,*}¹ aSSIST University1; Rakwon.lee@gmail.com

* Correspondence: Rakwon.lee@gmail.com

Abstract: Large-scale business unit separations require an IT operating model transition from shared services to stand-alone capabilities, often under compressed timelines and temporary dual-environment conditions. In such contexts, the separating entity’s Site IT must sustain day-to-day operations while simultaneously executing transition work (migration readiness, validation, change communications, knowledge sharing, and cross-team coordination). This dual mandate increases exposure to burnout and disengagement risk, particularly when execution enablement (information, access, tools, and resources) is constrained or when cross-team coordination mechanisms are insufficiently defined. This project conducted a tailored Pulse Check Survey to assess the Site IT employee experience using a 5-point Likert scale combined with open-ended questions across six domains: Value Proposition Alignment, Workload, Recognition, Autonomy, Collaboration, and Opportunity. The survey yielded 33 responses and was administered with anonymity as the default while encouraging respondents to provide Region/Geography information to enable regional comparison and region-specific action planning. Domain-level findings indicate comparatively strong Alignment (4.3/5.0) and internal Collaboration (4.2/5.0), while Workload (3.9/5.0) and Recognition (3.8/5.0) are weaker. Item-level signals identify constraints in workload manageability (3.8), recognition frequency/visibility (3.8), enablement through information/access/tools/resources (3.9), and cross-team collaboration support (3.9). Based on synthesis and leadership alignment, the project proposes a focused action framework consisting of three globally shared priorities—Recognition, Tools & Autonomy, and Cross-Team Collaboration—augmented by a region-selected “+1” priority to reflect geographic variation, thereby forming a “3+1” prioritization model. The report translates these priorities into an actionable portfolio and a repeatable measure–act–remeasure operating loop appropriate for separation-era volatility.

Keywords: Employee Survey; Site IT; business separation; employee engagement; burnout risk; workload; recognition; autonomy; enablement; cross-team collaboration; change management; “3+1” priority model

Received: date 03 May 2026

Revised: date 15 May 2026

Accepted: date 18 May 2026

Published: date 30 May 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors,
Licensee ABR, Seoul, Korea.

1. Introduction

1.1 Separation Transition as an Execution Environment

Large-scale separations create a distinctive execution environment for IT: the organization must preserve end-user continuity while simultaneously establishing independent capabilities. During the transition, legacy and new environments commonly coexist. This dual-environment period increases operational complexity because access paths, tool usage, governance rules, and support boundaries can change incrementally over time. From an end-user perspective, connectivity, access, collaboration routines, and support pathways may shift in phases, requiring repeated re-learning

and raising perceived disruption risk. Separation transitions also extend beyond technology delivery into operating model readiness. Readiness domains typically include service desk processes, knowledge and change management routines, security operating mechanisms, asset/configuration governance, and escalation pathways. These workstreams are interdependent; delays or gaps in one stream can cascade into quality or schedule risk in others. Therefore, transition success depends not only on technical execution but also on coordinated operational readiness and disciplined cross-team collaboration.

1.2 Why an IT-Tailored Pulse is Needed Beyond Enterprise Surveys

Many organizations rely on periodic HR-led enterprise engagement surveys (often annual or semi-annual) to establish baseline sentiment and guide action planning. While valuable for enterprise-wide trend visibility, such surveys can be insufficiently granular and timely during separation. Separation-era workload and user-facing volatility often concentrate within the separating entity's IT function—particularly within Site IT—where the “run + transform” burden peaks. Under such conditions, risk signals (e.g., workload overload, enablement gaps, delayed communications on the changes) can deteriorate rapidly.

Accordingly, separation-era Site IT benefits from a complementary pulse mechanism that is tailored to site execution realities, conducted at a more frequent cadence (e.g., quarterly or every 3–4 months), and designed for rapid conversion of feedback into actions. The goal is not to replace enterprise surveys but to add a time-sensitive, function-specific early warning and learning system that protects operational continuity and workforce sustainability.

1.3 Objectives and Research Questions - This project has four objectives:

1.3.1 Diagnose Site IT engagement and execution constraints during separation using combined quantitative and qualitative signals.

