2016 Employee Climate Survey: Prepared for University Operations

Assessment Group for Diversity Issues

Chair: VP for Diversity, Mary Ontiveros
Committee: Shannon Archibeque-Engle, Paul Doherty, Gene Gloeckner, Chris Henle, Laura Jensen, Dave McKelfresh, Debra Parker, Jennifer Schneider, Paul Thayer, Ria Vigil
This year’s survey was designed to assess the current campus climate of the university.

Results are intended to:

- Provide an overall picture of CSU’s employment experiences and perceptions
- Further CSU’s commitment to institutional accountability
- Inform policies, initiatives, and opportunities that will provide an exceptional and equitable work environment
- Provide a small benchmark for longitudinal data collection and comparison for perceptions of diversity
• Climate Survey designed by the Assessment Group for Diversity Issues

• Administered via Campus Labs in Fall 2016
  – Spanish and hard copy versions available
  – 15 minutes to complete
  – Anonymous
  – Results are reported in aggregate and no identifying information reported (e.g. small cell sizes)
  – Email initiation sent by President Frank
  – Two week follow-up reminder sent by councils to their employee listserv
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Category</th>
<th># of Respondents</th>
<th># of CSU Employees</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Employees</td>
<td>2,191</td>
<td>7,224</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Professional</td>
<td>1,181</td>
<td>3,696</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Classified</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents may not have completed the entire survey; therefore, respondent counts will vary depending on the topic/question.

University Operations: 36% Total Response Rate (n = 223)
58% AP Response Rate (n = 73)
31% SC Response Rate (n = 150)
Respondent Overview

- 8.9% of all respondents do not have a full-time appointment
- 7.2% work off-campus
- Approximately a quarter of respondents each are in their 30s (26%), 40s (23%), and 50s (25%)
  - 14% are 60+
  - 12% are under 30
- 38.4% are a primary caretaker of a minor and/or an adult
- 40% are CSU Alumni
Survey Framework

- Workload
- Work Respect
- Leadership
- Search Committee
- Physical Campus Environment
- Diversity in Your Work Environment
- Campus Trainings
- Campus and Department Perceptions
- Personal and Employee Characteristics
**Items worded in support of construct. A higher mean can be interpreted as a more negative response.**

**All questions were asked on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree & 5 = Strongly Agree)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th># of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload</strong>*</td>
<td>Work Overload</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>52.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Demands &amp; Expectations</td>
<td>2,124</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>10.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Respect</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>72.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Executive Leadership</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>46.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability Standards</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>10.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,884</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>46.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Perceptions</strong></td>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>10.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department/Unit</td>
<td>1,523</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>48.87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Work Overload**
- The amount of work I have to do interferes with the quality I want to maintain (45% Agree; UO: 53%)
- My workload is too heavy (39% Agree; UO: 46%)
- I don't have time to finish my job (37% Agree; UO: 47%)
- I'm rushed in doing my job (43% Agree; UO: 52%)
- I feel overburdened in my job (41% Agree; UO: 51%)

**Time Demands & Expectations**
- I am expected to work more than 40 hours a week (40% Agree; UO: 36%)
- I feel pressure to be reachable for work purposes throughout the day and evening (40% Agree; UO: 38%)
- I have to stay too many extra hours at my job (31% Agree; UO: 32%)
- I am expected to put my job ahead of my family or personal life (18% Agree; UO: 21%)

**Select additional Workload items not in constructs:**
- I have to take on work that falls outside my job description (46% Agree; UO: 55%)
- A healthy work/live balance is supported in my work environment (52% Agree; UO: 45%)
- My work is acknowledged when I do a good job (52% Agree; UO: 44%)

Agree = Strongly Agree or Agree
• Employees in **University Operations** have significantly higher perceptions of their Work Overload than all respondents \((d = .21)\); however, on average, their Time Demands & Expectations scores do not significantly differ.

• Within **University Operations**, Administrative Professional have significantly higher mean scores for Time Demands & Expectations (consistent with all employees) \((d = .50)\), but also significantly higher mean scores for Work Overload (not consistent with all employees) than Staff Classified \((d = .31)\);
• My work contribution is appreciated (69% Agree; UO: 59%)

• I am cared about at work (67% Agree; UO: 58%)

• I am treated with respect at work (75% Agree; UO: 67%)

• My supervisor supports me and advocates on my behalf (68% Agree; UO: 64%)
Employees under the University Operations division have a significantly lower mean score on average for Respect than all employees \((d = .20)\)

Within University Operations, Administrative Professionals have significantly higher mean scores for Work Respect than Staff Classified \((d = .36)\)
• 41% of University Operations employees agreed their employment category is not treated with the same respect as other jobs at CSU (30% of State Classified and 64% of AP)

• 42% of University Operations employees agreed their job type is not treated with the same respect as other jobs at CSU (45% of State Classified and 38% of AP)
Disrespectful Experiences

An individual or a group of individuals...

- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way: 43%
- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion: 50%
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others: 17%
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately: 21%
- Ignored or excluded you or others: 18%
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity: 37%
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters: 39%
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others: 26%

CSU vs. Univ. Operations
Executive Leadership

- CSU leadership communicates institutional goals  
  
  (58% Agree; UO: 49%)

- CSU's strategic goals are taking CSU in a positive direction  
  
  (55% Agree: UO: 49%)

- CSU leadership is transparent in decision-making  
  
  (23% Agree; UO: 18%)

- CSU is committed to shared governance  
  
  (32% Agree; UO: 30%)

- CSU's major strategic initiatives are broadly communicated  
  
  (55% Agree; UO: 45%)

- University leaders are held accountable for CSU's outcomes  
  
  (29% Agree; UO: 22%)

- CSU leadership acts ethically and honestly in the workplace  
  
  (53% Agree; UO: 44%)

- University leaders address issues of inequities  
  
  (43% Agree; UO: 32%)

Accountability Standards

- Employees are held accountable for negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace  
  
  (50% Disagree; UO: 51%)

- Employees are held accountable for poor performance in the workplace  
  
  (50% Disagree; UO: 55%)

- University leaders adequately address negative or inappropriate behavior in the workplace  
  
  (32% Disagree; UO: 41%)

- Employees in my immediate work environment act ethically and honestly in the workplace  
  
  (14% Disagree; UO: 16%)
• **University Operations** have significantly lower average scores for their perceptions of Executive Leadership and Accountability Standards compared to all respondents ($d = .23$ and $.18$ respectively)

• There were no significant differences within University Operations by employment category
Physical Environment

- My physical environment supports my successful completion of tasks
  - (18% Disagree; UO: 23%)

- I am physically comfortable in my work space
  - (16% Disagree; UO: 20%)

- My physical environment promotes collaboration
  - (23% Disagree; UO: 27%)

- I have the proper equipment and resources available to complete my work
  - (15% Disagree; UO: 24%)

- My physical environment is welcoming of employees from different backgrounds
  - (10% Disagree; UO: 12%)

- My physical environment meets my personal needs (access, bathroom, prayer, lactation)
  - (9% Disagree; UO: 12%)

- My physical environment (e.g. signage, construction hazards, lighting, parking) supports my sense of safety
  - (13% Disagree; UO: 14%)

- Employees respect shared space (e.g. classrooms)
  - (10% Disagree; UO: 14%)
Physical Environment

- **University Operations** have significantly lower perceptions on average of their Physical Environment compared to all CSU respondents \((d = .21)\)

- Among **University Operations**, Administrative Professionals have significantly higher mean scores for perceptions of their Physical Environment than Staff Classified (consistent with all employees) \((d < .05)\)
The power dynamics of the search committee dictate the decision-making process

The unfilled positions in my area are not being filled quickly enough

I witnessed bias/discrimination during the search process

Percent who responded Strongly Agree/Agree

- 51.1% of respondents have served on a search committee in the past five years
  - 33.3% of State Classified, 63.6% of Faculty, 60.1% of Administrative Professional
  - 36.8% of University Operations
The search process identifies the best talent for the position.

Equal Opportunity (EO) Coordinators are effective.

The hiring authority respectfully considers the recommendations of the search committee.

The search process is fair.

Selection of committee members is fair.

Search committees are fair.

The search committee allows members to voice concerns about bias/discrimination if it arises.

I am comfortable voicing concerns about bias/discrimination to members of the search committee.