1.3.2 Identify a small set of globally consistent improvement priorities suitable for centralized focus.

1.3.3 Provide a structured mechanism to address regional differences without diluting global focus.

1.3.4 Translate insights into an actionable portfolio and a repeatable measurement loop appropriate for transition volatility.

Research questions:

- What are the dominant engagement strengths and constraints for Site IT during separation?
- Which improvement areas are globally consistent and therefore suitable as global priorities?
- How should regional differences be operationalized through a region-selected “+1” priority?
- How can measured signals be converted into actions and re-measured to verify improvement?

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Engagement and Execution Capacity Under Separation Conditions

In separation environments, engagement and delivery outcomes are shaped by the balance between demands and resources. Demands increase due to parallel workstreams, heightened operational sensitivity, accelerated change volume, and increased coordination overhead. Resources can temporarily decrease because of access discontinuities, tool readiness gaps, immature operating processes, and ambiguous boundaries between teams. When demand growth outpaces resource availability, frontline functions—such as Site IT—may experience execution strain, elevated burnout risk, and declining engagement.

2.2 Operationalizing the Framework Through Six Survey Domains

To capture both motivational and execution conditions, the Pulse Check uses six domains: Value Proposition Alignment, Workload, Recognition, Autonomy (including execution enablement), Collaboration, and Opportunity. The framework is intentionally dual: it measures why people care (alignment, recognition, growth) and whether people can execute (workload realism, enablement, collaboration structures).

2.3 Rationale for a Focused “3+1” Model

Transformation initiatives often fail when priorities are too numerous or too diffuse. A focused set of global priorities increases clarity, communication effectiveness, and the probability of execution. However, separations may affect regions differently due to local operating constraints and differences in dependency intensity. The “3+1” model addresses this by requiring global alignment on three high-leverage priorities while allowing each region to select one additional priority that reflects local conditions and survey signals.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1 Survey Design and Administration

The Pulse Check Survey was designed as a complementary mechanism to enterprise engagement measurement, optimized for separation-era speed, relevance, and actionability. The instrument used a 5-point Likert scale to reduce respondent burden and enable rapid completion, while preserving comparability across domains and regions.

Anonymity was the default configuration to promote candid feedback. To balance confidentiality with analytical utility, the survey encouraged respondents to provide Region/Geography information, enabling analysis of whether results differ by region and supporting region-specific improvement planning when differences are observed.

Mixed-format design: Each domain included an open-ended prompt to capture improvement suggestions grounded in lived experience. In addition, the survey included three additional open-ended prompts: (i) the respondent’s biggest current challenge, (ii) what support from leadership would be most helpful, and (iii) what would increase engagement and motivation.

Construct basis and tailoring: The survey items were informed by Maslach Burnout Inventory–related constructs and were adapted to separation-era Site IT realities. The intent was to improve construct relevance and sensitivity to early burnout and disengagement signals in a population simultaneously carrying “run” and “transform” demands.

Table 1 summarizes the survey design and operating model.

Item	Content
Purpose	Early detection of time-sensitive Site IT risks and translation into priorities and actions
Enterprise survey complement	Complement periodic enterprise engagement baselines with faster, IT-tailored signals
Response format	5-point Likert items + domain-level open-ended prompts + three additional open-ended prompts
Anonymity and regional design	Anonymous by default; Region/Geography encouraged for regional comparison and action planning
Sample size	33 responses
Measured domains	Alignment / Workload / Recognition / Autonomy / Collaboration / Opportunity
Operating cadence	Intended for repeat use; a quarterly (3–4 month) cadence supports rapid review and actioning

3.2 Sample

The dataset contains 33 responses. Regional metadata was optional but encouraged to support regional comparisons while preserving confidentiality. Respondent distribution by Region/Geography is presented descriptively in Table 2.

Table 2. Respondents by Region/Geography (as recorded)

Region/Geography	Count
China	9
Americas	8
Taiwan	5
Japan/Korea	5
EMEA/ASEAN/India	2
Blank/Not provided	4
Total	33

3.3 Measures

The survey comprises Likert items across six domains and open-ended prompts. Likert items were used to compute domain means and key item means for comparison. Open-ended responses were used to explain low-scoring areas, identify concrete barriers, and provide improvement suggestions grounded in site realities. Region/Geography metadata was used to explore whether the intensity and practical impact of constraints differed by geography.