**Percent who responded Strongly Disagree/Disagree**

- Univ. Operations
- All
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Supervisory training should be required of all supervisors

Diversity training should be required of all supervisors

CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to do a good job

CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to work well with others

There are obstacles that prevent me from participating in on-campus training and/or prof. dev.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>University Operations</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory training should be required of all supervisors</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity training should be required of all supervisors</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to do a good job</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU offers training opportunities aimed at enhancing my ability to work well with others</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are obstacles that prevent me from participating in on-campus training and/or prof. dev.</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>44.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Women employees are treated fairly at CSU

My supervisor promotes a work environment where all employees feel included

Prejudice and/or acts of bigotry are not tolerated on this campus

Employees of color are treated fairly at CSU

There is respect for religious differences here at CSU

Employees at CSU treat each other with respect

Upper-level administrators promote respect for cultural differences at CSU

The campus offers sufficient opportunity for diversity training

CSU understands the importance/value of diversity
I feel pressure to change the way I speak, act, or dress in order to “fit in” at CSU

There is racial conflict among employees here at CSU

Sexual assault and/or sexual misconduct among employees is problematic at CSU

CSU: 19% NU; 33% U

CSU: 8% NU; 12% U; 8% M; 8% F; 32% T/NB/SI

CSU: 12% NU; 37% U

CSU: 10.1%
I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:
Campus Perceptions

- Perceptions were asked for both CSU and Unit/Department
  - Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds
  - Retains diverse employees
  - Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds
  - Improves the campus climate for all employees
  - Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees
  - Encourages discussions related to diversity
  - Provides employees with a positive work experience
  - Recommend as a place of employment
Employees in University Operations have significantly less favorable Dept./Unit climate perceptions compared to CSU employees; however, they do not significantly differ in their overall CSU perceptions ($d$: CSU = .22)

There were no employment category differences within University Operations
• Overall, 88% of UO respondents would agree that they would recommend **CSU** as a place of employment
  • 48% would agree they recommend their **unit** as a place of employment

• The majority of UO respondents agree that **CSU**’s (65%) and the **unit’s** (55%) campus climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees

• 73% of UO respondents agree that **CSU** encourages discussions related to diversity and 43% of respondents agree that their **unit** encourages these discussions
• **Univ. Operations:** Females had significantly more favorable perceptions of their Time Demands & Expectations, Work Respect, Physical Environment, Executive Administration Leadership and Accountability Standards compared to males.

• This finding was consistent among State Classified University Operations employees and had the addition of a gender difference (females more favorable) by Unit perception.

• The only gender difference among University Operations Administrative Professional employees was work respect: Females had higher perceptions of their work respect than males.
• **Univ. Operations:** There were no significant differences by underrepresentation (only 32 underrepresented employees).
Overall Key Findings

- The 2014 assessment results revealed minimal between-group differences by employee category, while the 2016 assessment finds consistent and significant employee category differences.

- Faculty respondents have less favorable perceptions than AP respondents on all constructs.

- AP respondents have significantly more favorable responses than SC respondents on all constructs except Work Overload and CSU Perceptions.

- SC respondents had significantly more favorable responses than faculty on the constructs of CSU Perceptions, Work Overload, and Time Demands & Expectations.

- Gender and race/ethnicity were personal characteristics with notable differences in experiences and perceptions. Respondents who identify as self-identify, transgender, and/or non-binary or of an underrepresented race/ethnicity reported more negative experiences with regard to disrespectful behavior and negative treatments compared to males and females and non-underrepresented employees respectively.
Key Findings: Univ. Operations

- Employees in Univ. Operations had significantly less favorable responses in all areas except Time Demands and Expectations and overall CSU Perceptions compared to all respondents.

- Univ. Operations experienced more disrespectful experiences when compared to all respondents.

- Executive Leadership and Work Respect emerged as having the least favorable perceptions among Univ. Operations employees.

- Of particular note, was the more negative perceptions of one’s Work Respect by State Classified employees within Univ. Operations.

- Work Respect was the variable most predictive of an employee’s unit perceptions.
Questions/Comments?
Thoughts on Impact and Potential Action Items

- Workload
- Work Respect
- Leadership
- Search Committee
- Physical Campus Environment
- Diversity in Your Work Environment
- Campus Trainings
- Campus and Department Perceptions
- Personal and Employee Characteristics
Disrespectful Experiences by Gender

An individual or a group of individuals…

- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way
  - Males: 32%
  - Females: 39%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 47%

- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion
  - Males: 42%
  - Females: 47%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 63%

- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others
  - Males: 17%
  - Females: 17%

- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately
  - Males: 25%
  - Females: 24%

- Ignored or excluded you or others
  - Males: 37%
  - Females: 35%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 38%

- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity
  - Males: 24%
  - Females: 26%

- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters
  - Males: 47%
  - Females: 47%

- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others
  - Males: 34%
  - Females: 14%
  - Self-Identify/Non-Binary/Transgender: 30%
Disrespectful Experiences by Underrepresentation (Race/Ethnicity)

An individual or a group of individuals…

- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way: 35% Non-Underrepresented, 40% Underrepresented
- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion: 45% Non-Underrepresented, 50% Underrepresented
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others: 15% Non-Underrepresented, 25% Underrepresented
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately: 24% Non-Underrepresented, 29% Underrepresented
- Ignored or excluded you or others: 35% Non-Underrepresented, 40% Underrepresented
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity: 24% Non-Underrepresented, 32% Underrepresented
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters: 16% Non-Underrepresented, 20% Underrepresented
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others: 12% Non-Underrepresented, 15% Underrepresented
I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:
### Negative Treatment or Behavior: Experiences by Underrepresentation (Race/Ethnicity)

I experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Non-Underrepresented</th>
<th>Underrepresented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race and/or ethnicity</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic status</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of experience</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit or college</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as 2nd language</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver status</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Identity</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Underrepresented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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[Bar chart showing various work environment issues and their percentages]
Disrespectful Experiences

An individual or a group of individuals…

- Put you or others down or was condescending to you or others in some way
- Paid little attention to a statement you or others made or dismissed an opinion
- Made demeaning, rude, or derogatory remarks or jokes about you or others
- Addressed you or others in unprofessional terms, either publicly or privately
- Ignored or excluded you or others
- Discounted you or others when you raised issues of inequity
- Made unwanted attempts to draw you or others into a discussion of personal matters
- Yelled, shouted, or swore at you or others
I observed and/or experienced negative treatment or behavior based on:

- Job function
- Employee category
- Years of experience
- Gender
- Age
- Unit or college
- Appearance
- Socioeconomic status
- Caregiver status
- Religion
- Race and/or ethnicity
- Disability
- Sexual orientation
- English as 2nd language
- Country of origin
- Gender identity
CSU Campus Perceptions: 2016 vs. 2014

- Recommend as a place of employment: 77% (2016) vs. 79% (2014)
- Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees: 64% (2016) vs. 58% (2014)
- Provides employees with a positive work experience: 69% (2016) vs. 69% (2014)
- Encourages discussions related to diversity: 66% (2016) vs. 63% (2014)
- Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds: 67% (2016) vs. 64% (2014)
- Retains diverse employees: 53% (2016) vs. 53% (2014)
- Improves the campus climate for all employees: 62% (2016) vs. 62% (2014)
- Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds: 67% (2016) vs. 57% (2014)

2016 Employee Climate Survey
Department/Unit/Office Perceptions: 2016 vs. 2014

- Recommend as a place of employment: 56% (2016) vs. 68% (2014)
- Climate has become consistently more inclusive of all employees: 68% (2016) vs. 69% (2014)
- Provides employees with a positive work experience: 63% (2016) vs. 69% (2014)
- Encourages discussions related to diversity: 49% (2016) vs. 50% (2014)
- Creates a supportive environment for employees from diverse backgrounds: 63% (2016) vs. 68% (2014)
- Retains diverse employees: 55% (2016) vs. 51% (2014)
- Improves the campus climate for all employees: 58% (2016) vs. 58% (2014)
- Recruits employees from a diverse set of backgrounds: 57% (2016) vs. 59% (2014)

Note: The percentages indicate the proportion of employees who strongly agree or agree with the statements.
• **CSU alumni** have significantly more positive perceptions of the Executive Leadership and the Campus Climate than non-alumni ($d = .11$ and $.16$ respectively)
  – No significant findings among underrepresented employees

• On average, **employees with no dependents** have significantly more favorable mean scores for all constructs except physical environment than employees with dependents ($d < .20$)

• Employees who have **worked at CSU for five years or less** have significantly more favorable mean scores for all constructs than those who have worked at CSU for six or more years ($d < .16 - .38$)
What impacts perceptions of work respect?

Covariates
- Gender
- Minority Status
- Alumni Status
- Less established (5 years or less) vs. established employee
- Dependent Status

- Work Overload
- Time Demands & Expectations
- Physical Environment
- Executive Leadership
- Accountability Standards

Work Respect
What impacts CSU perceptions?

**Covariates**
- Gender
- Minority Status
- Alumni Status
- Less established (5 years or less) vs. established employee
- Dependent Status

**CSU Perceptions**
- Work Overload
- Time Demands & Expectations
- Physical Environment
- Executive Leadership
- Accountability Standards
What impacts unit perceptions?

Covariates
- Gender
- Minority Status
- Alumni Status
- Less established (5 years or less) vs. established employee
- Dependent Status

• Work Overload
• Time Demands & Expectations
• Physical Environment
• Executive Leadership
• Accountability Standards

Unit/Department Perceptions