3.4 Analysis Plan

Quantitative analysis included (1) domain-level averages (Table 3) and (2) key item-level averages highlighting constraints (Table 4). Qualitative analysis summarized recurring themes from open-ended responses (Table 5). Regional metadata was used descriptively to identify variation and to inform selection of a region-owned “+1” priority when warranted (Table 9).

4. Results

4.1 Domain-Level Results (one-decimal reporting)

Domain averages (5-point scale) are shown in Table 3. Alignment (4.3) and Collaboration (4.2) are relative strengths, while Workload (3.9) and Recognition (3.8) indicate greater improvement need.

Autonomy (4.1) and Opportunity (4.1) appear generally positive but should be interpreted alongside item-level enablement signals.

Table 3. Domain Averages

Domain	Avg. (/5.0)
Value Proposition Alignment	4.3
Workload	3.9
Recognition	3.8
Autonomy	4.1
Collaboration	4.2
Opportunity	4.1

4.2 Item-Level Constraint Signals

Item-level results isolate operationally relevant constraints (Table 4). Workload realism/manageability is 3.8. Recognition frequency/visibility items are also 3.8. Enablement via information/access/tools/resources is 3.9, and cross-team collaboration effectiveness/support is 3.9.

Table 4. Key Low-Scoring Items

Domain	Item	Avg.
Workload	Workload is realistic and manageable	3.8
Recognition	Recognition for extra miles/important work	3.8
Recognition	Great work recognized often enough	3.8
Autonomy	Info/access/tools/resources sufficient	3.9
Collaboration	Cross-team collaboration effective/supportive	3.9

4.3 Qualitative Themes from Open-Ended Responses

Open-ended responses provide context for quantitative constraints. Recurring themes include enablement gaps (access/tools/permissions), workload and resourcing pressure (“run + transform” overload), communication and change readiness issues, learning constraints, transition friction, and recognition/career concerns.

Table 5. Recurring Qualitative Themes (Open-Ended Responses)

Theme	Summary
Access / Tools / Permissions	Enablement gaps during transition; access/permission/tool readiness issues
Workload & Resourcing	“Run + transform” overload; competing priorities
Communication & Change Management	Changes occurring before site readiness; insufficient advance notice
Learning & Growth	Desire to learn but constrained by time/content freshness
Migration / Separation friction	Complexity and early-stage gaps; dual-environment burden
Recognition / Career	Recognition expectations and career-related concerns

4.4 Regional Signals and Implications (descriptive)

Regional metadata enables descriptive comparison. Although the same themes recur broadly (Recognition, Autonomy/Enablement, Collaboration), practical intensity may vary by geography. Table 9 provides an illustrative regional signal-to-implication mapping consistent with the “3+1” design approach.

Table 9. Regional Differences: Stronger Signal and Execution Implication

Region	Stronger signal	Execution implication	“+1” candidate
Americas	Enablement / Autonomy	Tools/access gaps impede daily execution; higher dependency	Workload or enablement reinforcement
Japan/Korea	Recognition	High effort with low day-to-day visibility; motivation risk	Recognition reinforcement or career growth
China/APAC	Collaboration	Ownership ambiguity and late communication; structural friction	Collaboration structure or change cadence
All regions	R/A/C recurring	Global-level structural themes justify Top 3	Use +1 to address local urgency

5. Discussion

5.1 Interpretation: Separation-Era “Execution Strain” Profile

The observed pattern—strong alignment and internal collaboration alongside weaker workload and recognition—suggests a separation-era execution-strain profile. Site IT can remain mission-aligned and cohesive while still experiencing elevated fatigue and engagement risk if workload realism is weak, recognition is insufficiently frequent/visible, enablement is incomplete, or cross-team collaboration lacks clear ownership and escalation.

Enablement and collaboration constraints represent system-level conditions rather than individual-level deficiencies. When Site IT is accountable for outcomes but depends on external teams for access or decisions, perceived control decreases. When changes occur before site readiness, Site IT becomes the user-facing buffer for uncertainty, increasing cognitive and emotional load.

5.2 Priority Selection and the “3+1” Model

To translate signals into focused action, leadership aligned on three global priorities—Recognition, Tools & Autonomy, and Cross-Team Collaboration—and added a region-owned “+1” priority to reflect geographic differences. The “3+1” model maintains global focus while providing structured regional flexibility.

Table 6. “3+1” Priority Model (Global Top 3 + Regional +1)

Type	Priority	Notes
------	----------	-------

Global Top 3	Recognition	Global focus priority
Global Top 3	Tools & Autonomy	Global focus priority
Global Top 3	Cross-Team Collaboration	Global focus priority
Regional +1	Region-selected additional priority	Selected based on local signals and operating realities

5.3 Action Portfolio: Translating Priorities into Executable Work

Priority-to-action translation must remain operationally concrete and measurable. The report outlines an action portfolio aligned to the priority directions.

Table 7. Action Portfolio (Examples Aligned to Priority Directions)

Priority	Focus	Example actions
Recognition	Visibility / Frequency / Fairness	Lightweight recurring recognition; diversify methods (including peer-to-peer); link daily work to business impact; share success stories
Tools & Autonomy	Enablement	Define baseline tools/access; restore/replace critical access; standardize knowledge repositories and access
Cross-Team Collaboration	Clarity / Speed / Ownership	Publish “who does what” and escalation paths; simplify collaboration mechanisms; recognize collaboration behaviors
Next step	Execution governance	Select 3–4 actions per priority; assign owners/timelines; track progress transparently

5.4 Measurement and Follow-Up: A Repeatable “Measure–Act–Remeasure” Loop

Because separation environments change rapidly, a single survey wave should be treated as an actionable signal rather than a final diagnosis. The operating model recommends repeating the pulse on a quarterly cadence and using baseline items as the primary quantitative tracking set. Where feasible, operational measures can be used as supporting indicators.

Table 8. Measurement Frame (Baseline Survey + Optional Operational Measures)

Priority	Baseline	Optional operational measures
Workload	3.8	Qualitative shift in ability-to-adjust workload narratives
Recognition	3.8	Participation and satisfaction measures for recognition mechanisms
Tools & Autonomy	3.9	Baseline tools/access coverage rate; restoration lead time (if available)
Cross-Team Collaboration	3.9	Escalation lead time / re-open rate (if available)
Regional +1	Region-selected	Completion and qualitative improvement signals for the selected +1

5.5 Implementation Blueprint

To operationalize the portfolio, this report proposes a three-layer governance structure:

- (1) Global layer (Top 3): standard definitions, common KPI set, consistent communications, and cross-region learning.
- (2) Regional layer (+1): region-owned selection, region-specific plans, and local barrier removal.
- (3) Site execution layer: practical adoption (job aids, FAQs, training), escalation handling, and feedback capture.

A 30/60/90 structure can translate priorities into near-term execution steps while preserving optionality for adjustment after remeasurement.

Table 10. 30/60/90 Execution Roadmap

Timeframe	Recognition	Tools & Autonomy	Cross-Team Collaboration	Regional +1
0–30 days	Pilot lightweight recognition routines	Draft baseline tools/access requirements	Draft ownership/POC map	Select +1 and define success criteria
31–60 days	Expand methods (peer-to-peer mechanism)	Prioritize critical access restoration	Standardize escalation paths	Start 1–2 actions for +1
61–90 days	Institutionalize success-story sharing	Standardize knowledge repository access	Establish a recurring cross-team rhythm	Mid-course review and adjust
Post-90 days	Re-survey and iterate	Track baseline coverage	Track collaboration indicators	Re-measure and scale regionally

6. Conclusions

This report demonstrates that, during large-scale business unit separation, Site IT engagement risks can be identified rapidly via a tailored pulse instrument combining quantitative and qualitative signals. With 33 responses, findings indicate strong Alignment and internal Collaboration (4.3 and 4.2), alongside improvement needs in Workload and Recognition (3.9 and 3.8) and execution friction in enablement and cross-team collaboration (both 3.9). The survey design preserves anonymity while encouraging regional metadata to enable regional comparisons and region-specific action planning where differences emerge. Likert items support low-burden participation, while open-ended questions provide actionable clues regarding root causes and improvement opportunities.

The “3+1” prioritization model offers a governance mechanism that maintains global focus (Top 3) while providing structured regional flexibility (+1). Combined with an action portfolio and a repeatable measure–act–remeasure cadence (e.g., quarterly), the approach provides a practical decision and execution framework for sustaining engagement and delivery capability during separation-era volatility.

Appendix - Survey Item Composition Summary (Expanded Survey Item List)

A. Survey title and purpose

- Survey title: Global Site IT Pulse Check
- Purpose: Gather insights into experiences, workload, challenges, and well-being to reduce burnout risk and improve engagement through timely actions.

B. Response format and confidentiality design

- Response format: 5-point Likert rating items + open-ended (free-text) prompts.
- Anonymity: Anonymous by default; optional identifying fields (e.g., email/name) may be included as optional inputs.
- Region/Geography: Region/Geography is encouraged (and in later versions, set as required) to enable post-survey comparison by region and region-specific improvement action planning.

C. Basic information (metadata)

1. Region / Geography

- Region/Geography (encouraged; later version: required)
- Example region options: Americas; China; EMEA/ASEAN/India; Japan & Korea; Taiwan

2. Email (optional)

3. Name (optional) (Notes: Optional fields are used to preserve anonymity while allowing voluntary identification.)

D. Six Domains (“Six Areas of Worklife”) — Likert + Domain Open-Ended

Likert Scale Anchor:

- 5 = Strongly Agree
- 1 = Strongly Disagree

D-1. Value Proposition Alignment

Likert items:

1. Do you feel that the way our team works fits with the organization’s core values?
2. Do you feel that our Site IT team’s work matches the organization’s IT/Digital priorities?
3. Do you feel that your work is meaningful and creates value for your site users / key stakeholders? Open-ended (domain prompt):
4. Based on your answers above, what suggestions do you have for improvement? (Value Proposition Alignment)

D-2. Workload

Likert items:

1. Do you feel your workload is realistic and manageable?
2. When your workload becomes excessive, do you have ways to adjust? Open-ended (domain prompt):
3. Based on your answers above, what suggestions do you have for improvement? (Workload)

D-3. Recognition

Likert items:

1. Do you receive recognition (either financial or social) when delivering extra miles or important projects?
2. Do you feel great work is recognized often enough at our work? Open-ended (domain prompt):
3. Based on your answers above, what suggestions do you have for improvement? (Recognition)

D-4. Autonomy (Control + Enablement)

Likert items:

1. Do you feel you have enough autonomy to decide how you perform your work?
2. Do you have opportunities to provide input in making decisions that affect your work?
3. Do you have information, access, tools, and resources to perform your work effectively and with a sense of control? Open-ended (domain prompt):

4. Based on your answers above, what suggestions do you have for improvement? (Autonomy)

D-5. Collaboration

Likert items:

1. Do you feel our team works well together and communicates openly?
2. Do you feel safe sharing your opinions, even when they are different from others?
3. Do you feel that cross-team collaboration between Site IT and other IT teams is effective and supportive? Open-ended (domain prompt):

4. Based on your answers above, what suggestions do you have for improvement? (Collaboration)

D-6. Opportunity (Learning/Growth)

Likert item:

1. Do you feel there are learning / growing opportunities for you in this organization?

Open-ended (domain prompt):

2. Based on your answers above, what suggestions do you have for improvement? (Opportunity)

E. Additional Open-Ended Questions (free response)

1. What is your biggest challenge right now?
2. What support from leadership would be helpful for you?
3. What would help you feel more engaged and motivated?

F. Survey operating intent (cadence)

- Intended frequency: Quarterly (or every 3–4 months) as part of a closed-loop improvement cycle (listen → analyze → act → validate).

References

Item wording and domain coverage were developed with reference to the Maslach Burnout Inventory and broader burnout theory (Maslach et al., 2001), then tailored to the operational realities of Site IT during a separation.